

**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**

---

***Inter Partes* Review No. IPR2016-01509  
Patent 7,861,774**

---

**PETITIONERS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONERS'  
MOTION TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c)**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ..... iii

I. Improper Expert Testimony..... 1

II. Unauthenticated Evidence .....2

III. Irrelevant Evidence..... 4

IV. Hearsay Evidence .....4

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Nuvasive, Inc. v. Warsaw Orthopedic, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00206, slip op. (PTAB 10/15/2013) (Paper 23).....	3
<i>Roth v. Amtrak</i> , 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20173 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 30, 1999). ....	4

### Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.64 .....	2
Federal Rule of Evidence 401 .....	4
Federal Rule of Evidence 702 .....	2
Federal Rule of Evidence 703 .....	4
Federal Rule of Evidence 705 .....	2
Federal Rule of Evidence 807 .....	5
Federal Rule of Evidence 901 .....	3
Federal Rule of Evidence 902 .....	3
PTAB Trial Practice Guide .....	2

Patent Owner's ("PO") Opposition to Petitioners' Motion to Exclude (Paper 50) ("Opp.") ignores the evidence cited in the Motion to Exclude (Paper 44) ("Motion") and does not overcome its showing that the evidence should be excluded.

### **I. Improper Expert Testimony**

PO's expert, Mr. McGowen, relied on undisclosed Baker Hughes data for his opinions on commercial success. Motion at 4. Petitioners moved to exclude section 14.4 of Ex. 2051 and section 11.2 of Ex. 2081. PO opposed, arguing that the objection is "untimely" because it was raised "well after" PO served exhibits 2051 and 2081. Opp. ("Paper 50") at 1. However, Weatherford first became aware that McGowen was relying upon undisclosed data at his deposition, and Petitioners' Objections (Paper 40) themselves make clear "the present Objections are timely as they are being served and filed within five business days of receipt of the official transcript of the Oral Deposition of Harold E. McGowen III . . . ." Paper 40 at 1 n.1. While PO asserts that Exs. 2051 and 2081 show that "McGowen prepared a separate revenue calculation for this proceeding—he estimated Baker Hughes' revenue based only on publicly available information," Opp. at 2, McGowen told a different story at his deposition: "I just know that, that I saw that information, and that entered into my thinking when I was writing my report and drawing my conclusions." Ex. 1038 at 163:4-7. When asked directly, "So in drawing your conclusions, you relied on – you're referring to the Baker Hughes' data?" *Id.* at

163:8-9. McGowen responded, “Yes” and he admitted that Weatherford did not have access to that data. *Id.* at 163:13-20. Weatherford objected both at the deposition (Ex. 1038 at 163:22-164:3) and in Paper 40 submitted within five business days of receiving his official transcript. Weatherford’s objections are therefore timely.

PO admits that its argument that Petitioners could have obtained the information under the district court Protective Order is wrong because “this provision is not directly applicable in an IPR.” Opp. at 5.

PO next asserts that Petitioners’ arguments about lack of underlying data go only to the weight of the evidence, not its admissibility under the PTAB Trial Practice Guide. Opp. at 6. But PO does not address its violations of FRE 705 (requiring disclosure of the basis for an expert opinion on cross examination) and its failure to provide the basis for its expert’s opinions under FRE 702.

Finally, PO argues that the objections are moot because McGowen provided new Baker Hughes data to substantiate his opinion. McGowen’s testimony that his opinion relied upon undisclosed data refutes PO’s argument. Ex. 1038 at 163:8-13. Thus, McGowen’s opinions should be excluded.

## **II. Unauthenticated Evidence**

PO asserts that it followed the “proper procedure” for authenticating Exs. 2004-2012, 2014, and 2020 by ignoring 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(2), which requires

# 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.