

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PADAGIS ISRAEL PHARMACEUTICALS LIMITED;
PADAGIS US LLC; AND PADAGIS, LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

BAUSCH HEALTH US, LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2023-01114
Patent 11,311,482 B2

Before SHERIDAN K. SNEDDEN, TINA E. HULSE, and
MICHAEL A. VALEK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

VALEK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Granting Patent Owner's Unopposed Motions for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission
of Thomas P. Steindler and Christopher M. Bruno
37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c)

On November 9, 2023, Patent Owner filed Motions for admission *pro hac vice* of Thomas P. Steindler (Paper 10) and Christopher M. Bruno (Paper 11) (collectively, “the Motions”). Patent Owner also filed supporting Declarations of Mr. Steindler (Ex. 2023) and Mr. Bruno (Ex. 2024). Patent Owner indicates that Petitioner does not oppose the Motions. Paper 10, 1; Paper 11, 1.

As explained below, we grant the Motions.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), counsel may be recognized *pro hac vice* upon a showing of good cause, subject to the condition that lead counsel be a registered practitioner. A motion for *pro hac vice* admission requires a statement of facts showing there is good cause to recognize counsel *pro hac vice*, and an affidavit or declaration of the individual seeking to appear. *See Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, IPR2013-00639, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 15, 2013) (Order Authorizing Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission).

Based on the statements in the Motions and the accompanying Declarations, we conclude that Mr. Steindler and Mr. Bruno have sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Patent Owner in this proceeding and that Mr. Steindler and Mr. Bruno meet all other requirements for admission *pro hac vice* admission. *See* Ex. 2023 ¶¶ 1–9; Ex. 2024 ¶¶ 1–9. Accordingly, Patent Owner has established good cause for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Steindler and Mr. Bruno.

Accordingly, it is:

ORDERED that Patent Owner’s motions for admission *pro hac vice* of Thomas P. Steindler and Christopher M. Bruno in this proceeding are *granted*, and Mr. Steindler and Mr. Bruno are authorized to represent Patent Owner only as back-up counsel;

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

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Steindler and Mr. Bruno shall comply with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board's Consolidated Trial Practice Guide (84 Fed. Reg. 64,280 (Nov. 21, 2019))¹ and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Part 42 of Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Steindler and Mr. Bruno shall be subject to the USPTO's disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a), and the USPTO's Rules of Professional Conduct set forth at 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101–11.901.

¹ Available at <https://www.uspto.gov/TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated>.

IPR2023-01114
Patent 11,311,482 B2

FOR PETITIONER:

Carol Pitzel Cruz
Brian Barnes
Andrea Cheek
2cmp@knobbe.com
brian.barnes@knobbe.com
2ale@knobbe.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

April Weisbruch
Ian Brooks
aweisbruch@mwe.com
ibrooks@mwe.com