

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

RAPID COMPLETIONS LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

**BAKER HUGHES INCORPORATED,
et al.,**

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No. 6:15-cv-724-RWS-KNM

Consolidated with

Civil Action No. 6:16-cv-286-RWS-KNM

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**WEATHERFORD'S EXPEDITED MOTION TO STAY PENDING
INTER PARTES REVIEW PROCEEDINGS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LEGAL STANDARDS	2
III. THE RELEVANT FACTORS FAVOR A STAY	3
A. A Stay Will Not Unduly Prejudice or Present a Clear Tactical Disadvantage to Rapid	3
B. A Stay Will Simplify the Issues in Question and Trial of the Case.....	5
C. Discovery is Not Complete and This Case is Far From Trial.....	8
IV. EVEN IF IT CHOOSES NOT TO EVALUATE THE FACTORS INDEPENDENTLY AS TO WEATHERFORD, THE COURT SHOULD STILL STAY THIS CASE.....	9
A. The Case Should Be Stayed as to Baker Hughes.....	9
B. Weatherford and Peak Should Be Stayed Along with Baker Hughes	10
V. CONCLUSION.....	11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Affinity Labs of Texas LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.
 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 105850 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 1, 2014)----- 5

CANVS Corp. v. United States
 2014 U.S. Claims LEXIS 1550 (Fed. Cl. Dec. 19, 2014)----- 5

Capella Photonics, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.
 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27953 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 6, 2015) ----- 5

Crossroads Systems, Inc. v. Dot Hill Systems Corp.
 2015 WL 3773014 (W.D. Tex. June 16, 2015)----- 3

Cutsforth, Inc. v. Westinghouse Air Brake Techs. Corp.
 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 31453 (D. Minn. Jan. 15, 2015) ----- 5

Cypress Semiconductor Corp. v. GSI Tech., Inc.
 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 142858 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 7, 2014)----- 5

Depomed Inc. v. Purdue Pharma L.P.
 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 102109 (D.N.J. July 25, 2014)----- 5

Evolutionary Intelligence, LLC v. Sprint Nextel Corp.
 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 139066 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 26, 2014) ----- 5

Gentherm Can., Ltd. v. IGB Auto., Ltd.
 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23180 (E.D. Mich. Feb. 26, 2015)----- 5

In re CTP Innovations, LLC, Patent Litig.
 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8142 (D. Md. Jan. 23, 2015) ----- 5

Intellectual Ventures II LLC v. Suntrust Banks, Inc.
 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 142295 (N.D. Ga. Oct. 7, 2014) ----- 5

Intellectual Ventures II LLC v. U.S. Bancorp
 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 153638 (D. Minn. Aug. 7, 2014) ----- 5

Kaneka Corp. v. SKC Kolon PI, Inc.
 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 182809 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 5, 2014) ----- 5

Locata LBS LLC v. Paypal Inc.
 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 182792 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 4, 2014) ----- 5

Motion Games, LLC v. Nintendo Co.
 2014 WL 11678661 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 23, 2014) ----- 3

NFC Technology LLC v. HTC America, Inc.
 2015 WL 1069111 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 11, 2015) ----- 2, 6

Norman IP Holdings, LLC v. Chrysler Group LLC
 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 182788 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 8, 2014) ----- 5

Odom v. Microsoft Corp.
 429 F. App'x 967 (Fed. Cir. 2011)----- 6

PersonalWeb Techs., LLC v. Google Inc.
 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 116172 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 20, 2014) ----- 5

Procter & Gamble Co. v. Kraft Foods Global, Inc.
 549 F.3d 842 (Fed. Cir. 2008)----- 6

Safe Storage LLC v. Dell Inc.
 Civil Action No. 12-1624 (D. Del. Jan. 22, 2015) ----- 5

Service Solutions U.S., L.L.C. v. Autel.US Inc.
 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9582 (E.D. Mich. Jan. 28, 2015)----- 5

Smartflash LLC v. Apple Inc.
 621 Fed. Appx. 995 (Fed. Cir. 2015) ----- 6, 8, 9

Soverain Software LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc.
 356 F. Supp. 2d 660 (E.D. Tex. 2005)----- 2

Surfcast, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.
 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 160062 (D. Me. Nov. 14, 2014)----- 5

Trover Group, Inc. v. Dedicated Micros USA
 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 29572 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 11, 2015)----- 2

Verinata Health, Inc. v. Ariosa Diagnostics, Inc.
 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 12693 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 2, 2015)----- 5

VirtualAgility Inc. v. Salesforce.com
 759 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2014)----- 8, 9

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 103 ----- 7

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) ----- 6

35 U.S.C § 315(e)----- 7

In accordance with the Court's June 1, 2016 Order, Baker Hughes recently renewed its prior motion to stay,¹ and requested a stay of this litigation pending completion of *inter partes* reviews ("IPRs") that the Patent Trial & Appeal Board ("PTAB") recently instituted in connection with the Baker Hughes' IPR petitions. The Weatherford Defendants ("Weatherford") now file their expedited motion to stay based, in part, on their own IPR petitions that were filed in July.² Those Weatherford IPR petitions on the '505, '634 and '774 patents will likely be instituted for the same reasons that the Baker Hughes' IPRs were instituted, as well as other reasons based on additional prior art and evidence. Weatherford will also file an IPR petition on the new '501 patent later this month.

I. INTRODUCTION

The PTAB recently instituted IPRs on all asserted claims of the five original patents-in-suit, finding that Baker Hughes demonstrated a "reasonable likelihood" of proving invalidity. *See, e.g.*, Decision to Institute dated August 22, 2016, IPR 2016-00598 at 11. Statutory estoppel will attach to Baker Hughes when final written decisions issue in the Baker Hughes IPRs. It is extremely likely that the PTAB will institute additional IPRs based on Weatherford's IPR petitions given that those petitions contain grounds similar to those on which the PTAB has already found a "reasonable likelihood" of proving invalidity, as well as additional grounds and additional evidence. The PTAB would have to do a complete one-eighty in order to not institute Weatherford's IPRs – this will not happen. Accordingly, statutory estoppel will also likely attach

¹ On March 3, 2016, Baker Hughes moved to stay the first-filed action (Case No. 6:15-cv-724) on the 7,134,505 ("505"), 7,543,634 ("634"), 7,861,774 ("774"), 8,657,009 ("009") and 9,074,451 ("451") patents-in-suit. (Dkt. Nos. 132, 143.) On April 5, 2016, Rapid filed a separate action (Case No. 6:16-cv-286), asserting the 9,303,501 ("501") patent, which is a continuation of the '774 patent-in-suit. On June 15, 2016, the Court consolidated the two actions. (Case No. 6:15-cv-724, Dkt. 29).

² Weatherford and Rapid have reached an agreement on an expedited briefing schedule as follows: Rapid will file a response to this Motion within 5 business days; Weatherford will file a reply within 3 business days of the response; and Rapid will file a surreply within 3 business days of the reply.

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.