1	RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
2	UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
3	
4	BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD
5	
6	McClinton Energy Group, LLC
7	Petitioner
8	v.
9	Magnum Oil Tools International, Ltd.
10	Patent Owner
11	
12	
13	Case IPR2013-00231
14	Patent 8,079,413
15	
16	
17	Oral Hearing Held: Thursday, May 8, 2014
18	
19	Before: SALLY C. MEDLEY, MEREDITH C. PETRAVICK,
20	MICHAEL R. ZECHER, Administrative Patent Judges.
21	
22	The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on
23	Thursday, May 8, 2014 at the U.S. Patent and Trademark
24	Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia at 10:03 a.m.
25	in Courtroom B.



1	
2	APPEARANCES:
3	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:
4	JASON A. ENGEL, ESQ.
5	K&L Gates LLP
6	70 West Madison Street, Suite 3100
7	Chicago, Illinois 60602-4207
8	312-807-4236
9	
10	ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:
11	ROBB D. EDMONDS, ESQ.
12	JOHN D. HOLMAN, ESQ.
13	Edmonds & Nolte, PC
14	2625 Bay Area Boulevard, Suite 530
15	Houston, Texas 77058
16	281-480-2700
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	



1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(10:03 a.m.)
3	JUDGE MEDLEY: Please be seated. Good morning.
4	This is the hearing for IPR2013-00231, between Petitioner,
5	McClinton Energy Group, and Patent Owner, Magnum Oil Tools
6	International.
7	Before we proceed we would like to memorialize on
8	the record that a conference call was held on May 7th between
9	counsel for the respective parties and the Panel.
10	The purpose of the conference call was to discuss
11	certain objections that Petitioner had with respect to Patent
12	Owner's demonstratives that were filed May 6.
13	Based on the guidance provided by the Panel,
14	Patent Owner sought authorization to expunge the May 6
15	demonstratives and to replace them with the corrected
16	demonstrative set.
17	That request was granted. And so just to let the
18	parties know, the May 6 demonstratives were expunged this
19	morning.
20	Are there any questions regarding demonstratives
21	before we begin?
22	MR. EDMONDS: No.
23	MR. ENGEL: No.
24	JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay. We will proceed then with
25	the hearing. At this time we would like the parties to



1	please introduce counsel, beginning with Petitioner.
2	MR. ENGEL: Good morning, Your Honor. Jason Engel
3	on behalf of the Petitioner.
4	JUDGE MEDLEY: Thank you. And then for Patent
5	Owner.
6	MR. EDMONDS: Good morning, Your Honor. I am Robb
7	Edmonds on behalf of the Patent Owner.
8	JUDGE MEDLEY: And you have with you?
9	MR. HOLMAN: John Holman on behalf of the Patent
10	Owner.
11	JUDGE MEDLEY: And who will be arguing today?
12	MR. EDMONDS: I will, Your Honor.
13	JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay. Great. And do you have
14	anybody else with you? Okay. Great.
15	So each party will have 30 minutes of total time
16	to present arguments. Petitioner will begin with the
17	presentation of its case with regard to the challenged claims
18	on which basis the Board instituted trial.
19	Thereafter, Patent Owner, you will have a chance
20	to respond to Petitioner's presentation. And then,
21	Petitioner, you may reserve rebuttal time to respond to
22	Patent Owner's presentation.
23	Petitioner, you may begin. And would you like to
24	reserve rebuttal time?
25	MR. ENGEL: Yes, Your Honor. I would like to



1	reserve 15 minutes.
2	JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay.
3	MR. ENGEL: And I do have paper copies of the
4	demonstratives.
5	JUDGE MEDLEY: Yes, you may approach the bench,
6	please.
7	MR. ENGEL: I would like to start today with a
8	summary of where we are in the proceedings.
9	The petition as filed by the Petitioner, McClinton
10	Energy, set forth a prima facia case of obviousness with
11	respect to all the challenged claims, claims 1 through 20.
12	That petition was supported by the declaration of
13	Dr. Gary Wooley, an industry expert with decades of
14	experience with downhole tools.
15	Notably, Dr. Wooley was not cross-examined by the
16	Patent Owner. So a lot of his testimony stands largely
17	unchallenged in this proceeding.
18	The Board instituted a review on all of the
19	claims. And the dispute here really centers around the
20	combination of three references, Lehr, Cockrell and
21	Kristiansen. Lehr being the primary reference and Cockrell
22	and Kristiansen being the base reference.
23	One thing to note is that the institution decision
24	here addressed all of the arguments that were made in the
25	preliminary response that the Patent Owner filed. And the



DOCKET A L A R M

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.

