

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NOVARTIS PHARMACEUTICALS CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

PLEXXIKON INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-01287
Patent 9,469,640 B2

Before SHERIDAN K. SNEDDEN, JO-ANNE M. KOKOSKI, and
KRISTIL R. SAWERT, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

KOKOSKI, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER

Granting Petitioner's Motion for Admission
Pro Hac Vice of Thomas P. Steindler
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

Petitioner filed a Motion for Admission *Pro Hac Vice* of Thomas P. Steindler (Paper 3) supported by a declaration from Mr. Steindler (Paper 4).¹ Patent Owner did not oppose the motion. The motion is *granted*.

¹ The parties are reminded that affidavits and declarations must be filed as exhibits so they may be referenced individually by exhibit number. *See 37 C.F.R. § 42.63.*

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), we may recognize counsel *pro hac vice* during a proceeding upon a showing of good cause. In authorizing a motion for *pro hac vice* admission, the Board requires the moving party to provide a statement of facts showing there is good cause for the Board to recognize counsel *pro hac vice*, and an affidavit or declaration of the individual seeking to appear in the proceeding. See Paper 4, 2 (citing *Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, Case IPR2013-00639 (PTAB Oct. 15, 2013) (Paper 7) (representative “Order – Authorizing Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission”)).

Having reviewed the motion and supporting declaration, good cause exists for granting admission *pro hac vice* to Mr. Steindler.

Accordingly, it is:

ORDERED that Petitioner’s motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Thomas P. Steindler is *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Steindler is to comply with the Board’s Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in Part 42 of Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations and the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide including the August 2018 update;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Steindler is subject to the USPTO’s Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq.* and to the USPTO’s disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a); and

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner shall continue to have a registered practitioner represent it as lead counsel in this proceeding; Mr. Steindler is authorized to represent Petitioner only as back-up counsel in this proceeding.

Case IPR2018-01287
Patent 9,469,640 B2

PETITIONER:

Robert H. Underwood
McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
runderwood@mwe.com

PATENT OWNER:

Elizabeth Stotland Weiswasser
Derek C. Walter
Brian Chang
WEIL, GOTSCHAL & MANGES LLP
elizabeth.weiswasser@weil.com
derek.walter@weil.com
brian.chang@weil.com