

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

**JOHN CRANE, INC., JOHN CRANE
PRODUCTION SOLUTIONS, INC., & JOHN CRANE GROUP CORP.,**

Petitioners,

v.

FINALROD IP, LLC,

Patent Owner.

**IPR2016-01827
U.S. Patent No. 9,045,951
Issued June 2, 2015**

**PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-318 & 37 C.F.R. 42.100 *et. seq.***

Table of Contents

I.	MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8)	1
A.	Real Party-In Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))	1
B.	Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2))	1
C.	Counsel & Service Information (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.8(b)(3)-(4))	1
II.	CERTIFICATION AND FEES	2
III.	IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)) & RELIEF REQUESTED (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(1))	2
IV.	BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR THE '951 PATENT	3
A.	Introduction	3
B.	Background of Field of Art	4
C.	Overview of the '951 Patent	8
D.	Prosecution History of the '951 Patent	9
V.	THE CLAIMS OF THE '951 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE	11
A.	Relevant Field of Art and Level of Ordinary Skill	11
B.	Independent Claims Listing	11
C.	Claim Constructions	14
(a)	“define a [first/second/third] distribution of force” (claims 4, 7, 14, and 21) & “determining distribution ... of compressive force” (Claims 60 and 63)	14
(b)	“such that” (Claims 4, 7, 14-15, 21)..... Error! Bookmark not defined.	
(c)	“to bias distribution of compressive force” (Claims 60-63)	16
(d)	“confining ... to distribute” (Claims 60-63)	17
D.	Ground 1: Claims 4, 6-8, 14-15, 17, 21-22, 35, 47, 52, 60-63, and 65-69 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over the Rutledge '431 Patent in view of Iwasaki & McKay	19
(a)	Overview of Rutledge '431, Iwasaki, and McKay Patents	19

(b) Reasons and Motivation to Combine	20
(c) Independent Claims 4, 7, 14, and 21	21
(d) Claims 6 and 52	Error! Bookmark not defined.
(e) Claims 8 and 35	Error! Bookmark not defined.
(f) Claims 15 and 22	Error! Bookmark not defined.
(g) Claim 17	Error! Bookmark not defined.
(h) Independent Claims 60	Error! Bookmark not defined.
(i) Claims 61 and 62	37
(j) Claim 63	41
(k) Claims 65-69.....	52
E. Ground 2: Claims 50, 57, and 59 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over the Rutledge '431, Iwasaki, and McKay Patents further in view of Anderson	Error! Bookmark not defined.
(a) Reasons and Motivation to Combine	Error! Bookmark not defined.
(b) Claim 50	Error! Bookmark not defined.
(c) Claim 57	Error! Bookmark not defined.
(d) Claim 59	Error! Bookmark not defined.
VI. CONCLUSION.....	53

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit	Case No. IPR2014-01827
1001	U.S. Patent No. 9,045,951 (“’951 Patent”)
1002	U.S. Patent No. 9,045,951 File History
1003	U.S. Patent No. 6,193,431 (“Rutledge ’431 Patent”)
1004	U.S. Patent No. 4,475,839 (“Strandberg”)
1005	U.S. Patent No. 4,662,774 (“Morrow”)
1006	U.S. Patent No. 8,113,277 (“Rutledge ’277 Patent”)
1007	U.S. Patent No. 4,822,201 (“Iwasaki”)
1008	U.S. Patent No. 4,919,560 (“Rutledge ’560 Patent”)
1009	U.S. Patent No. 5,253,946 (“Watkins”)
1010	Declaration of Gary R. Wooley
1011	Side-by-Side Comparison of the ’951 Patent claims
1012	U.S. Patent No. 4,401,396 (“McKay”)
1013	U.S. Reissue Patent No. RE32,865 (“Rutledge ’865 Patent”)
1014	U.S. Patent No. 7,730,938 (“Rutledge ’938 Patent”)
1015	Edward L. Hoffman, Finite Element Analysis of Sucker Rod Couplings with Guidelines for Improving Fatigue Life, Sandia National Laboratories, (Jul. 11, 1997) (“Hoffman Article”).
1016	U.S. Patent No. 8,062,463 (“Rutledge ’463 Patent”)
1017	U.S. Patent No. 6,886,484 (“Thomas”)
1018	U.S. Patent No. 4,653,953 (“Anderson”)
1019	Printout of Fiberod History from “ https://superod.com/about-us/ ”
1020	Press Release for Smith’s purchase of Fiberod (March 19, 2008)
1021	Asset Purchase Agreement Between Smiths and Fiberod (March 2008)
1022	Intellectual Property Disclosure Schedule from Asset Purchase Agreement
1023	U.S. Patent No. 8,851,162 (“Rutledge ’162 Patent”)
1024	U.S. Patent No. 9,181,757 (“Rutledge ’757 Patent”)
1025	Case No. 7:15-cv-00097 (W.D. Tex.), September 15, 2015, First Amended Complaint

Petitioners, John Crane, Inc., John Crane Production Solutions, Inc., and John Crane Group Corp. (“John Crane”), respectfully request Inter Partes Review (“IPR”) of claims 60-63 and 69 (“Challenged Claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 9,045,951 (“the ’951 Patent”, Exhibit 1001), believed to be currently assigned to Finalrod IP, LLC (“Finalrod” or “Patent Owner”).¹

I. MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8)

A. Real Party-In Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))

Petitioners, John Crane, Inc., John Crane Production Solutions, Inc., and John Crane Group Corp., are the real parties-in-interest.

B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2))

The ’951 Patent is also currently the subject of the following litigations: *Finalrod IP, LLC, et al. v. John Crane, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 7-15-cv-00097 (W.D. Tex. 2015). Petitioners are filing an additional IPR of claims 4, 6-8, 14-15, 17, 21-22, 35, 50, 52, 57, 59, and 65-68 concurrently herewith as IPR2016-01786. The ’951 Patent is a continuation-in-part of U.S. Patent No. 8,851,162 (the “’162 Patent”), which was the subject of IPR2016-00232 (terminated).

C. Counsel & Service Information (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.8(b)(3)-(4))

Lead Counsel: Dion M. Bregman (Reg. No. 45,645); Back-Up Counsel:

¹ While no assignment data has been recorded at the U.S.P.T.O., Finalrod represented in District Court that it is the owner of the ’951 Patent. *See* Exhibit 1025, ¶ 13.

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.