UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NATIONAL OILWELL VARCO, L.P., Petitioner,

v.

TECHNICAL INDUSTRIES, INC., Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-00860 (Patent 7,552,640) Case IPR2017-00910 (Patent 7,997,138)

> Record of Oral Hearing Held: May 17, 2018

Before THOMAS L. GIANNETTI, BRYAN F. MOORE, and JASON J. CHUNG Administrative Patent Judges.



Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

BRADFORD T. LANEY, ESQUIRE Raley & Bowick, LLP 1800 Augusta Drive Suite 300 Houston, Texas 77057

ON BEHALF OF PATENT OWNER:

JOSEPH L. LEMOINE, Jr., ESQUIRE Lemoine & Associates 1018 Harding Street Suite 102B Lafayette, Louisiana 70503

and

DOCKE.

Δ

TED M. ANTHONY, ESQUIRE Babineaux, Poché, Anthony & Slavich, LLC P.O. Box 52169 Lafayette, Louisiana 70505

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Thursday, May 17, 2018, commencing at 10:00 a.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia.

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	
3	JUDGE GIANNETTI: So we are here this morning for
4	final hearing in two cases, IPR2017-00860 and IPR2017-00910.
5	Let me introduce the panel. To my left is Judge Jason Chung. To
6	my right is Judge Bryan Moore. And I am Judge Giannetti, and I
7	will be presiding at the hearing today.
8	Let me get appearances from counsel. Who is
9	appearing here for the petitioner first?
10	MR. LANEY: Brad Laney, Your Honor, here for
11	petitioner, National Oilwell Varco.
12	JUDGE GIANNETTI: Thank you. And for the patent
13	owner?
14	MR. ANTHONY: Ted Anthony for the patent owner.
15	MR. LEMOINE: And also Joseph Lemoine, Jr., for the
16	patent owner, Your Honors.
17	JUDGE GIANNETTI: Mr. Anthony, will you be
18	making the presentation today?
19	MR. ANTHONY: I will be making the primary part of
20	the presentation, but we would like to actually have both of us
21	deliver a portion of it, if that's okay with the panel.
22	JUDGE GIANNETTI: That's permissible. You will be
23	dividing argument; is that correct?
24	MR. ANTHONY: Correct.

DOCKET

1	JUDGE GIANNETTI: That is fine. I have a few
2	housekeeping details before we get started. And I'll address this
3	to the patent owner. You state in your papers that you are not
4	going to pursue claims 3 and 12; is that correct? Mr. Anthony
5	and Mr. Lemoine?
6	MR. ANTHONY: We had previously disclaimed
7	claims, and if that's what you are referring to, I don't know if you
8	recall, we had a conference call, and we did file a disclaimer, a
9	formal disclaimer, but
10	JUDGE GIANNETTI: Well, I know you disclaimed
11	some claims prior to institution but that did not include 3 and 12.
12	I thought that you said in your papers that you were going to
13	disclaim 3 and 12.
14	MR. ANTHONY: Your Honor, if that's what we said
15	I don't have that recollection in front of mind here, but if that's
16	what we said, then I'm sure that's correct.
17	JUDGE GIANNETTI: Why don't you look into it.
18	What we would like to see is a request for adverse judgment on
19	those claims 3 and 12. That's in the 860 case. So it would be
20	claims 3 and 12 of the '640 patent. And I believe you said that
21	and I'll give you the page cite but not at the moment. You said
22	that in your papers that you would be disclaiming those. I didn't
23	see a disclaimer in the record, so that's why I'm requesting that
24	you enter a request for adverse judgment. If you are not prepared
25	to do that now, then I would like you to do that within a few days

DOCKET

of the hearing so that we know what we are dealing with when we
write our final decision.

3 The other thing I want to address in the nature of 4 housekeeping, you recall in the -- in light of the SAS case, the Supreme Court's decision in SAS, we issued an order adding some 5 6 grounds to the cases. Do you recall that order, Mr. Laney? 7 MR. LANEY: Yes, Your Honor. 8 JUDGE GIANNETTI: We would like a joint 9 agreement to limit the case to the grounds on which we initially 10 instituted the proceedings. I don't know how serious you are with 11 those grounds, but what we would like to see, if the parties are in 12 agreement, is a joint agreement to limit the petition to the grounds 13 originally instituted. Are you willing to do that now or is that 14 something you want to take under advisement? 15 MR. ANTHONY: We are, for patent owner, Your 16 Honor. 17 JUDGE GIANNETTI: Just so that we know what we 18 are talking about, in the 860 case, it would be Lam and Assanelli, 103 with respect to claims 5, 7, 14 and 16, and Assanelli and Lam 19 20 with regard to claims 3, 5, 7, 12, 14 and 16. In the 910 case it 21 would be claims 1 through 21, the 103 ground on Assanelli and 22 Lam, and claims 8, 9, 14, 15, 20 and 21, the 103 grounds with 23 respect to Assanelli, Lam and Palusamy. The parties agree that 24 we can limit the petition to the original claims and those claims would not be -- and the grounds would not be included? 25

5

DOCKET A L A R M



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.