

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PFIZER, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

GENENTECH, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-01488
Patent 6,407,213 B2

Before SHERIDAN K. SNEDDEN, ZHENYU YANG, AND
ROBERT A. POLLOCK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

POLLOCK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Granting Patent Owner's Unopposed Motions for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission
of Daralyn J. Durie, Robert J. Gunther, Lisa J. Pirozzolo,
Kevin S. Prussia, and Andrew J. Danford
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

Patent Owner filed motions for *pro hac vice* admission of
Daralyn J. Durie, Robert J. Gunther, Lisa J. Pirozzolo, Kevin S. Prussia, and
Andrew J. Danford. Papers 10–13, respectively. The motions are supported
by declarations of Ms. Durie, Mr. Gunther, Ms. Pirozzolo, Mr. Prussia, and
Mr. Danford. Exs. 2035, 2034, 2036, 2037, and 2038, respectively.

Patent Owner avers that Petitioner does not oppose the motions. *See* Papers 9–13, 1.

The Board has reviewed the submissions and determined that the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.10 have been met and there is good cause to admit Ms. Durie, Mr. Gunther, Ms. Pirozzolo, Mr. Prussia, and Mr. Danford and *pro hac vice*. Ms. Durie, Mr. Gunther, Ms. Pirozzolo, Mr. Prussia, and Mr. Danford will be permitted to appear *pro hac vice* as back-up counsel only. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c).

It is, therefore,

ORDERED that Patent Owner's motions for admission of Daralyn J. Durie, Robert J. Gunther, Lisa J. Pirozzolo, Kevin S. Prussia, Andrew J. Danford *pro hac vice* are granted;

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner is to continue to have a registered practitioner as lead counsel;

FURTHER ORDERED that Daralyn J. Durie, Robert J. Gunther, Lisa J. Pirozzolo, Kevin S. Prussia, Andrew J. Danford 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 Daralyn J. Durie, Robert J. Gunther, Lisa J. Pirozzolo, Kevin S. Prussia, Andrew J. Danford are subject to the Office's disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a), and to the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq.*

IPR2017-01488
Patent 6,407,213 B2

PETITIONER:

Amanda Hollis
Stefan M. Miller
Karen Younkins
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
amanda.hollis@kirkland.com
stefan.miller@kirkland.com
karen.younkins@kirkland.com

PATENT OWNER:

David L. Cavanaugh
Owen K. Allen
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP
david.cavanaugh@wilmerhale.com
owen.allen@wilmerhale.com

Adam R. Brausa
DURIE TANGRI LLP
abrausa@durietangri.com