

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re U.S. Patent No. 8,459,346	§	
	§	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review
Issued: June 11, 2013	§	
	§	Attorney Docket No.: 2700032-00005
Name of Patentee: W. Lynn Frazier	§	
	§	Customer No.: 24573
Patent Owner: Magnum Oil Tools International Ltd.	§	
	§	
Petitioner: McClinton Energy Group L.L.C.	§	
	§	
Title: BOTTOM SET DOWNHOLE PLUG	§	

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PAT. NO. 8,459,346

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....1

II. Fee.....1

III. Mandatory Notices.....1

 A. Real Party-in-Interest1

 B. Standing.....1

 C. Related matters1

 D. Lead and Back-up Counsel and Service Information2

IV. Grounds for Standing.....2

V. Relief Requested.....3

VI. Reasons for the Requested Relief.....3

 A. Summary of ‘346 Petition3

 1. Background of Technology.....3

 a. Overview of Fracking4

 b. Well Known Prior Art Plug Configuration4

 c. Well Known Prior Art Method For Setting Plugs6

 d. Well Known And Interchangeable Prior Art Shearable
 Release Elements7

 e. Well Known Prior Art Method For Flow Control.....9

 f. Well Known Prior Art Anti-Rotation Features10

 g. Well Known Prior Art Composite Materials.....11

 2. Summary of The ‘346 Patent12

 a. The ‘413 Patent IPR12

 b. Claim Construction.....14

 B. Prior Art.....16

 C. Identification of Challenges17

1.	Claims 1-38 are anticipated or obvious in view of the teachings of Lehr as a base reference.....	18
a.	CHALLENGE #1: Claims 1-3, 5-21, 23-35, 37-38 are anticipated by Lehr	18
b.	CHALLENGE #2: Claims 1-38 are obvious over Lehr.....	28
c.	CHALLENGE #3: Claims 1-38 are obvious over Lehr in view of Slup.....	31
d.	CHALLENGE #4: Claims 1-38 are obvious over Lehr in view of Cockrell	33
e.	CHALLENGE #5: Claims 1-38 are obvious over Lehr in view of Cockrell and Slup	34
f.	CHALLENGE #6: Claims 16, 17, 21-24, 33, 34, 36, 37 are obvious over Lehr in view of Kristiansen	34
g.	CHALLENGE #7: Claims 1-38 are obvious over Lehr in view of Cockrell and Kristiansen	36
h.	CHALLENGE #8: Claims 1-38 are obvious over Lehr in view of Cockrell, Kristiansen and Slup.....	37
i.	CHALLENGE #9: Claim 4 is obvious over Lehr in view of Cockrell, Slup and McKeachnie	37
j.	CHALLENGE #10: Claims 21, 22, 36, 37 are obvious over Lehr in view of Cockrell, Slup, Kristiansen and Streich	38
2.	Claims 1-38 are obvious in view of the teachings of Alpha as a base reference.....	39
a.	CHALLENGE #11: Claims 1-38 are obvious over Alpha in view of the well-known prior art.....	39
b.	CHALLENGE #12: Claims 1-38 are obvious over Alpha in view of Cockrell and Slup.....	45
c.	CHALLENGE #13: Claims 16, 17, 21-24, 33, 34, 36, 37 are obvious over Alpha in view of Slup, Cockrell and Kristiansen	46
d.	CHALLENGE #14: Claims 21, 22, 36, 37 are obvious over Alpha in view of Slup, Cockrell, Kristiansen and Streich	48

e.	CHALLENGE #15: Claim 4 is obvious over Alpha in view of Cockrell, Slup and McKeachnie.....	49
3.	Claims 1-38 are obvious in view of the teachings of Kristiansen as a base reference.....	49
a.	CHALLENGE #16: Claims 1-38 are obvious over Kristiansen in view of Cockrell and Slup.....	49
b.	CHALLENGE #17: Claim 4 is obvious over Kristiansen in view of Cockrell, Slup and McKeachnie.....	59
c.	CHALLENGE #18: Claims 21, 22, 36, 37 are obvious over Kristiansen in view of Cockrell, Slup and Streich ..	59
VII.	Conclusion	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.,
550 U.S. 39828

Motorola Mobility LLC v. Arouse,
IPR2013-00010, Paper No. 20 (January 30, 2013).....3

Sciele Pharma, Inc. v. Lupin Ltd.,
684 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2012)28

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 1023, 16

35 U.S.C. § 1033, 28, 30

OTHER AUTHORITIES

37 C.F.R. §§ 42.15 and 42.103 1

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)14

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.