

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MERCK SHARP & DOHME CORP.,
Petitioner,

v.

WYETH LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2017-00378
IPR2017-00380
Patent 8,562,999 B2

Before FRANCISCO C. PRATS, ERICA A. FRANKLIN, and
SHERIDAN K. SNEDDEN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

FRANKLIN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER¹

Granting Patent Owner's Unopposed Motion for
Pro Hac Vice Admission of Amit H. Thakore
37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c)

¹ This Order addresses issues common to each captioned case. Thus, we enter the same Order in each case. The parties are not authorized to use this format for filings.

Wyeth LLC (“Patent Owner”) moves for an Order allowing Amit H. Thakore of White & Case LLP to appear *pro hac vice* on behalf of Patent Owner. Paper 65, *see also* Exhibit 2164 (affidavit of Amit H. Thakore in support of the Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission).² Patent Owner explains that it has been informed by counsel for Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. (“Petitioner”) that Petitioner does not oppose the motion. Paper 65, 1.

Patent Owner’s motion is *granted*. Patent Owner shall confirm that its mandatory notices and official electronic file records have been updated accordingly. Counsel recognized *pro hac vice* shall comply with 37 C.F.R. Parts 11 and 42 and the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48755 (Aug. 14, 2012), and are subject to disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a).

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Patent Owner’s motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Amit H. Thakore is *granted*; Mr. Thakore is authorized to represent Patent Owner as backup counsel in each of the above-captioned proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Thakore shall comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board’s Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Part 42 of the C.F.R.; and

² Citations refer to filings in IPR2017-00378. Similar documents were filed in IPR2017-00380.

IPR2017-00378; IPR2017-00380
Patent 8,562,999 B2

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Thakore shall be subject to the Office's disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a) and the Office's Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101-11.901.

PETITIONER:

Arlene L. Chow
Ernest Yakob
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP
arlene.chow@hoganlovells.com
ernest.yakob@hoganlovells.com

PATENT OWNER:

John Scheibeler
Dimitrios T. Drivas
Sebastian Zonte
WHITE & CASE LLP
jscheibeler@whitecase.com
ddrivas@whitecase.com
sebastian.zonte@whitecase.com