

Paper No. ____
Date Filed: Jan. 14, 2016

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AMERIGEN PHARMACEUTICALS LIMITED
Petitioner,

v.

JANSSEN ONCOLOGY, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00286
Patent 8,822,438 B2

**JANSSEN ONCOLOGY, INC.'S MOTION FOR *PRO HAC VICE*
ADMISSION OF DAVID T. PRITIKIN**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c) and the Board's December 10, 2015 Notice of Filing Date Accorded to Petition and Time for Filing Patent Owner Preliminary Response (Paper 4), Patent Owner Janssen Oncology, Inc. ("Janssen") respectfully requests the *pro hac vice* admission of attorney David T. Pritikin in this proceeding. Patent Owner has conferred with counsel for Amerigen Pharmaceuticals Limited ("Petitioner"), and Petitioner does not oppose this motion.

I. Statement of Facts Showing Good Cause for the Board to Recognize David T. Pritikin *Pro Hac Vice* in this Proceeding

The Board may recognize counsel *pro hac vice* during an *inter partes* review 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). For example, "where the lead counsel is a registered practitioner, a motion to appear *pro hac vice* by counsel who is not a registered practitioner may be granted upon showing that counsel is an experienced litigating attorney and has an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding." *Id.*

As set forth below and in the accompanying Declaration of David T. Pritikin in Support of Motion to Appear *Pro Hac Vice* ("Pritikin Decl.," Exhibit 2001), the facts here establish good cause for the Board to recognize David T. Pritikin *pro hac vice* in this proceeding.

1. Lead counsel, Dianne Elderkin, is a registered practitioner (Reg. No. 28,598).
2. Mr. Pritikin is a member in good standing of the State Bar of Illinois (Bar No. 2256339). *See Exhibit 2001, ¶ 2.*
3. Mr. Pritikin has never been suspended or disbarred from practice before any court or administrative body. *See Exhibit 2001, ¶ 3.*
4. None of Mr. Pritikin's applications for admission to practice before any court or administrative body have ever been denied. *See Exhibit 2001, ¶ 4.*
5. Mr. Pritikin has not been sanctioned nor has he had a contempt citation imposed on him by any court or administrative body. *See Exhibit 2001, ¶ 5.*
6. Mr. Pritikin has declared that he has read and will comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trial set forth in part 42 of 37 C.F.R. *See Exhibit 2001, ¶ 6.*
7. Mr. Pritikin has acknowledged and agrees that he will be subject to the USPTO 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). *See Exhibit 2001, ¶ 7.*
8. Mr. Pritikin has not applied to appear *pro hac vice* before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board in the last three years. *See Exhibit 2001, ¶ 8.*

9. Mr. Pritikin has been a practicing attorney for over 40 years and has been involved in numerous patent cases. He is presently lead counsel for Janssen in pending patent litigations involving the patent under review in this proceeding, U.S. Patent No. 8,822,438 (the “’438 patent”). These cases are captioned *BTG Int’l Ltd., et al. v. Actavis Labs. FL, Inc., et al.*, C.A. No. 2:15-cv-05909-KM-JBC (D.N.J.) and *Janssen Biotech, Inc., et al. v. Mylan Pharm. Inc., et al.*, C.A. No. 1:15-cv-00130-IMK (N.D. W. Va.). As part of these litigations, Mr. Pritikin has studied and analyzed the ’438 patent and has become very familiar with its subject matter. He is also familiar with prior art asserted in this IPR proceeding, conception and reduction to practice of the inventions claimed in the ’438 patent, and claim construction of various claim terms. *See* Exhibit 2001, ¶ 9.

In view of Mr. Pritikin’s knowledge of the subject matter at issue in this proceeding, and in view of the interrelatedness of this proceeding and the two district court litigations mentioned above, Janssen has a substantial need for Mr. Pritikin’s *pro hac vice* admission and his involvement in the continued prosecution of this proceeding. In addition, *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Pritikin will enable Janssen to avoid unnecessary expense and duplication of work between this proceeding and the related district court litigations. *See* 77 Fed. Reg. 48,612, 48,661 (Aug. 14, 2012) (Office’s comment on final rule discussing concerns about

efficiency and costs where an entity has already engaged counsel for parallel district court litigation).

II. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Patent Owner Janssen respectfully requests that the Board admit David T. Pritikin *pro hac vice* in this proceeding.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 14, 2016

/Dianne B. Elderkin/
Dianne B. Elderkin
Registration No. 28,598
Counsel for Patent Owner

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.