



R. Danny Huntington

MEMBER

Washington, D.C.

T +1 202 783 6040

dhuntington@rothwellfigg.com

OVERVIEW

Described as "a great lawyer" (Chambers & Partners client interview, 2015) and "among the best and most knowledgeable patent practitioners in the United States" (IAM Patent 1000 2015), R. Danny Huntington is a former chemist for The Gillette Research Institute. He is involved in all phases of intellectual property law, including United States and foreign patent prosecution; litigation in the federal and state courts; licensing; and general client counseling. He has extensive patent interference experience, with particular experience in biotechnology and pharmaceuticals.

Danny assisted with the planning of FICPI's Joint Colloquia, and the 2019 event, "Joint Colloquium on Artificial Intelligence: A Focus on AI in Patent Procurement," held in conjunction with the American Intellectual Property Law Association (AIPLA) and the International Association for the Protection of Intellectual Property (AIPPI), was built around Danny's idea. The 2019 colloquium is the sixth he has organized, the previous ones being "A Comprehensive Approach to Patent Quality" in Amsterdam, The Netherlands in 2007, "Patent Cooperation Treaty for the Americas" in Miami, Florida in 2008, "The Patent Offices Backlog Crisis" in Edinburgh, Scotland in 2010, "Patent Application Quality" in Warsaw, Poland in 2012, and "Protection of Confidentiality in Intellectual Property" in Paris, France in 2013.

Practices

Alternative Dispute Resolution

Appellate Litigation

Counseling, Transactions, and Guidance

False Advertising and Unfair Competition Litigation

Hatch-Waxman Litigation

Interferences

International Filings

International Trade Commission (ITC) Litigation

Licensing and Transactions

Patent Litigation

Patent Prosecution

Education

J.D., The George Washington University Law School

B.S., Chemistry, Indiana University

Bar Admissions

District of Columbia

Virginia

EXPERIENCE

Enzo Therapeutics, Inc. v. Yeda Research & Dev. Co. (Eastern District of Virginia) - represented Yeda Research and Development Co. in a §146 Action involving interferon- 2.

N2IT Holding BV v. Native Instruments GmbH (Central District of California) - represented the patent owner N2IT in a patent infringement case concerning electronic systems for controlling the playback of digital music.

Ceravision, Limited V. Luxim Corporation (Northern District of California) - represented Ceravision in a §146 Action involving high-intensity light sources.

Yu et al (Human Genome Sciences, Inc.) v. Browning et al (Biogen Idec) - Interference No. 105,485 - Represented Human Genome Sciences in an interference proceeding relating to LymphoStat-B, a human monoclonal antibody that inhibits the biological activity of B-lymphocyte stimulator (BLyS), before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

Novozymes North America, Inc. v. Genencor International, Inc. - Patent Interference No. 105,155 - Represented Genencor in an interference proceeding relating to cellulase enzymes for detergents before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

Novo Nordisk A/S v. Eli Lilly and Co. (District of Delaware) - represented Lilly in a declaratory judgment action by a competitor for non-infringement and invalidity of Lilly's patent on the rapid-acting human insulin analog formulation, insulin lispro [rDNA origin]), and the product Humalog®.

Eli Lilly and Company v. University of Washington - Represented Eli Lilly in an interference proceeding involving Protein C before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

BASF Corp. v. Eastman Chemical Co. (District of Delaware) - defended Eastman against charge of patent infringement concerning a catalytic process for making 2,5-dihydrofuran, a chemical intermediate.

Massachusetts

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Novo Nordisk of North America v. Eli Lilly and Company (District of New Jersey) - Defended Lilly against charge of patent infringement case involving Lilly's recombinant human growth hormone (rhGH) and its product Humatrope®.

TV Interactive Data Corporation v. Microsoft Corporation (Northern District of California) - Defended Microsoft against charge of patent infringement involving its Windows technology.

Sturman Industries v. Caterpillar - Represented Sturman in an interference proceeding involving fuel injector valves before U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

Short v. Patten, Interference No. 105,532 (methods and compositions for polypeptide engineering), United States Patent and Trademark Office, Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

Howell v. Lentz, Interference No. 105,413 (methods of enhancing immune responses by removing sTNFR1), United States Patent and Trademark Office, Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

DeLucas (Fluidigm Corp.) v. Santarsiero (Takeda San Diego) - Interference No. 105,403 - Represented Fluidigm Corp. in an interference where the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences invalidated more than 400 claims from Takeda San Diego's patents.

Sehgal v. Revel, Interference No. 105,304 (interferon β -2, IL-6), United States Patent and Trademark Office, Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

Sehgal v. Revel, Interference No. 105,303 (interferon β -2, IL-6), United States Patent and Trademark Office, Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

Sehgal v. Revel, Interference No. 105,302 (interferon β -2, IL-6), United States Patent and Trademark Office, Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

Sehgal v. Revel, Interference No. 105,293 (interferon β -2, IL-6), United States Patent and Trademark Office, Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

Short v. Punnonen, Interference No. 105,188 (non-stochastic generation of genetic vaccines), United States Patent and Trademark Office, Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

Wang v. Murakawa, Interference No. 105,055 (quantitative PCR), United States Patent and Trademark Office, Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

Deen v. Ni, Interference No. 104,784 (TNF-1), United States Patent and Trademark Office, Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

Noelle v. Lederman, Interference No. 104,415 (CD40CR monoclonal antibodies), United States Patent and Trademark Office, Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

Talieh v. Demaray, Interference No. 103,629 (collimated plasma sputtering), United States Patent and Trademark Office, Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

Dung v. Buehler, Interference No. 105,893 (analgesics), United States Patent and Trademark Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board

HONORS & RECOGNITIONS

The Best Lawyers in America® in Washington, D.C. (2007-2024)

Ranked in Biotechnology and Life Sciences Practice; Litigation - Intellectual Property; Litigation - Patent; Patent Law

Named 2023 "Lawyer of the Year" in Washington, D.C. for Biotechnology and Life Sciences Practice

Intellectual Asset Management's (IAM) Patent 1000 - The World's Leading Patent Professionals (2013-2023)

Ranked for Prosecution in the D.C. Metro Area; ranked for Post-Grant Proceedings nationwide

Washington, D.C. Super Lawyers (2011-2023)

LMG Life Sciences (2012-2023)

Named a Life Sciences Star

Managing Intellectual Property (MIP) IP Stars (2016-2023)

Ranked as a Patent Star in the District of Columbia and in the U.S. (National)

IAM Strategy 300: The World's Leading IP Strategists (2013-2019)

Chambers USA (2006-2009; 2012-2018)

Ranked in the area of intellectual property litigation in the District of Columbia

COMMUNITY & PROFESSIONAL

American Bar Association

American Intellectual Property Law Association

District of Columbia Bar Association

Fédération Internationale des Conseils en Propriété Intellectuelle, President of Honour; President, 2006-2009; Vice-President, 2003-2006; Biotechnology Committee, 1988-present