

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 RESPONSE

PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit	Shorthand	Description
2001	Fleckenstein	Declaration of William W. Fleckenstein, Ph.D, PE (CA#1666)
2002	Chambers2	Declaration of Michael Chambers, filed in IPR2019-00768 as EX1022
2003	Dictionary	Dictionary Definitions from Random House Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, 2d Ed. (1998)
2004	ChambersDepo.	Transcript of Michael Chamber's November 21, 2019 Deposition
2005	Stout	Pub. No. US 2012/0103628 A1 to Stout
2006	Stout Provisional	U.S. Provisional Patent App. No. 61/408,780 to Stout
2007	Saheta	U.S. Patent No. 8,783,353 B2 to Saheta et al.
2008	Patel '427	Pub. No. US 2009/0078427 A1 to Patel (EX1021 from IPR2019-00768)
2009	Davitt	U.S. Patent No. 4,105,044 to Davitt
2010	Holcombe	U.S. Patent No. 5,558,153 to Holcombe et al. (EX1023 from IPR2019-00768)
2011	Xu	U.S. Patent No. 7,703,510 B2 to Xu (EX1025 from IPR2019-00768)
2012	Patel '186	U.S. Patent No. 6,659,186 B2 to Patel (EX1026 from IPR2019-00768)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. PETITIONER’S CONSTRUCTION OF CLAIMS 1, 19,
AND 21 IS INCORRECT 3

 A. “First” and “Second” Have More Meaning
 Than Petitioner Asserts 4

 B. Petitioner’s Construction Ignores the Invention 7

 C. Claim 20 Does Not Help Petitioner 9

 1. Claim 20 Isn’t Limited as Petitioner Proposes 9

 2. Claim 20 Covers an Initially-Closed Valve 11

III. PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW THAT GIROUX’S PREFERRED
EMBODIMENT ANTICIPATES ANY CLAIM 15

IV. PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW THAT IT WOULD HAVE BEEN
OBVIOUS FOR ANY REASON TO MODIFY GIROUX’S
PREFERRED EMBODIMENT TO BE INITIALLY CLOSED 15

 A. Petitioner’s Motivation Would Not Have Led
 a POSITA to Giroux 16

 B. Even If a POSITA Turned to Giroux, They Wouldn’t
 Have Been Motivated to Modify the Preferred Embodiment
 to Be Initially Closed 18

 1. The Intended Purpose and Principle of Operation of
 Giroux’s Preferred Embodiments 18

 2. Modifying Giroux’s Preferred Embodiment to Be
 Initially Closed Would’ve Rendered It Inoperative for Its
 Intended Purpose and
 Changed Its Principle of Operation 22

V. PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW THAT GIROUX DISCLOSES
THE ALTERNATIVE EMBODIMENT INITIALLY CLOSED 25

VI. PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW THAT IT WOULD HAVE BEEN
OBVIOUS FOR ANY REASON TO MODIFY GIROUX’S
ALTERNATIVE EMBODIMENT TO BE INITIALLY CLOSED 29

VII. PETITIONER FAILS TO ESTABLISH THE ANTICIPATION OR
OBVIOUSNESS OF ANY “URGING” CLAIM 31

..

A.	Petitioner’s Anticipation Challenge Fails	32
B.	Petitioner’s Obviousness Challenge Fails	33
1.	Giroux’s FIG. 3 Does Not Amount to a Disclosure of a Sleeve Urged to Its Initial Position	33
(a)	Petitioner/Mr. Chambers’s Assertions About the Configuration of Piston 110	34
(b)	Petitioner Hasn’t Established a POSITA Would View Giroux’s Piston 110 as Contended.....	38
2.	Petitioner’s Remaining Obviousness Challenges to the Urging Claims Are Defective	49
(a)	The Prior Art Does Not Teach a Biased-Closed Sleeve.....	50
(b)	Petitioner’s “Combine Prior Art Elements to Yield a Predictable Result” Argument Fails	51
(c)	Petitioner Impermissibly Relies on Hindsight.....	53
(d)	Petitioner Fails to Establish That a POSITA Would Have Been Motivated by a Concern with Premature Actuation of Giroux’s Piston	53
(e)	A POSITA Concerned with Premature Actuation Would Not Have Used Sleeve Biasing.....	58
(f)	Petitioner’s Obvious-to-Try Rationale Is Defective.....	60
VIII.	PETITIONER’S ALLEGED SIMULTANEOUS INVENTION EVIDENCE CANNOT SAVE ITS OBVIOUSNESS CHALLENGES	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	54
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel</i> , 314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	57
<i>In re Bush</i> , 296 F.2d 491 (C.C.P.A. 1961)	18, 19, 20
<i>In re Daniel</i> , 17 C.C.P.A. 605 (C.C.P.A. 1929).....	45, 46, 47, 48
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	13, 60
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	23
<i>Hockerson-Halberstadt, Inc. v. Avia Group Int’l</i> , 222 F.3d 951 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	38, 43
<i>Interconnect Planning Corp v. Feil</i> , 774 F.3d 1132 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	53
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	18, 58
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	52, 60
<i>Luminara Worldwide, LLC v. Liown Elecs. Co.</i> , 814 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	7
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Biscotti, Inc.</i> , 878 F.3d 1052 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	33
<i>In re Mouttet</i> , 686 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	18

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.