

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FUEL AUTOMATION STATION, LLC,
PETITIONER,

V.

FRAC SHACK INC.,
PATENT OWNER.

CASE IPR2017-01349
PATENT 9,346,662

FRAC SHACK INC.'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
37 C.F.R. § 42.107

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OVERVIEW OF THE '662 PATENT	3
III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	9
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	11
A. “A fuel delivery connection . . . for securing the second end of the hose to a corresponding one of the multiple pieces of equipment to which fuel is to be delivered” (Claim 1).....	11
1. Term Is Governed by §112(6)	11
a. Means-Plus-Function Standard.....	11
b. The Claim Limitation Uses a Generic Placeholder for Performing a Claimed Function	11
c. The Generic Placeholder Is Modified by Functional Language Linked by the Transition Word “For”	12
d. The Generic Placeholder Is Not Modified by Sufficient Structure for Performing the Claimed Function	13
e. Summary: §112(6) Controls	14
2. Corresponding Structure	15
B. Term Found in the Preamble.....	16
1. The Preamble Is Limiting.....	16
a. Petitioner’s Introductory Case Law Does Not Support Petitioner.....	16
b. Case Law in Petitioner’s Analysis Does Not Support Petitioner	18
c. Other “Guideposts” Indicate the Preamble is Limiting	21
d. Summary: Preamble	24
2. “Work Site” (Claim 1)	24
C. Relevant Terms Proposed by Petitioner.....	26
1. “Manifold” (Claims 1–2)	26

2. “Set Up for Delivery of Fuel at a Well Site During Fracturing of a Well” (Claim 7).....	29
a. Claim 7 Has Three Valid and Connected Limitations	29
b. “For Delivery of Fuel” Is A Functional Capability	30
c. “At a Well Site” Is a Particular Place in a “Work Site”	30
d. “During Fracturing of a Well” Is A Specific Limited Duration	31
e. “Set up” Reflects Assembly, Erection, and Position	32
f. Summary: Limitations Found in Claim 7	33
V. TOSHIO IN LIGHT OF HOSE HANDBOOK OR GRISWOLD FAILS TO RENDER CLAIM 1—AND, HENCE, ANY REMAINING CLAIM— OBVIOUS.....	33
A. Claim 1	33
1. Toshio Does Not Disclose Capability of Delivery to Multiple Pieces of Equipment at a Work Site	33
a. Petitioner Puts Forth No Credible Argument.....	34
b. Toshio’s Disclosure Shows Unsuitability for Functioning at a Work Site	35
c. Summary: “Work Site”	39
2. Toshio Does Not Disclose Structure Corresponding to Hoses or Hose Connections and Petitioner Does Not Combine References to Create the ’662 Patent’s Claimed Invention.....	40
a. Petitioner Impermissibly Relies upon Visual Appearance in a Drawing	40
b. Petitioner Impermissibly Uses One Structure for Multiple Limitations	42
c. Petitioner Simply Contends That References Teach the Use of “Hoses in Buildings,” Not That the Proposed Combination Is the Claimed Invention	44

d. Summary: “Hoses” and “Hose Connections”	45
3. Toshio Does Not Have “A Fuel Delivery Connection”	46
a. Petitioner Ignores the Claim Language.....	46
b. Petitioner Evinces No Structure Meeting the “Fuel Delivery Connection” Limitation	47
c. Petitioner Shows No Equivalency for the “Fuel Delivery Connection”	48
d. Petitioner Has Not Shown Griswold or Hose Handbook Remedy Toshio’s “Fuel Delivery Connection” Deficiencies.....	50
e. Summary: “Fuel Delivery Connection”	52
4. Toshio’s Fuel Delivery System Does Not Have a Sensor and Toshio’s Sensors Are Not Associated with a Fuel Outlet, Hose and Fuel Delivery Connection Combination.....	53
B. Claims 2–11: All Remaining Dependent Claims are Similarly Non-Obvious	54
C. Claims 7 and 10–11: Additional Reasons for Non-Obviousness.....	55
1. Claim 7: Petitioner Has Not Shown References Set Up for Delivery at a Well Site During Fracturing of a Well	55
a. Petitioner May Not Ignore Claim 7	55
b. Petitioner’s Regurgitation of Its Argument for Claim 1’s Preamble Fails to Address Claim 7’s Further Limitations.....	55
c. Petitioner’s Alternative Theory Adds Nothing to Its Primary Argument and Is Founded Upon the Long-Felt but Unsolved Problem Identified by the ’662 Patent	57
2. Claim 10: Petitioner Does Not Show Independent Start of Fuel Flow and Toshio Appears to Describe Sequential Operation.....	60
3. Claim 11: Sequential Operation Precludes Independent Stopping of Fuel Flow	62

D. Claim 12 Is Not at Issue62

VI. CONCLUSION.....62

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.