

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

THERMO FISHER SCIENTIFIC INC. and
THERMO FISHER SCIENTIFIC (BREMEN) GMBH,
Patent Owner.

Cases

IPR2018-00297 (Patent RE45,553 E)
IPR2018-00298 (Patent RE45,386 E)
IPR2018-00299 (Patent 7,230,232 B2)
IPR2018-00313 (Patent RE45,386 E)¹

Before MICHAEL R. ZECHER, JOHN F. HORVATH, and
DANIEL J. GALLIGAN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

GALLIGAN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER

Granting Patent Owner's Motions for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission
37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c)

¹ This Order addresses an issue that is identical in all four cases. We, therefore, exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be filed in each case. The parties may not use this style heading unless authorized.

IPR2018-00297 (Patent RE45,553 E) IPR2018-00298 (Patent RE45,386 E)
IPR2018-00299 (Patent 7,230,232 B2) IPR2018-00313 (Patent RE45,386 E)

In each of the proceedings identified above, Patent Owner, Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc. and Thermo Fisher Scientific (Bremen) GmbH, filed an unopposed Motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Sonal N. Mehta as well as a declaration of Ms. Mehta in support of the Motion. Paper 15; Ex. 2022.² Patent Owner's Motions are granted. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c); *see also* *Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, IPR2013-00639, Order Authorizing Motion for Pro Hac Vice Admission (PTAB October 15, 2003) (Paper 7) (setting forth requirements for *pro hac vice* admission).³

It is

ORDERED that Patent Owner's Motions for *pro hac vice* admission are *granted* and that Ms. Mehta is authorized to represent Patent Owner as back-up counsel in Cases IPR2018-00297, IPR2018-00298, IPR2018-0299, and IPR2018-00313;

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner is to continue to have a registered practitioner as lead counsel in these proceedings; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Ms. Mehta is to comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Title 37, Part 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations, and that Ms. Mehta is subject to the Office's disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a), and the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq.*

² For purposes of expediency, we refer to the papers and exhibits filed in Case IPR2018-00297. The same papers were filed in Cases IPR2018-00298, IPR2018-0299, and IPR2018-00313.

³ Available at <http://www.uspto.gov/patents-application-process/appealing-patent-decisions/decisions-and-opinions/representative-orders>.

IPR2018-00297 (Patent RE45,553 E) IPR2018-00298 (Patent RE45,386 E)
IPR2018-00299 (Patent 7,230,232 B2) IPR2018-00313 (Patent RE45,386 E)

For PETITIONER:

Brian M. Buroker
Anne Y. Brody
David L. Glandorf
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP
bburoker@gibsondunn.com
abrody@gibsondunn.com
dglandorf@gibsondunn.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Adam R. Brausa
Sonal N. Metha
Eneda Hoxha
Durie Tangri LLP
abrausa@durietangri.com
smethta@durietangri.com
ehoxha@durietangri.com