

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TOYOTA MOTOR CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

AMERICAN VEHICULAR SCIENCES LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2013-00417
Patent 8,036,788 B2

Before JAMESON LEE, BARBARA A. PARVIS, and
GREGG I. ANDERSON, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

ANDERSON, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Petitioner's Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of K. Patrick Herman
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

On April 25, 2014, Petitioner (“Toyota”) filed a motion for *pro hac vice* admission of K. Patrick Herman. Paper 33. The motion indicates that it is unopposed by Patent Owner. *Id.*

The Board may recognize counsel *pro hac vice* during a proceeding upon a showing of good cause, subject to the condition that lead counsel is a registered practitioner. 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c). If lead counsel is a registered practitioner, a non-registered practitioner may be permitted to appear *pro hac vice* “upon showing that counsel is an experienced litigating attorney and has an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding.” *Id.*

In this proceeding, lead counsel for Toyota is A. Antony Pfeffer, a registered practitioner. Toyota’s motion relies on a declaration of K. Patrick Herman (Ex. 1018). Mr. Herman declares that he is a member in good standing of the Bar of New York. Ex. 1018 ¶ 1. Mr. Herman also declares that he has never been suspended, disbarred, sanctioned or cited for contempt by any court or administrative body, and that he has never had an application for admission to practice denied by any court or administrative body. Ex. 1018 ¶¶ 2-4. Mr. Herman further declares that he is familiar with the subject matter at issue in this proceeding based on his work as counsel for Toyota in the related district court litigation between the parties involving Patent 8,019,501: *American Vehicular Sciences LLC v. Toyota Motor Corp. et al.*, No. 6:12-CV-405 (E.D. Tex.). Ex. 1018 ¶ 8.

Mr. Herman further states (1) that he has read and will comply with the Board’s Rules of Practice for Trials as set forth in Part 42 of Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, as well as the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, and (2) that he agrees to be subject to the “United States Patent and

Case IPR2013-00414
Patent 7,630,802 B2

Trademark Office Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq.* and disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a).”
Ex. 1018 ¶¶ 5-6.

Based on the foregoing, we determine that Toyota has established good cause for admission, *pro hac vice*, of Mr. K. Patrick Herman.

It is

ORDERED that Toyota’s motion for *pro hac vice* admission of K. Patrick Herman is *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Herman is authorized to represent Petitioner only as backup counsel;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Herman is subject to the USPTO’s Rules of Professional Conduct as 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).

Case IPR2013-00414
Patent 7,630,802 B2

For PETITIONER:

A. Antony Pfeffer
Thomas R. Makin
KENYON & KENYON LLP
apfeffer@kenyon.com
tmakin@kenyon.com
ptab@kenyon.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Thomas J. Wimbiscus
Scott P. McBride
MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
twimbiscus@mcandrews-ip.com
smcbride@mcandrews-ip.com