

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

WEATHERFORD INTERNATIONAL, LLC,  
Petitioner,

v.

BAKER HUGHES OILFIELD OPERATIONS, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2019-00708  
Patent RE46,137

---

**PATENT OWNER'S OBJECTIONS TO PETITIONER'S EVIDENCE  
SERVED WITH ITS REPLY**

As set forth below, Patent Owner objects to evidence that Petitioner served with its Reply (Paper 20).

<b>Ex. # and Petitioner's Description</b>	<b>Objections</b>
<p>1027. Baker Hughes Model "B" Annulus Operated Reversing Valve with Rupture Disc, July 1997</p>	<p><u>Hearsay.</u> Fed. R. Evid. 801(c) and 802. Petitioner relies on Ex. 1027 to prove the truth of out-of-court statements therein, e.g., that it shows a "Baker Hughes [(actually, 'BAKER OIL TOOLS' (Ex. 1027 at 1))] Model 'B' Annulus Operated Reversing Valve with Rupture Disc," and that that tool actually had the depicted components and dimensions. Paper 20 at 21-22. Such statements are thus hearsay, and Petitioner has not offered evidence sufficient to demonstrate that they fall within any exception to the rule against hearsay.</p> <p><u>Authenticity.</u> Fed. R. Evid. 901(a). Petitioner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that Ex. 1027 is what Petitioner purports it to be: "Baker Hughes Model 'B' Annulus Operated Reversing Valve with Rupture Disc, July 1997." Paper 21 at 3.</p> <p>Patent Owner objected to Ex. 1027 as unauthenticated when Petitioner introduced it during Dr. Fleckenstein's deposition (Ex. 1045 at 133:12-135:9), and Petitioner did not cure that objection during the deposition. 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(a). Nor did Petitioner—to the extent the rules would have permitted it to—cure that objection within 10 business days of Patent Owner making it. <i>Id.</i> at § 42.64(b)(2). Petitioner's Reply evidence comes too late to do so.</p> <p><u>Incomplete.</u> Fed. R. Evid. 106. Ex. 1027 is allegedly one of a collection of documents contained on a CD. Ex. 1037 at ¶¶ 6 and 7. But Petitioner has made neither the CD nor the full collection of documents available to Patent Owner.</p>

<p>1028. Baker Hughes Model “A” Sampler, July 1997</p>	<p><u>Hearsay.</u> Fed. R. Evid. 801(c) and 802. Petitioner relies on Ex. 1028 to prove the truth of out-of-court statements therein, e.g., that it shows “PO’s [(actually, ‘BAKER OIL TOOLS[’s]’ (Ex. 1028 at 1))] Model ‘A’ Sampler,” and that that tool actually had the depicted components and dimensions. Paper 20 at 22. Such statements are thus hearsay, and Petitioner has not offered evidence sufficient to demonstrate that they fall within any exception to the rule against hearsay.</p> <p><u>Authenticity.</u> Fed. R. Evid. 901(a). Petitioner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that Ex. 1028 is what Petitioner purports it to be: “Baker Hughes Model ‘A’ Sampler, July 1997.” Paper 21 at 3.</p> <p>Patent Owner objected to Ex. 1028 as unauthenticated when Petitioner introduced it during Dr. Fleckenstein’s deposition (Ex. 1045 at 146:22-147:1 and 135:3-9), and Petitioner did not cure that objection during the deposition. 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(a). Nor did Petitioner—to the extent the rules would have permitted it to—cure that objection within 10 business days of Patent Owner making it. <i>Id.</i> at § 42.64(b)(2). Petitioner’s Reply evidence comes too late to do so.</p> <p><u>Incomplete.</u> Fed. R. Evid. 106. Ex. 1028 is allegedly one of a collection of documents contained on a CD. Ex. 1037 at ¶¶ 6 and 7. But Petitioner has made neither the CD nor the full collection of documents available to Patent Owner.</p>
<p>1029. Baker Hughes Model “C” Annulus Operated Reversing Valve, Nov. 1997</p>	<p><u>Hearsay.</u> Fed. R. Evid. 801(c) and 802. Petitioner relies on Ex. 1029 to prove the truth of out-of-court statements therein, e.g., that it shows “PO’s [(actually, ‘BAKER OIL TOOLS[’s]’ (Ex. 1029 at 1))] Model ‘C’ Annulus Operated Reversing Valve,” and that that tool actually had the depicted components and dimensions. Paper 20 at 22. Such statements are thus hearsay, and Petitioner has not offered evidence sufficient to</p>

	<p>demonstrate that they fall within any exception to the rule against hearsay.</p> <p><u>Authenticity.</u> Fed. R. Evid. 901(a). Petitioner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that Ex. 1029 is what Petitioner purports it to be: “Baker Hughes Model ‘C’ Annulus Operated Reversing Valve, Nov. 1997.” Paper 21 at 3.</p> <p>Patent Owner objected to Ex. 1029 as unauthenticated when Petitioner introduced it during Dr. Fleckenstein’s deposition (Ex. 1045 at 162:17-19 and 135:3-9), and Petitioner did not cure that objection during the deposition. 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(a). Nor did Petitioner—to the extent the rules would have permitted it to—cure that objection within 10 business days of Patent Owner making it. <i>Id.</i> at § 42.64(b)(2). Petitioner’s Reply evidence comes too late to do so.</p> <p><u>Incomplete.</u> Fed. R. Evid. 106. Ex. 1029 is allegedly one of a collection of documents contained on a CD. Ex. 1037 at ¶¶ 6 and 7. But Petitioner has made neither the CD nor the full collection of documents available to Patent Owner.</p>
1033. Marco Rubber & Plastics, Standard USA O-Rings Sizes	<p><u>Hearsay.</u> Fed. R. Evid. 801(c) and 802. Petitioner relies on Ex. 1033 to prove the truth of out-of-court statements therein, e.g., that “the o-ring part numbers show that they are standard sizes and 336 is an o-ring that is smaller than 337” (and the like). Paper 20 at 22. Such statements are thus hearsay, and Petitioner has not offered evidence sufficient to demonstrate that they fall within any exception to the rule against hearsay.</p> <p><u>Unauthenticated.</u> Fed. R. Evid. 901(a). Petitioner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that Ex. 1033 is what Petitioner purports it to be: “Marco Rubber &amp; Plastics, Standard USA O-Rings Sizes.” Paper 21 at 3.</p>

	<p>Patent Owner objected to Ex. 1033 as unauthenticated when Petitioner introduced it during Dr. Fleckenstein’s deposition (Ex. 1045 at 143:20-23 and 135:3-9), and Petitioner did not cure that objection during the deposition. 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(a). Nor did Petitioner—to the extent the rules would have permitted it to—cure that objection within 10 business days of Patent Owner making it. <i>Id.</i> at § 42.64(b)(2). Petitioner’s Reply evidence comes too late to do so.</p>
<p>1047. Excerpts from Aerospace Size Standard for O-Rings (AS 568A)</p>	<p><u>Hearsay.</u> Fed. R. Evid. 801(c) and 802. Petitioner relies on Ex. 1047 to prove the truth of out-of-court statements therein, e.g., that “the o-ring part numbers show that they are standard sizes and 336 is an o-ring that is smaller than 337” (and the like). Paper 20 at 22. Such statements are thus hearsay, and Petitioner has not offered evidence sufficient to demonstrate that they fall within any exception to the rule against hearsay.</p> <p><u>Unauthenticated.</u> Fed. R. Evid. 901(a). Petitioner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that Ex. 1047 is what Petitioner purports it to be: “Excerpts from Aerospace Size Standard for O-Rings (AS 568A).” Paper 21 at 3.</p> <p><u>Incomplete.</u> Fed. R. Evid. 106. Ex. 1047 is allegedly “Excerpts from Aerospace Size Standard for O-Rings” Paper 21 at 3. But Petitioner has not made the remainder of that purported standard available to Patent Owner.</p>

Dated: March 20, 2020

Respectfully submitted,  
/Mark T. Garrett/  
Mark T. Garrett (Reg. No. 44,699)

# 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.