

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MERCK SHARP & DOHME CORP.,
Petitioner,

v.

WYETH LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-00378
Case IPR2017-00380
Case IPR2017-00390
Patent 8,562,999 B2

Before ERICA A. FRANKLIN and JACQUELINE T. HARLOW,
Administrative Patent Judges.

FRANKLIN, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION¹

Granting Unopposed Motion for Pro Hac Vice Admission of
Dr. Jayashree Mitra
37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c)

¹ This Decision grants a motion filed in each of the captioned cases. Thus, we enter this Decision in each case.

Wyeth LLC (“Patent Owner”) moves for an Order allowing Dr. Jayashree Mitra of White & Case LLP to appear *pro hac vice* on behalf of Patent Owner. Paper 27,² *see also* Paper 26 (affidavit of Jayashree Mitra in support of the Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission). Patent Owner explains that it has been informed by counsel for Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. (“Petitioner”) that Petitioner does not oppose the motion. Paper 27, 1.

Patent Owner’s motion is *granted*. Patent Owner shall confirm that its mandatory notices and official electronic file records have been updated accordingly. Counsel recognized *pro hac vice* shall comply with 37 C.F.R. Parts 11 and 42 and the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48755 (Aug. 14, 2012), and are subject to disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a).

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Patent Owner’s motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Dr. Jayashree Mitra is *granted*; Dr. Mitra is authorized to represent Patent Owner as backup counsel in each of the above-captioned proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Dr. Mitra shall comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board’s Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Part 42 of the C.F.R.; and

² Citations to paper numbers in this Decision refer to filings in IPR2017-00378. Similar documents were filed in each case.

IPR2017-00378; IPR2017-00380; IPR2017-00390
Patent 8,562,999 B2

FURTHER ORDERED that Dr. Mitra shall be subject to the Office's disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a) and the Office's Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101-11.901.

PETITIONER:

Arlene L. Chow
Ernest Yakob
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP
arlene.chow@hoganlovells.com
ernest.yakob@hoganlovells.com

PATENT OWNER:

John Scheibeler
Dimitrios T. Drivas
Eric Krause
WHITE & CASE LLP
jscheibeler@whitecase.com
ddrivas@whitecase.com
eric.krause@whitecase.com