

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PADAGIS US LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

NEURELIS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00464 (Patent 8,895,546 B2)
IPR2025-00465 (Patent 11,241,414 B2)
IPR2025-00466 (Patent 11,793,786 B2)¹

Before GRACE KARAFFA OBERMANN, ANNETTE R. REIMERS, and
TIMOTHY G. MAJORS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PER CURIAM.

ORDER
Granting Patent Owner's Motions for
Pro Hac Vice Admission of HANNAH HURLEY
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

¹ This Order addresses issues common to the listed cases. We exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be filed in each case. The parties are not authorized to use this style of heading.

IPR2025-00464 (Patent 8,895,546 B2)
IPR2025-00465 (Patent 11,241,414 B2)
IPR2025-00466 (Patent 11,793,786 B2)

On May 28, 2026, Patent Owner filed motions requesting *pro hac vice* admission of Hannah Hurley in each of the above-identified proceedings (collectively “Motions”). Paper 56.² Patent Owner also submitted declarations from Hannah Hurley in support of the Motions (collectively “Declarations”). Ex. 2501. Patent Owner attests that Petitioner does not oppose the Motions. Paper 56, 1.

For the reasons provided below, Patent Owner’s Motions are *granted*.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c)(1), 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. In authorizing a motion for *pro hac vice* admission, the Board requires the moving party to provide a statement of facts showing there is good cause for the Board to recognize counsel *pro hac vice* and an affidavit or declaration of the individual seeking to appear in the proceeding. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c)(1); *Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, IPR2013-00639 (PTAB Oct. 15, 2013) (Paper 7) (representative “Order – Authorizing Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission”).

Based on the facts set forth in the Motions and the accompanying Declarations,³ we conclude that Ms. Hurley has sufficient qualifications to

² For purposes of expediency, we cite to papers and exhibits filed in IPR2025-00464. Patent Owner filed similar materials in IPR2025-00465 (Paper 56) and IPR2025-00466 (Paper 56).

³ *Unified Patents* indicates that “A motion for *pro hac vice* admission must: . . . Be accompanied by an affidavit or declaration of the individual seeking to appear attesting to the following: . . . All other proceedings before the Office for which the individual has applied to appear *pro hac vice* in the last three (3) years.” *See Unified Patents*, Paper 7 at 3. The Declarations of Ms. Hurley indicate that in the last three years, Ms. Hurley “ha[s] not

IPR2025-00464 (Patent 8,895,546 B2)
IPR2025-00465 (Patent 11,241,414 B2)
IPR2025-00466 (Patent 11,793,786 B2)

represent Patent Owner in these proceedings, has demonstrated sufficient litigation experience and legal familiarity with the subject matter of these proceedings, and meets all other requirements for admission *pro hac vice*. See Ex. 2501. Accordingly, Patent Owner has established good cause for *pro hac vice* admission of Ms. Hurley. Ms. Hurley will be permitted to serve as back-up counsel only. 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c)(1).

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby

ORDERED that Patent Owner's Motions for *pro hac vice* admission of HANNAH HURLEY are *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner shall continue to have a registered practitioner represent it as lead counsel for the above-identified proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Ms. Hurley is authorized to represent Patent Owner as back-up counsel only in the above-identified proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Ms. Hurley be familiar with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board Consolidated Trial Practice Guide⁴ (84 Fed. Reg. 64,280 (Nov. 21, 2019)), and comply with the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Part 42 of Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations; and

appeared *pro hac vice* in proceedings before the United States Patent and Trademark Office" but do not specifically indicate that Ms. Hurley has not *applied* to appear *pro hac vice*. See Ex. 2501. For the purposes of this Order, we deem this harmless error, and treat the statements by Ms. Hurley as a representation that Ms. Hurley has not applied to appear *pro hac vice* in any other proceedings before the Office (aside from IPR2025-00464, IPR2025-00465, and IPR2025-00466) in the last three years.

⁴ Available at <https://www.uspto.gov/TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated>.

IPR2025-00464 (Patent 8,895,546 B2)
IPR2025-00465 (Patent 11,241,414 B2)
IPR2025-00466 (Patent 11,793,786 B2)

FURTHER ORDERED that Ms. Hurley is subject to the Office's disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a), and the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq.*

IPR2025-00464 (Patent 8,895,546 B2)
IPR2025-00465 (Patent 11,241,414 B2)
IPR2025-00466 (Patent 11,793,786 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

James Murphy
Corey Casey
Mark Deming
Chad A. Landon
POLSINELLI
jpmurphy@polsinelli.com
ccasey@polsinelli.com
mdeming@polsinelli.com
clandmon@polsinelli.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Michael A Sitzman
Timothy Best
David J. Tobin
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
msitzman@mwe.com
tbest@mwe.com
dtobin@mwe.com

Raymond Miller
N. Nicole Endejann
DLA PIPER LLP (US)
raymond.miller@us.dlapiper.com
nicole.endejann@us.dlapiper.com