

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

AGILA SPECIALTIES INC. and MYLAN LABORATORIES LIMITED  
*Petitioners*

v.

CEPHALON, INC.  
*Patent Owner*

---

Case IPR2016-00026  
Patent No. 8,791,270

---

***PRO HAC VICE* MOTION TO ADMIT  
AARON STIEFEL PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c)**

**Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"**  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), Patent Owner, Cephalon, Inc.

(“Cephalon”), hereby files this motion for Aaron Stiefel to appear *pro hac vice* on its behalf before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board in this proceeding. This motion is being filed with the Board’s authorization (*see* Paper 4) and in accordance with the Board’s order in IPR2013-00639 (Paper 7) (setting forth the requirements for *pro hac vice* admission).

## I. STATEMENT OF FACTS

The following facts along with the attached Declaration of Aaron Stiefel (“Stiefel Decl.”) support admission of Mr. Stiefel *pro hac vice* in this proceeding:

1. Lead counsel Soumitra (Sam) Deka is a registered attorney (Reg. No. 70,252) and is experienced in *inter partes* proceedings in the USPTO.
2. Aaron Stiefel is an experienced litigation attorney. Mr. Stiefel has been a litigator for more than 30 years and has been a litigator of patent cases for more than 20 years. He is a partner at the firm of Kaye Scholer LLP. (Ex. 2001, Stiefel Decl. ¶ 2). Mr. Stiefel has litigated numerous pharmaceutical-related patent cases, and has regularly been counsel of record in patent cases during this time. (*Id.* ¶ 2). Mr. Stiefel is a member in good standing of the New York and New Jersey State Bars, and is admitted to practice in the United States Supreme Court, the United States Courts of Appeals for the Federal, Second and Third Circuits, and

the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, the Northern District of California and the District of New Jersey, with no suspensions or disbarments from practice before any court or administrative body, nor any application for admission to practice before any court or administrative body ever denied. (*Id.* ¶¶ 1, 3, 4). Mr. Stiefel has never had any sanctions or contempt citations imposed against him by any court or administrative body. (*Id.* ¶ 5).

3. Mr. Stiefel has significant familiarity with the subject matter at issue in this proceeding based on his work as lead counsel in the pending district court case *Cephalon, Inc. v. Fresenius Kabi USA, LLC*, 1:15-cv-00536-LPS (D. Del.), which involves bendamustine, the same active pharmaceutical ingredient that is at issue in this proceeding. (*Id.* ¶¶ 9, 10). Mr. Stiefel has been actively involved in all aspects of this pending district court case, including regarding the validity of the patent-in-suit, and accordingly, has gained substantive knowledge of the patent-at-issue in this proceeding, its prosecution, and the cited prior art. (*Id.* ¶ 11). Mr. Stiefel also has substantive knowledge of the patent-at-issue in this proceeding by virtue of his preparation for this proceeding as well as two proceedings before the Office (IPR2016-00098 and IPR2016-00111) that involve the same active ingredient. (*Id.* ¶ 11).

4. Mr. Stiefel has read and will comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 42, and he agrees to be subject to the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq.*, and to disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a). (*Id.* ¶¶ 6, 7).

5. Mr. Stiefel has applied to appear *pro hac vice* in IPR2016-00098 and IPR2016-00111. (*Id.* ¶ 8). The Board has not issued a decision on either motion.

## II. REASONS FOR GRANTING THE MOTION

The Board 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 and to any other conditions as the Board may impose.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c). Where the lead counsel is a registered practitioner, a motion to appear *pro hac vice* may be granted upon showing that counsel who is seeking *pro hac vice* admission is “an experienced litigating attorney and has an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding.” (*Id.*).

The motion for *pro hac vice* admission must contain a statement of facts showing good cause and be accompanied by a declaration of the individual who is seeking admission. *See Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, IPR2013-00639, Paper No. 7 at 3-4 (Oct. 15, 2013). The declaration in turn must contain

certain attestations. (*Id.*). This motion and the accompanying declaration meet all of the Board's requirements.

As set forth above, the lead counsel in this proceeding, Soumitra (Sam) Deka, is a registered practitioner. Mr. Stiefel is an experienced patent litigation attorney and has an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding. (*See* Exhibit 2001 at ¶¶ 9-11.). Mr. Stiefel is lead counsel in the pending district court case *Cephalon, Inc. v. Fresenius Kabi USA, LLC*, 1:15-cv-00536-LPS (D. Del.), which involves bendamustine, the same active pharmaceutical ingredient that is at issue in this proceeding. (*Id.* ¶¶ 9, 10). Mr. Stiefel has been actively involved in all aspects of this pending district court case, including the validity of the patent-in-suit, and accordingly, has gained substantive knowledge of the patent-at-issue in this proceeding, its prosecution, and the cited prior art. (*Id.* ¶ 11). In his declaration, Mr. Stiefel makes the necessary attestations. His admission *pro hac vice* will enable the Patent Owner to avoid unnecessary expense and duplication of work between this proceeding, other related IPR proceedings, and the co-pending litigation.

### III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Patent Owner respectfully requests that the Board admit Aaron Stiefel *pro hac vice*, in this proceeding.

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.