UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD
WEATHERFORD INTERNATIONAL, LLC
Petitioner,
${f v}.$
BAKER HUGHES OILFIELD OPERATIONS, LLC
Patent Owner.
Case IPR2019-00708
Patent RE46,137

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW



TABLE OF CONTENTS

			Page No	0.	
I.	INT	RODU	CTION	1	
II.	GROUND 1 – GIROUX'S PREFERRED EMBODIMENT ANTICIPATES CLAIM 1				
III.			1 – GIROUX'S ALTERNATIVE EMBODIMENT ATES CLAIMS 1, 16, 17, 31, 34, 41, AND 42	5	
	A.	A. Giroux Anticipates Claims 1 and 34 Under Either Construction			
	B. Giroux Anticipates Claims 16, 17, 31, 41, and 42			9	
		1.	Giroux Discloses Urging	9	
		2.	Piston 110 Is the Same in Both of Giroux's Embodiments 1	4	
IV.	GROUND 2 – CLAIMS 1, 8-11, 16, 17, 31, 34, 41, AND 42 ARE OBVIOUS OVER GIROUX IN VIEW OF A POSITA'S KNOWLEDGE AND THE ADMITTED PRIOR ART				
	A.		OSITA Would Have Been Motivated to Use Giroux as a Sleeve	17	
	B. It Would Have Been Obvious to Add Biasing (If Necessary To Giroux's Sleeves			21	
		1.	A POSITA Was Aware of Urged Sleeves	21	
		2.	A POSITA Was Concerned with Premature Actuation of Sliding Sleeves	23	
V.	GRO	OUND	3 – PO DOES NOT RESPOND	26	
VI	CONCLUSION 26)6	



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page No(s).
3M Innovative Props. Co. v. Avery Dennison Corp., 350 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	2, 3
Amgen Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc., 314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	8
Applera Corp. v. Micromass UK Ltd., 186 F. Supp. 2d 487 (D. Del. 2002)	2
In re Aslanian, 590 F.2d 911 (C.C.P.A. 1979)	10
In re Baum, 374 F.2d 1004 (C.C.P.A. 1967)	10
Ex parte Bjorn, 2018-001567, 2019 WL 6173305 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 16, 2019)	12
In re Daniel, 34 F.2d 995 (C.C.P.A. 1929)	14
Ex parte Elder, 2016-004536, 2018 WL 2318043 (P.T.A.B. May 14, 2018)	13
Free Motion Fitness, Inc. v. Cybex Int'l, Inc., 423 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	2
Genentech, Inc. v. Chiron Corp., 112 F.3d 495 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	
Hockerson-Halberstadt, Inc. v. Avia Group International, 222 F.3d 951 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	11, 12
KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	18, 19



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

P	Page No(s).
Ex parte Nguyen, Appeal 2018-001801, 2018 WL 5821695 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 19, 2018)	13
Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	2, 3
Plas-Pak Industries, Inc. v. Sulzer Mixpac AG, 600 F. App'x 755 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	20
Presidio Components Inc. v. Am. Tech. Ceramics Corp., IPR2015-01330, 2015 WL 9599180 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 3, 2015)	12
Ex parte Roth, Appeal 2010-009869, 2012 WL 359969 (B.P.A.I. Feb. 1, 2012)	13, 14
Techtronic Industries Co. Ltd. v. International Trade Commission, 944 F.3d 901 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	3
Thorner v. Sony Comput. Entm't Am. LLC, 669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	3
Univ. of Maryland Biotech. Inst. v. Presens Precision Sensing GmbH, 711 F. App'x 1007 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	20
In re Wolfensperger, 302 F.2d 950 (C.C.P.A. 1962)	13
Yeda Research v. Mylan Pharm. Inc., 906 F.3d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	19
OTHER AUTHORITIES	
27 C E D	O



I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

The Petition showed that Giroux anticipates claims 1-2, 4-7, 12-25, 31-35, and 41-44, and that Giroux in combination with a POSITA's knowledge, the admitted prior art, and/or Patel '853 renders claims 1-44 obvious. In the face of these assertions on February 19, 2020, Patent Owner ("PO") disclaimed claims 2-7, 12-15, 18-30, 32, 33, 35-40, 43, and 44. Paper 19 at 1. That leaves only claims 1, 16, 17, 31, 34, 41, and 42 at issue in Ground 1 and claims 1, 8-11, 16, 17, 31, 34, 41, and 42 at issue in Grounds 2 and 3. Notably, PO's apparent concession that claims 2 and 35 are invalid necessarily means that independent claims 1 and 34 from which 2 and 35 depend, respectively, are also invalid.

II. GROUND 1 – GIROUX'S PREFERRED EMBODIMENT ANTICIPATES CLAIM 1

PO's only argument that remaining claim 1 is not anticipated by Giroux's Preferred Embodiment is that the claim requires an initially-closed sleeve. PO Response (Paper 16) ("Resp.") 15. PO's reasons for such a construction fail. Resp. 3-15.

First, PO claims that without a temporal limitation, "first" and "second" would be superfluous because the two positions are already defined by other characteristics. Resp. 4. That is false. Claim 1 uses "first" and "second" as shorthand labels for closed and partially-open positions, just like claims 8 and 16.



DOCKET

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.

