

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

McCLINTON ENERGY GROUP, LLC, JAYCAR ENERGY GROUP LLC,  
SURF FRAC WELLHEAD EQUIPMENT CO., MOTOR MILLS SNUBBING  
LLC, STAN KEELING, AND TONY D. McCLINTON  
Petitioners

v.

MAGNUM OIL TOOLS INTERNATIONAL, LTD.  
Patent Owner

---

*Inter Partes* Review No. IPR2014-00993  
Patent No. 8,459,346

---

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|     |   |    |
|-----|---|----|
| 1.0 | Introduction.....   | 1  |
| 1.1 | Related Proceedings.....  | 1  |
| 1.2 | Patent Owner is not estopped from defending the patentability of the '346 Patent in this proceeding under 37 C.F.R. § 42.73(d)(3) .....   | 2  |
| 2.0 | Summary of the Petition .....   | 4  |
| 3.0 | Summary of the '346 Patent.....   | 5  |
| 4.0 | Claim Interpretation for the '346 Patent.....   | 8  |
| 4.1 | District Court's Claim Construction Order .....   | 8  |
| 4.2 | The Petition argues contrary to the Court's Claim Construction Order and the '346 Patent Specification.....   | 11 |
| 5.0 | The Petition improperly incorporates by reference from another document to support Challenges 1-10.....   | 13 |
| 6.0 | Challenge Nos. 1-10 should be further denied because the Petition fails to establish the prior art discloses the claim limitation: <i>an insert adapted to receive or engage a setting tool that enters the body through the first end thereof</i> , as required in every claim ..... | 15 |
| 7.0 | Challenge No. 1 should be further denied because <i>Lehr</i> does not anticipate Claims 1-3, 5-21, 23-35, 37, and 38.....   | 18 |
| 7.1 | <i>Lehr</i> does not disclose " <i>shearable threads</i> " on an inner surface of an insert.....  | 20 |
| 7.2 | <i>Lehr</i> does not disclose one or more threads on an outer surface of an insert.....   | 22 |
| 7.3 | <i>Lehr</i> does not disclose shearable threads made of composite material  | 23 |

7.4 *Lehr* does not disclose a body adapted to receive a ball that restricts fluid flow in at least one direction through the body ..... 24

7.5 *Lehr does not disclose* an insert having a bore only partially formed therethrough or a blocked passageway that restricts fluid flow in opposing axial direction therethrough..... 24

7.6 *Lehr* does not disclose the one or more shearable threads are disposed proximate the second end of the body..... 25

7.7 *Lehr* does not disclose one or more shearable threads adapted to release the setting tool when exposed to a predetermined axial force that is less than an axial force required to break the body ..... 26

7.8 *Lehr* does not disclose an insert comprising brass..... 27

8.0 The Petition should be further denied because the claims are not obvious in view of *Lehr* alone or in combination with the other asserted references 28

8.1 Challenge No. 2: Claims 1-38 are not obvious over *Lehr* ..... 28

8.2 Challenge No. 3: Claims 1-38 are not obvious over *Lehr* in view of *Slup*..... 32

8.3 Challenge No. 4: Claims 1-38 are not obvious over *Lehr* in view of *Cockrell*..... 33

8.4 Challenge No. 5: Claims 1-38 are not obvious over *Lehr* in view of *Cockrell* and *Slup* ..... 36

8.5 Challenge No. 6: Claims 16, 17, 21-24, 33, 34, 36, and 37 are not obvious over *Lehr* in view of *Kristiansen*..... 38

8.6 Challenge No. 7: Claims 1-38 are not obvious over *Lehr* in view of *Cockrell* and *Kristiansen*..... 40

8.7 Challenge No. 8: Claim 1-38 are not obvious over *Lehr* in view of *Cockrell*, *Kristiansen*, and *Slup*..... 42

8.8 Challenge No. 9: Claim 4 is not obvious over *Lehr* in view of *Cockrell, Slup, and McKeachnie* ..... 45

8.9 Challenge No. 10: Claims 21, 22, 36, and 37 are not obvious over *Lehr* in view of *Cockrell, Slup, Kristiansen, and Streich*..... 46

9.0 Challenge Nos. 11-15: *Alpha* is not Prior Art..... 48

10.0 Challenges 16-18: *Kristiansen* does not render any of Claims 1-38 obvious, whether alone or in combination with *Cockrell, Slup, McKeachnie, and/or Streich* ..... 50

10.1 Challenge No. 16: Claims 1-38 are not obvious over *Kristiansen* in view of *Cockrell and Slup* ..... 50

10.2 Challenge No. 17: Claim 4 is not obvious over *Kristiansen* in view of *Cockrell, Slup, and McKeachnie*..... 56

10.3 Challenge No. 18: Claims 21, 22, 36, and 37 are not obvious over *Kristiansen* in view of *Cockrell, Slup, and Streich* ..... 57

11.0 Conclusion ..... 58

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <i>Agilent Tech., Inc v. Affymetrix, Inc.</i> ,<br>567 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....  | 20 |
| <i>Avia Group International, Inc. v. L.A. Gear Cal., Inc.</i> ,<br>853 F.2d 1557 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....  | 35 |
| <i>Bear Archery, Inc. v. AMS, LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2014-00700, Paper No. 9 (August 15, 2014).....  | 31 |
| <i>Becton, Dickinson, and Co. v. One StockDuq Holdings, LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2013-00235, Paper No. 10 (October 1, 2013).....   | 20 |
| <i>Bettcher Industries, Inc. v. Bunzl USA, Inc.</i> ,<br>661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....   | 3  |
| <i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. C-Cation Technologies, LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2014-00454, Paper No. 12 .....   | 13 |
| <i>Cooper Techs. Co. v. Dudas</i> , 536 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....   | 3  |
| <i>DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> ,<br>567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....  | 35 |
| <i>Hitzeman v. Rutter</i> , 243 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....  | 19 |
| <i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....  | 56 |
| <i>In re Montgomery</i> , 677 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....   | 19 |
| <i>In re Robertson</i> , 169 F.3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....  | 19 |
| <i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> , 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....  | 8  |
| <i>iOnroad Ltd. v. MobileEye Technologies, Ltd.</i> ,<br>IPR2013-00227, Paper No. 17 (August 27, 2013).....   | 49 |
| <i>Magnum Oil Tools International, Ltd., v. McClinton, et al</i> , 2:12-cv-99, U.S.<br>District Court, Southern District of Texas – Corpus Christi Division ..... | 8  |

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

# 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.