

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ENSIGN US SOUTHERN DRILLING LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

C&M OILFIELD RENTALS, LLC
D/B/A C-MOR ENERGY SERVICES
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2023-00804
U.S. Patent No. 10,976,016

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 10,976,016**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OVERVIEW OF THE '016 PATENT	3
III. THE PETITION’S PROCEDURAL FAILURES WARRANT DENYING INSTITUTION.....	5
A. The Petition Takes Inconsistent Positions on Claim Construction	6
B. Petitioner’s Conclusory Expert Declaration Should be Given No Weight and Does Not Cure The Petition’s Deficiencies.....	7
IV. PETITIONER FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS	10
A. Petitioner has not demonstrated a reasonable likelihood of prevailing on Ground 1 (Gowanlock)	11
i. Ground 1 fails to establish that Gowanlock discloses a “crown deck”	12
ii. Ground 1 fails to establish that Gowanlock discloses a “mounting pole”	14
iii. Ground 1 fails to establish that Gowanlock discloses “a bracket configured to attach the mounting pole to the crown deck of the rig”	16
iv. Ground 1 fails to establish that Gowanlock discloses that “the bucket is connected to the crown deck of the rig using bolts”	19
B. Petitioner has not demonstrated a reasonable likelihood of prevailing on Ground 2 (Gowanlock and Swivelpole).	20
i. Ground 2 fails to identify with particularity the proposed combination.....	21
ii. Ground 2’s references fail to disclose a “crown deck”	23
iii. Ground 2’s references fail to disclose a “mounting pole”	24

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
iv. Ground 2’s references fail to disclose “a bracket configured to attach the mounting pole to the crown deck of the rig”	26
v. Ground 2’s references fail to disclose that “the bracket is connected to the crown deck of the rig using bolts”	28
vi. Petitioner fails to establish a supportable, non-hindsight reason why a POSITA would have been motivated to combine the references	29
vii. Petitioner fails to establish that a POSITA would have had a reasonable expectation of success in combining the references.	37
C. Petitioner has not demonstrated a reasonable likelihood of prevailing on Ground 3 (Chinese ‘413, Swivelpole, and APA).	39
i. Ground 3 fails to identify with particularity the proposed combination.....	40
ii. Ground 3’s references fail to disclose a “crown deck”.....	40
iii. Ground 3’s references fail to disclose “a bracket configured to attach the mounting pole to the crown deck of the rig”	42
iv. Ground 3’s references fail to disclose a “bracket [] connected to the crown deck of the rig using bolts”	44
v. Petitioner fails to establish a supportable, non-hindsight reason why a POSITA would have been motivated to combine the references	44
vi. Petitioner fails to establish that a POSITA would have had a reasonable expectation of success in combining the references	48
D. Petitioner has not demonstrated a reasonable likelihood of prevailing on Ground 4 (Magnalight Video and APA).....	49

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
i. Ground 4 fails to identify with particularity the proposed combination.....	49
ii. Ground 4’s references fail to disclose a “crown deck”	50
iii. Ground 4’s references fail to disclose a “mounting pole”	51
iv. Ground 4’s references fail to identify “a bracket configured to attach the mounting pole to the crown deck of the rig”	52
v. Ground 4’s references fail to disclose that “the bracket is connected to the crown deck of the rig using bolts”	52
vi. Petitioner fails to establish a supportable, non-hindsight reason why a POSITA would have been motivated to combine the references	53
vii. Petitioner’s remaining motivations to combine are based on impermissible hindsight.	55
viii. Petitioner fails to establish that a POSITA would have had a reasonable expectation of success in combining the references.	56
V. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION UNDER § 314(A)	57
A. Factor 1: A Stay is Highly Unlikely in the Parallel Proceeding	57
B. Factor 2: The Median Time to Trial Is Before the Deadline for a Final Written Decision	58
C. Factor 3: The Parties Have Invested Significant Time and Money in The Parallel Proceeding, Which Has Been Pending for Over 16 Months	59
D. Factor 4: The Petition Challenges the Same Claims Using Substantially the Same Prior Art That Petitioner Asserts in the Parallel Proceeding.....	60
E. Factor 5: The Parties in Both Proceedings are the Same	62

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
F. Factor 6: Petitioner's Arguments Do Not Plainly Lead to a Conclusion of Unpatentability	62
VI. CONCLUSION.....	63

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.