

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
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.	Overview of the Patented Technology	1
III.	Claim Interpretation.....	3
	A. Packing Element.....	3
	B. Solid Body Packer	3
	C. Sleeve Shifting Means.....	6
	D. Has Engaged and Moved the Sliding Sleeve	7
	E. Plug.....	7
	F. Load Into One Another	7
IV.	Obviousness Analysis With Regard to Thomson and Ellsworth Ground	7
	A. The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	8
	1. A POSITA Would Have Been Aware of a Variety of Different Completion Techniques	10
	2. A POSITA Would Have Expected Multi-Stage Hydraulic Fracturing Operations to Require Cemented Casing	13
	3. A POSITA Would Carefully Weigh the Risks, Reliability, and Economics of a Proposed Completion	16
	4. Petitioners Improperly Assume that a POSITA Would Be Motivated to Act Contrary to the Conventional Wisdom in the Field.....	18
	5. Petitioners Fail to Acknowledge that a POSITA Would Be Motivated to Act in a Commercially Reasonable Way	19
	B. The Objective Indicia of Non-Obviousness.....	20
	1. The Claimed Technology Operates Contrary to the Accepted Wisdom That Prevailed at the Time of the Invention and it Demonstrated Unexpected Results	21
	2. The Claimed Technology Has Received Industry Praise and Recognition.	24

3.	Petitioners Copied the Claimed Technology.	29
4.	The Claimed Technology Has Enjoyed Commercial Success.	34
5.	There Is a Nexus Between the Claimed Technology and Its Commercial Success.	37
C.	The Scope and Content of the Prior Art.....	39
1.	Thomson Describes a Cased Hole Fracturing Operation, Not Fracturing Through Open Hole Segments	39
2.	Ellsworth Describes Water Shut-Off Operations, Not Hydraulic Fracturing.	41
D.	The Differences Between the Prior Art and the Claimed Invention.....	42
1.	Petitioners Fail to Show that Thomson Discloses Positioning a Tubing String Adjacent an Open Hole Section of the Wellbore	42
2.	Petitioners Fail to Show That Ellsworth Discloses Forcing Wellbore Fluid out of the Tubing String Port	42
E.	Opinions of Learned Experts.....	43
F.	Overall Conclusions on Obviousness.....	46
V.	Invalidity Analysis With Regard to Remaining Grounds	50
A.	Grounds 1-4—Petitioners Fail to Show that Thomson Discloses a Solid Body Packer Having Multiple Packing Elements.....	50
B.	Ground 4—Petitioners Fail to Show that a POSITA Would Combine Thomson and Echols	53
C.	Grounds 5-8—Petitioners Fail to Show that Thomson Could Be Combined With Brown.	55
VI.	Conclusion	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Akamai Techs., Inc. v. Cable & Wireless Internet Servs., Inc.
344 F.3d 1186 (Fed.Cir.2003)29

Anascape, Ltd. v. Nintendo of Am. Inc.
601 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2010)6

Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.
No. 2015-1171, 2016 WL 5864573 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 7, 2016)..... 31, 35

Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc.
776 F.2d 281 (Fed. Cir. 1985)34

Black & Decker, Inc. v. Positec USA, Inc.
No. 2015-1646, 2016 WL 2898012 (Fed. Cir. May 18, 2016) 44, 46

Crocs, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n
598 F.3d 1294 (Fed.Cir.2010) 21, 44

Dunnhumby USA, LLC v. Emnos USA Corp.
No. 13-CV-0399, 2015 WL 1542365 (N.D. Ill. Apr. 1, 2015)5

Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.
800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)46

Envtl. Designs, Ltd. v. Union Oil Co. of California
713 F.2d 693 (Fed. Cir. 1983)9

Gambro Lundia AB v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.
110 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1997)37

Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City
383 U.S. 1 (1966).....8, 21

In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended–Release Capsule Patent Litig.
676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)8

<i>In re Gurley</i> 27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	58
<i>In re Hedges</i> 783 F.2d 1038 (Fed.Cir.1986)	21
<i>In re Kahn</i> 441 F.3d 977 (Fed Cir. 2006)	46
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> 2016 WL 3974202 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	46
<i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGO Commc'ns, Inc.</i> 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	43, 45
<i>Intri-Plex Techs., Inc. v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Rencol Ltd.</i> IPR2014-00309, Paper 83 (PTAB March 23, 2014)	21, 38
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	46, 58
<i>McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.</i> 262 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	20
<i>Orthopedic Equipment Co., Inc. v. All Orthopedic Appliances, Inc.</i> 707 F.2d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	8
<i>Procter & Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> 566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	46
<i>Reiffin v. Microsoft Corp.</i> 214 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	6
<i>Ring Plus, Inc. v. Cingular Wireless, LLC</i> No. CIV.A. 2:06-CV-159DF, 2007 WL 5688765 (E.D. Tex. July 9, 2007)...	5
<i>Standard Oil Co. v. American Cyanamid Co.</i> 774 F.2d 448 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	9

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.