

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 IPR2016-01506
Patent 7,861,774

**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. The Board Should Deny Institution under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) and § 325(d).....1

 A. Petitioners Fail to Demonstrate that Lane-Wells Was Unavailable at the Time They Filed Their First Petition4

 B. Petitioners Used Rapid Completions’ Preliminary Response as a Roadmap to Support Improper Serial Petitions6

 C. Petitioners Fail to Show That This Follow-On Petition Advances Arguments That Are Not Substantially the Same as the First Round of Petitions8

III. Claim Interpretation.....9

IV. The Petition Fails to Show a Reasonable Likelihood that the Petitioner Will Prevail With Respect to the Challenged Claims12

 A. The Petition Fails to Establish Lane-Wells as Prior Art.....12

 B. Objective Evidence Confirms the Patentability of the Claimed Technology.....17

 1. The Patented Technology Has Received Praise and Enjoyed Commercial Success.....18

 2. The Claimed Invention Operates Contrary to the Prevailing Wisdom at the Time of the Invention.....24

 C. The Petition Fails to Show That Either Lane-Wells or Ellsworth Disclose Pumping Fracturing Fluid Into an Open Hole and Uncased, Non-Vertical Annular Segment.....29

 1. Petitioners Fail to Identify This Limitation in Lane-Wells29

 2. Petitioners Fail to Identify This Limitation in Ellsworth31

 3. The Board May Not Look to Other Sources to Find this Limitation in the Prior Art34

D. Petitioners Have Failed to Show that a POSITA Would Combine
Lane-Wells and Ellsworth as Described in the Petition.....35

V. Conclusion38

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Application of Bayer
568 F.2d 1357 (C.C.P.A. 1978).....14

Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.
832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016)34

Black & Decker, Inc. v. Positec USA, Inc.
No. 2015-1646, 2016 WL 2898012 (Fed. Cir. May 18, 2016)35

Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.
815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 14, 15

Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. Philip Morris Inc.
229 F.3d 1120 (Fed. Cir. 2000)24

Bruckelmyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc.
445 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006)14

Butamax Advanced Biofuels v. Gevo, Inc.
IPR2014-00250; Paper No. 8 (May 22, 2014)6

Carella v. Starlight Archery & Pro Line Co.
804 F.2d 135, 139 (Fed. Cir. 1986), *amended on reh'g sub nom.*
Carella v. Starlight Archery
No. 86-728, 1986 WL 1154370 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 16, 1986) 14, 16

Crocs, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n
598 F.3d 1294 (Fed.Cir.2010)17

Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.
800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)35

In re Hall
781 F. 2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986)13

<i>In re Hedges</i> 783 F.2d 1038, 228 USPQ 685 (Fed.Cir.1986).....	24
<i>In re Klopfenstein</i> 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	14
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> No. 2015-1300, 2016 WL 3974202 (Fed. Cir. July 25, 2016)	passim
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> IPR2013-00324, Paper 19 (Nov. 21, 2013).....	2
<i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGO Commc'ns, Inc.</i> 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	17, 38
<i>Intri-Plex Techs., Inc. v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Rencol Ltd.</i> IPR2014-00309, Paper 83 (PTAB March 23, 2014).....	17
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	35, 36
<i>Kyocera Wireless Corp. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> 545 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	13
<i>McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.</i> 262 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	17
<i>Medichem, S.A. v. Rolabo, S.L.</i> 437 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	29, 30
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> IPR2013-00109, Paper 15 (PTAB Feb. 25, 2014)	4
<i>Nvidia Corp. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> IPR2016-00134, Paper 9 (PTAB May 4, 2016)	3, 5, 9
<i>PAR Pharm., Inc. v. TWI Pharm., Inc.</i> 773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	29

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.