

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**  
**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

GREENE'S ENERGY GROUP, LLC,

Petitioner,

v.

OIL STATES ENERGY SERVICES, LLC,

Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2014-00216

Patent No. 6,179,053

---

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**  
**UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Summary Of The '053 Patent.....	1
III. Petitioner's Proposed Claim Constructions.....	8
A. "operative position".....	8
B. "fixed-point packoff," "fixed-point," And "packed off against a fixed-point" .....	9
1. The Specification Of The '053 Patent Clearly Describes The Meaning Of "fixed-point packoff" .....	9
2. Petitioner's Proposed Construction Is Completely Divorced From The Intrinsic Record And Would Make The Term More Difficult To Understand .....	10
C. "first lockdown mechanism" .....	12
1. "first lockdown mechanism" Is Written In Plain English And Needs No Separate Construction .....	13
2. There Is A Presumption That "first lockdown mechanism" Is Not A Means-Plus-Function Element, And Petitioner Cannot Overcome That Presumption .....	14
a. Legal Standard .....	14
b. Petitioner Has Failed To Overcome The Presumption Against Means-Plus-Function Treatment Of "first lockdown mechanism" .....	17
c. "first lockdown mechanism" Is Easily Understood As A Reference To Structure, Particularly As Used In The Claims .....	18
d. "first lockdown mechanism" Cannot Be A Means- Plus-Function Element In Claim 22, Which Is A Method Claim .....	20
A. "second lockdown mechanism" .....	21

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

	<b>Page</b>
1. “second lockdown mechanism” Is Clearly Defined In The Specification As Being Separate From The Setting Tool Used To Install The Claimed Invention .....	21
2. There Is A Presumption That “second lockdown mechanism” Is Not A Means-Plus-Function Element, And Petitioner Has Failed To Overcome That Presumption .....	23
3. “second lockdown mechanism” Cannot Be A Means-Plus-Function Element In Claim 22, Which Is A Method Claim .....	25
B. Petitioner’s Claim Construction Requiring A Fixed Order To Method Claim 22 Is Incorrect .....	25
IV. Greene’s Petition Should Be Denied .....	27
A. The Petition Fails To Establish A Reasonable Likelihood That Dallas ’118 Anticipates The Claims Of The ’053 Patent.....	27
1. Background Of The Dallas ’118 Canadian Application.....	27
2. Dallas ’118 Fails To Disclose A “second lockdown mechanism” As Recited In Claims 1 And 22 .....	29
3. Dallas ’118 Fails To Disclose A Device That “secures” Or “locks” The Mandrel In The Operative Position.....	30
B. The Petition Fails To Establish A Reasonable Likelihood That The Combination Of Dallas ’118 And McLeod Renders The Claims Of The ’053 Patent Obvious .....	31
C. The Petition Fails To Establish A Reasonable Likelihood That The Combination Of Herricks And Dellinger Renders The Claims Of The ’053 Patent Obvious .....	32
1. Introduction To Herricks Reference .....	32
2. Petitioner Admits That Herricks Does Not Disclose Either “lockdown mechanism” .....	33
3. In Addition, Several Other Elements Are Missing From Herricks .....	34

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

	<b>Page</b>
a. Herricks Does Not Disclose A “mandrel” .....	34
b. Herricks Does Not Disclose A “range of adjustment” .....	34
c. Herricks Fails To Disclose A Device That “secures” Or “locks” The Mandrel In The Operative Position .....	35
4. Introduction To Dellinger Reference .....	35
5. Dellinger Does Not Disclose A “first lockdown mechanism” .....	37
6. There Would Be No Reason To Combine Herricks With Dellinger.....	38
7. Dellinger Does Not Disclose A “second lockdown mechanism” With A “range of adjustment” .....	38
8. Dellinger Does Not Disclose A “mandrel” .....	39
V. Conclusion .....	40

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Altiris Inc. v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 318 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	26
<i>Avanir Pharms., Inc. v. Actavis S. Atl. LLC</i> , No. CA 11-704-LPS, 2012 WL 6019095, at *1 (D. Del. Dec. 3, 2012).....	13
<i>Cascades Computer Innovation, LLC v. Dell Inc.</i> , No. 1:11-cv-07264, 2014 WL 26288, at *1 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 2, 2014) .....	17
<i>Fleming v. Escort, Inc.</i> , No. CV 09-105-S-BLW, 2013 WL 1290418, at *1 (D. Idaho Mar. 27, 2013) .....	14
<i>Flo Healthcare Solutions, LLC v. Kappos</i> , 697 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	15, 18
<i>Greenberg v. Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc.</i> , 91 F.3d 1580 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	15, 16, 19
<i>Inventio AG v. ThyssenKrupp Elevator Ams. Corp.</i> , 649 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	passim
<i>Lighting World, Inc. v. Birchwood Lighting, Inc.</i> , 382 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	15, 16, 19
<i>Nomura v. Youtube, LLC</i> , Nos. C-11-01208 HRL, C-11-01210 HRL, 2013 WL 503102, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 8, 2013) .....	16
<i>O.I. Corp v. Tekmar Co.</i> , 115 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	20
<i>Personalized Media Commc'ns LLC v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 161 F.3d 696 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	16, 19

# 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.