

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SEADRILL AMERICAS, INC.,
SEADRILL GULF OPERATIONS AURIGA, LLC,
SEADRILL GULF OPERATIONS VELA, LLC,
SEADRILL GULF OPERATIONS NEPTUNE, LLC,

Petitioner,

v.

TRANSOCEAN OFFSHORE DEEPWATER DRILLING, INC.,

Patent Owner

Case

IPR2015-01990 (Patent 6,068,069)

PETITIONER'S NOTICE OF APPEAL

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 141(c), 142, and 319 and 37 C.F.R. §§ 90.2(a) and 90.3(a), that Petitioners Seadrill Americas, Inc., Seadrill Gulf Operations Auriga, LLC, Seadrill Gulf Operations Vela, LLC, and Seadrill Gulf Operations Neptune, LLC (collectively, “Seadrill” or “Petitioner”) hereby appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit from the Patent and Appeal Board’s Final Written Decision (Paper 89) (“Final Written Decision”) entered on March 27, 2017 in the above-captioned *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 6,068,069 (“the ‘069 Patent”), and from all underlying orders, decisions, rulings, and opinions.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 90.2(a)(3)(ii), Seadrill states that the issues on appeal may include, but are not limited to: (i) whether the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“Board”) erred in holding that Petitioner Seadrill did not demonstrate, by a preponderance of the evidence, that claims 17 and 18 of the ‘069 Patent are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 by U.S. Patent No. 4,850,439 to Lund (“Lund”); (ii) whether the Board erred in its claim constructions for the ‘069 Patent; (iii) whether the Board erred in holding that Petitioner Seadrill did not demonstrate, by a preponderance of the evidence, that claims 17-19 of the ‘069 Patent are obvious in light of the asserted prior art combinations of Lund, UK Patent Application GB 2 042 836 A (“Horn”), J.L. Rike and R. G. McGlamery, “Recent Innovations in Offshore Completion and Workover Systems,” Offshore

Technology Conference (1969) (“Rike”), R. Baker, “A Primer of Oilwell Drilling” (“Baker”), and “Ocean Industry,” Vol. 3, No. 3 (Mar. 1968) (“Chevron S-55”); and Lund, Horn, U.S. Patent 3,658,298 (“Moore”), Baker, and Varco/BJ General Catalog 1992-1993 (“Varco”); (iv) whether the Board erred in its factual findings regarding the objective evidence of non-obviousness, including whether the Board’s findings conflict with the evidence of the record and are not supported by substantial evidence; (v) whether the Board erred in its legal conclusions drawn from its analysis of Seadrill’s asserted grounds of obviousness in light of the factual finding of a prima facie case of obviousness and the factual findings regarding each category of the objective evidence of non-obviousness; (vi) whether the Board erred in its factual findings regarding the teachings of the Lund Patent, including whether the Board’s findings conflict with the evidence of the record and are not supported by substantial evidence; and, (vii) any other finding or determination supporting or related to the foregoing issues, as well as other issues decided adversely to Seadrill in any orders, decisions, rulings or opinions.

Simultaneously with this filing and in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 90.2(a)(1), this Notice of Appeal is filed with the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, filed with the Board, and served upon the Patent Owner in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e). In addition, Petitioner is sending one true and correct paper copy of this Notice of Appeal to the Clerk’s Office for

the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in accordance with Fed.
Cir. R. 15(a)(1).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 26, 2017

/s/ Matthew G. Reeves
Matthew G. Reeves (Reg. No. 39,339)
Locke Lord LLP
2800 JPMorgan Chase Tower
600 Travis
Houston, Texas 77002

*Attorneys for Petitioners
Seadrill Americas, Inc.;
Seadrill Gulf Operations Auriga, LLC;
Seadrill Gulf Operations Vela, LLC;
and Seadrill Gulf Operations Neptune,
LLC*

Certificate of Service

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), the undersigned certifies that on May 26, 2017, complete copies of “Petitioner’s Notice of Appeal” were served on Lead Counsel and Back-Up Counsel for Petitioner via email (by agreement) to:

Charles B. Walker, Jr. (charles.walker@nortonrosefulbright.com)
Jon C. Rice (jon.rice@nortonrosefulbright.com)
W. Andrew Liddell (Reg. No. 65,693)
Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP
1301 McKinney, Suite 5100
Houston TX 77010-3095

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 26, 2017

/s/ Matthew G. Reeves

Matthew G. Reeves (Reg. No. 39,339)
Locke Lord LLP
2800 JPMorgan Chase Tower
600 Travis
Houston, Texas 77002

*Attorneys for Petitioners
Seadrill Americas, Inc.;
Seadrill Gulf Operations Auriga, LLC;
Seadrill Gulf Operations Vela, LLC;
and Seadrill Gulf Operations Neptune,
LLC*

Certificate of Filing

I hereby certify that, in addition to being electronically filed through the PTAB E-2-E system, a true and correct copy of the foregoing “Petitioner’s Notice of Appeal” is being filed by hand with the Director on May 26, 2017, at the following address:

Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office
c/o Office of the General Counsel, 10B20
Madison Building East
600 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Certificate of Filing

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing “Petitioner’s Notice of Appeal” and the filing fee is being filed via CM/ECF with the Clerk’s Office of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit on May 26, 2017. Additionally, I certify that a paper copy of “Petitioner’s Notice of Appeal” has been sent to the Clerk’s Office of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit via First-Class U.S. Mail on May 26, 2017.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 26, 2017

/s/ Matthew G. Reeves

Matthew G. Reeves (Reg. No. 39,339)

Locke Lord LLP

2800 JPMorgan Chase Tower

600 Travis

Houston, Texas 77002

Attorneys for Petitioners

Seadrill Americas, Inc.;

Seadrill Gulf Operations Auriga, LLC;

Seadrill Gulf Operations Vela, LLC;

*and Seadrill Gulf Operations Neptune,
LLC*