

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re patent of Frazier	§	
	§	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review
U.S. Patent No. 8,079,413	§	
	§	Attorney Docket No.: 48629.6
Issued: December 20, 2011	§	
	§	Customer No.: 27683
Title: BOTTOM SET	§	
DOWNHOLE PLUG	§	Real Party in Interest: McClinton Energy Group L.L.C.

PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW

Mail Stop Inter Partes Review
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319, McClinton Energy Group L.L.C. (“Petitioner” or “MEGCO”) hereby petitions the Patent Trials and Appeals Board to institute an *Inter Partes* Review of claims 1-20 (all claims) of United States Patent No. 8,079,413 (“the ’413 Patent,” Exhibit 1001), which issued on December 20, 2011, to W. Lynn Frazier, resulting from Patent Application No. 13/194,871 filed on July 29, 2011. According to USPTO records, the ’413 Patent is assigned to Magnum Oil Tools International LLC.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Mandatory Notices.....1

 A. Real Party-in-Interest.....1

 B. Related matters1

 C. Lead and Back-up Counsel and Service Information1

II. Grounds for Standing.....2

III. Relief Requested2

IV. Reasons for the Requested Relief.....2

 A. Summary of Petition.....2

 1. Background of Technology3

 a. Overview of Fracking3

 b. Basic plug configuration4

 c. Standard Prior Art Method For Setting Plugs.....6

 d. Standard Prior Art Method For Using Plugs8

 e. Removing Frac Plugs (Anti-Rotation Features)9

 2. Summary Of The '413 Patent.....10

 a. The Disclosure Of The '413 Patent10

 b. The Claims Of The '413 Patent12

 c. The Prosecution History Of The '413 Patent.....13

 B. Claim Construction.....15

 1. “first end” and “second end”17

 2. “the first and second ends of the body each comprise anti-rotation features formed thereon”.....19

 3. “shearable threads” and “the insert comprises one or more shearable threads disposed on an inner surface thereof”21

 C. Prior Art.....22

D. Identification of Challenges26

1. Claims 1-20 are obvious in view of the teachings of Alpha as a base reference.....27

 a. CHALLENGE #1: Claims 1, 2, 4-8, and 13 are obvious over Alpha in view of Cockrell in view of Kristiansen27

 b. CHALLENGE #2: Claims 3 and 12 are obvious over Alpha in view of Cockrell in view of Kristiansen in view of Lehr36

 c. CHALLENGE #3: Claims 9, 10, 11 are obvious over Alpha in view of Cockrell in view of Kristiansen in view of Slup.....38

 d. CHALLENGE #4: Claims 14 and 16 are obvious over Alpha in view of Cockrell in view of Kristiansen in view of Streich40

 e. CHALLENGE #5: Claim 15 obvious over Alpha in view of Cockrell in view of Kristiansen in view of Streich in view of McKeachnie.....41

 f. CHALLENGE #6: Claims 17-19 are obvious over Alpha in view of Cockrell in view of Kristiansen in view of Slup in view of Streich in view of Lehr.....42

 g. CHALLENGE #7: Claim 20 is obvious over Alpha in view of Cockrell in view of Kristiansen in view of Slup in view of Streich in view of Lehr in view of McKeachnie44

2. Claims 1-20 are obvious in view of the teachings of Lehr as a base reference.....44

 a. CHALLENGE #8: Claims 1-3, 5-8, 12, and 13 are obvious over Lehr in view of Cockrell.....44

 b. CHALLENGE #9: Claims 4, 9, 10, 11 are obvious over Lehr in view of Cockrell in view of Slup.....49

 c. CHALLENGE #10: Claims 14 and 16 are obvious over Lehr in view of Cockrell in view of Streich.....51

 d. CHALLENGE #11: Claim 15 obvious over Lehr in view of Cockrell in view of Streich in view of McKeachnie52

 e. CHALLENGE #12: Claims 17-19 are obvious over Lehr in view of Cockrell in view of Slup in view of Streich52

 f. CHALLENGE #13: Claim 20 is obvious over Lehr in view of Cockrell in view of Slup in view of Streich in view of McKeachnie.....54

3. Claims 3, 12, and 14-20 are obvious in view of the teachings of the Frazier '497 application as a base reference54

 a. CHALLENGE #14: Claims 17 and 18 are obvious over the Frazier '497 application in view of Lehr in view of Streich55

 b. CHALLENGE #15: Claim 19 is obvious over the Frazier '497 application in view of Streich in view of Lehr in view of Cockrell57

 c. CHALLENGE #16: Claim 20 is obvious over the Frazier '497 application in view of Lehr, in view of Streich in view of McKeachnie57

 d. CHALLENGE #17: Claim 3 is obvious over the Frazier '497 application in view of Lehr57

 e. CHALLENGE #18: Claim 12 is obvious over the Frazier '497 application in view of Lehr in view of Cockrell.....58

 f. CHALLENGE #19: Claims 14 and 16 are obvious over the Frazier '497 application in view of Cockrell in view of Streich.....59

 g. CHALLENGE #20: Claim 15 obvious over the Frazier '497 application in view of Cockrell in view of Streich in view of McKeachnie
 60

V. Conclusion60

I. Mandatory Notices

A. Real Party-in-Interest

The parties in interest for Petitioner are the McClinton Energy Group LLC, Jaycar Energy Group LLC, SurfFrac Wellhead Equipment Co., Motor Mills Snubbing LLC, and Tony D. McClinton.

B. Related matters

The '413 patent was asserted against the parties-in-interest in *Magnum Oil Tools Int'l LLC v. Tony D. McClinton et al.*, Case No. 2:12-cv-00099 (S.D. Tex). Stan Keeling, an employee of Jaycar, is also a defendant in the *Magnum* lawsuit.

This petition also has bearing on at least three pending patent applications, U.S. Patent Application Nos. 12/317,497, filed December 23, 2008, 13/329,077, filed December 16, 2011 and 13/329,096, filed December 16, 2011.

C. Lead and Back-up Counsel and Service Information

Lead Counsel

John Russell Emerson
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
2323 Victory Ave. Suite 700
Dallas, TX 75219

Phone: 214-651-5328
Fax: 214-200-0884
russ.emerson@haynesboone.com
USPTO Reg. No. 44,098

Back-up Counsel

Dustin Johnson
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
2323 Victory Ave. Suite 700
Dallas, TX 75219

Phone: 972-739-6969
Fax: 972-692-9080
ipr.thomas.king@haynesboone.com
USPTO Reg. No. 47,684

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.