

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

WEATHERFORD INTERNATIONAL, LLC;
WEATHERFORD/LAMB, INC.;
WEATHERFORD US, LP; and WEATHERFORD
ARTIFICIAL LIFT SYSTEMS, LLC
Petitioners

v.

PACKERS PLUS ENERGY SERVICES INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-01509
Patent 7,861,774

**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. Solid Body Packer	3
	B. The Second Annular Wellbore Segment.....	5
IV.	Obviousness Analysis.....	6
	A. The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	7
	1. A POSITA Would Have Been Aware of a Variety of Different Completion Techniques	8
	2. A POSITA Would Have Expected Multi-Stage Hydraulic Fracturing Operations to Require Cemented Casing	11
	3. A POSITA Would Carefully Weigh the Risks, Reliability, and Economics of a Proposed Completion.....	15
	4. Weatherford’s Reliance on the Halliburton Litigation Materials Conflates Mechanical Packer Operation with Fracture Engineering.....	17
	B. The Objective Indicia of Non-Obviousness.....	21
	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	26
	3. Baker Hughes Copied the Claimed Technology.	31
	4. The Claimed Technology Has Enjoyed Significant Commercial Success.	37

5.	There Is a Nexus Between the Claimed Technology and Its Commercial Success	41
6.	The Length of Intervening Time Between the Asserted Prior Art Dates and the Claimed Invention Objectively Demonstrate that the Invention Was Not Obvious	43
C.	The Scope and Content of the Prior Art.....	45
1.	Yost Describes an Experimental Operation That Teaches Away From Open Hole Multi-Stage Fracturing	45
2.	Thomson Describes a Cased Hole Fracturing Operation, Not Fracturing Through Open Hole Segments	51
3.	Ellsworth Describes Water Shut-Off Operations, Not Hydraulic Fracturing.	53
D.	The Differences Between the Prior Art and the Claimed Invention.....	55
1.	Petitioners Fail to Show that Yost Discloses the Solid Body Packers, Ball-Actuated Sleeves, and Fracturing Limitations of the '774 Claims	55
2.	Petitioners Fail to Show that Thomson Discloses Various Open Hole Limitations of the '774 Claims.....	56
3.	Petitioners Fail to Show That Ellsworth Discloses Various Ball-Activated Sleeve and Fracturing Limitations of the '774 Claims	56
V.	Overall Conclusions on Obviousness	57
A.	Petitioners Fail to Demonstrate a Motivation to Combine and Reasonable Expectation of Success With Respect to Ground 1	58
B.	Petitioners Fail to Demonstrate a Motivation to Combine and Reasonable Expectation of Success With Respect to Ground 2	61
C.	The Objective Evidence Demonstrates that Petitioners' Theories Are Flawed	64

D. Petitioners Fail to Demonstrate a Teaching of Isolating
Fracturing Fluid to the Claimed Open Hole Segments66

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Akamai Techs., Inc. v. Cable & Wireless Internet Servs., Inc.
344 F.3d 1186 (Fed.Cir.2003)31

Amkor Tech., Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n
692 F.3d 1250 (Fed. Cir. 2012)61

Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.
No. 2015-1171, 2016 WL 5864573 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 7, 2016)..... 34, 37

Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc.
776 F.2d 281 (Fed. Cir. 1985)37

Black & Decker, Inc. v. Positec USA, Inc.
No. 2015-1646, 2016 WL 2898012 (Fed. Cir. May 18, 2016) 58, 62

Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. Philip Morris Inc.
229 F.3d 1120 (Fed. Cir. 2000)41

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

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)58

Envtl. Designs, Ltd. v. Union Oil Co. of California
713 F.2d 693 (Fed. Cir. 1983)7

Gambro Lundia AB v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.
110 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1997)41

Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City
383 U.S. 1 (1966).....6, 21

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.