

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BAKER HUGHES INCORPORATED and
BAKER HUGHES OILFIELD OPERATIONS, INC.,
Petitioners

v.

PACKERS PLUS ENERGY SERVICES INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-00596
Patent 7,134,505

**EXCLUSIVE LICENSEE RAPID COMPLETIONS LLC'S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Wellbore completion background.	3
A.	Water shut-off completions prevent unwanted fluids from entering a wellbore.	4
B.	Well stimulation is very different than water shut-off.	7
C.	The '505 patent technology is a nonobvious multistage fluid treatment approach that is an alternative to cased hole plug-and-perf fracturing.	10
D.	The '505 patent technology has been praised as “revolutionary” and “game-changing.”	15
III.	Claim constructions.	18
IV.	Petitioners have not established that the challenged claims are unpatentable under any of the proposed grounds.....	18
A.	Grounds 1–8—Petitioners fail to establish that Thomson is prior art. ...	18
B.	Ground 3—Petitioners fail to establish that claims 23 and 27 are unpatentable over Thomson and Ellsworth.....	23
1.	Applicable law.	24
2.	The asserted prior art describes a modified plug-and-perf completion and a water shut-off completion, not open hole multistage fluid treatment.	25
a)	Thomson is directed to a variation of a plug-and-perf completion.	26
b)	Ellsworth is directed to a conventional water shut-off completion.	27
3.	A person of ordinary skill in the art would not have expected a combination of Thomson and Ellsworth to yield predictable results.	27

4.	Combining Thomson and Ellsworth would alter the “basic principles” of their operation.	31
C.	Ground 1—Petitioners fail to establish that claims 1–7, 11, 14–22, and 24–26 are unpatentable over Thomson.	32
1.	Claim 1—Petitioners fail to disclose that Thomson discloses the claimed solid body packer.....	33
2.	Claim 7—Petitioners fail to show that Thomson discloses the claimed compression ring.	37
3.	Claim 19—Petitioners fail to show that Thomson discloses every claim feature.....	40
a)	Petitioners fail to show that Thomson discloses the claimed solid body packer.	40
b)	Petitioners fail to show that Thomson discloses the claimed hydraulically driven piston.	40
4.	Claim 24—Petitioners fail to show that Thomson discloses every claim feature.....	42
D.	Ground 2—Petitioners fail to establish that claim 15 is unpatentable over Thomson and Hartley.	42
E.	Ground 4—Petitioners fail to establish that claim 11 is unpatentable over Thomson and Echols.	42
F.	Ground 5—Petitioners fail to establish that claims 1–7, 11, 14–22, and 24–26 are unpatentable over Thomson and Brown.	45
1.	Claims 1–7, 11, 14–22, and 24–26—Petitioners fail to articulate how the combination of Thomson and Brown discloses or suggests every claim feature.	45
2.	Claims 1–7, 11, 14–22, and 24–26—Thomson teaches away from being combined with Brown.	47
G.	Ground 6—Petitioners fail to establish that claim 15 is unpatentable over Thomson, Brown, and Hartley	51

H. Ground 7—Petitioners fail to establish that claims 23 and 27 are unpatentable over Thomson, Ellsworth, and Brown.....51

I. Ground 8—Petitioners fail to establish that claim 11 is unpatentable over Thomson, Brown, and Echols.52

V. Conclusion.53

Table of Authorities

Cases:

<i>A.C. Dispensing Equip. Inc. v. Prince Castle LLC</i> , IPR2014-00511, Paper 16 (Sept. 10, 2014).....	20
<i>Blue Calypso, LLC, v. Groupon, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	22
<i>Bungie, Inc. v. Worlds Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01321, Paper 13 (Nov. 30, 2015)	21
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Constellation Techs. L.L.C.</i> , IPR2014-01085, Paper 11 (Jan. 9, 2015).....	19
<i>Creston Electronics, Inc. v. Intuitive Building Controls, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01379, Paper 16 (Dec. 15, 2015).....	21
<i>DeSilva v. DiLeonardi</i> , 181 F.3d 865 (7th Cir. 1999)	20
<i>DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	25, 28
<i>GP Strategies Corp. v. Chart Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00558, Paper 8 (July 31, 2015)	22
<i>In re Hall</i> , 781 F. 2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	19
<i>In re Klopfenstein</i> , 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	22
<i>In re Lister</i> , 583 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	22
<i>In re Ratti</i> , 270 F.2d 810 (1959).....	25

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.