

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AKER BIOMARINE AS
Petitioner

v.

NEPTUNE TECHNOLOGIES AND BIORESSOURCES INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-00003
Patent 8,278,351

Before LORA M. GREEN, JACQUELINE WRIGHT BONILLA, and
SHERIDAN K. SNEDDEN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

GREEN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER

Petitioner's Motion for the *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of
Michael W. De Vries
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

Petitioner, Aker BioMarine AS (“Petitioner”), timely filed a Motion for the *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of Michael W. De Vries¹ pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c) (Paper 39), accompanied by the Declaration of Michael W. De Vries in Support of the Motion (Ex. 1082). Patent Owner has not filed an opposition to the Motion. For the reasons provided below, Petitioner’s Motion is *granted*.

As set forth in § 42.10(c), we may recognize counsel *pro hac vice* during a proceeding upon a showing of good cause, subject to the condition that lead counsel be a registered practitioner. For example, where the 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.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c). In authorizing motions for *pro hac vice* admission, we also require a statement of facts showing there is good cause for us to recognize counsel *pro hac vice* and an affidavit or declaration of the individual seeking to appear in this proceeding. *See* Paper 7 (referencing the “Order – Authorizing Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission” in *Motorola Mobility LLC v. Arnouse*, Case IPR2013-00010 (PTAB October 15, 2012) (Paper 7 at 3-4) (expanded panel)).

In its Motion, Petitioner asserts that there is good cause for Mr. De Vries’ *pro hac vice* admission because: (1) Mr. De Vries is an experienced patent litigation attorney; and (2) Mr. De Vries is familiar with the subject matter at issue in the instant proceeding. Mr. De Vries experience as a patent litigation attorney “includes several matters in the chemical, electrical, and computer science arts, and . . . particular experience relevant to the technological and legal matters at issue in

1. The Motion is captioned as a combined Motion for the *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of Michael W. De Vries and Leslie M. Schmidt. This Order addresses the Motion as it pertains to the *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. De Vries.

this proceeding.” Mr. DeVries states that he is “very familiar with U.S. Patent No. 8,278,351, and with the legal subject matter, technical subject matter, and prior art discussed in AKBM’s Request for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,278,351, which forms the basis for this proceeding.” Ex. 1082, ¶ 5. In support of the Motion, Mr. De Vries attests to these facts in his Declaration. Ex. 1082. In addition to the foregoing, Petitioner’s lead counsel J. Mitchell Jones, and back-up counsel, Amanda J. Hollis, are registered practitioners. Ex. 1082, ¶ 1.

Based on the facts set forth above, we conclude that Mr. De Vries has sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Petitioner in this proceeding and that the criteria for *pro hac vice* admission are satisfied. *See Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, Case IPR2013-00639 (PTAB Oct. 15, 2013) (Paper 7) (expanded panel), (superseding IPR2013-00010, Paper 7, dated October 15, 2012, and setting forth the requirements for *pro hac vice* admission) (copy available on the Board Web site under “Representative Orders, Decisions, and Notices”). Accordingly, Petitioner has established good cause for Mr. De Vries’ *pro hac vice* admission. Mr. De Vries will be permitted to appear *pro hac vice* in the instant proceeding as back-up counsel only. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c).

For the foregoing reasons, it is

ORDERED that Petitioner’s Motion for the Pro Hac Vice Admission of Michael W. De Vries for the instant proceeding is granted; Mr. De Vries is authorized to represent Petitioner as back-up counsel in the instant proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner is to continue to have a registered practitioner as lead counsel in the instant proceeding;

Case IPR2014-00003
Patent 8,278,351

FURTHER ORDRED that Mr. De Vries 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

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. De Vries is to be 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. §§ 11.101-11.901.

For PETITIONER:

John Jones
jmjones@casimirjones.com

Amanda Hollis
amanda.hollis@kirkland.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Stephen Altieri
saltieri@cooley.com

J. Dean Farmer
dfarmer@cooley.com