

In the Matter Of:
LUBRIZOL SPECIALTY PRODUCTS V BAKER HUGHES

4:15-cv-02915

BRIAN DUNN, PH.D.

February 09, 2016

r

ii.

ESQUIRE

1 of 6

S O L U T I O N S

Baker Hughes Incorporated

Exhibit 1039

BAKER HUGHES v. LUBRIZOL

IPR2016-01896

800.211.DEPO (3376)

EsquireSolutions.com

J0284735 eb

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

LUBRIZOL SPECIALTY
PRODUCTS, INC.

VS.

BAKER HUGHES
INCORPORATED

*

* CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:15-cv-02915

*

VIDEOTAPED 30(b)(6) DEPOSITION OF BRIAN DUNN, PhD

UPON RECEIPT OF SIGNATURE, THE ORIGINAL OF THIS
DEPOSITION WILL BE IN THE CUSTODY OF:

Robert J. McAughan, Jr., Esquire
Sutton McAughan Deaver PLLC
Three Riverway, Suite 900
Houston, Texas 77056

Date

Edith A. Boggs, CSR

2-9-16

HOUSTON, TEXAS

30(b) (6) DEPOSITION OF BRIAN DUNN, PhD

DEPOSITION AND ANSWERS of BRIAN DUNN, PhD, taken
before Edith A. Boggs, a certified shorthand reporter in
Harris County for the State of Texas, taken at the law
offices of Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP, 700 Louisiana,
Suite 1700, Houston, Texas, on the 9th day of February,
2016, between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 2:26 p.m.

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2
3 A T T O R N E Y F O R P L A I N T I F F :
4

5 Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
6 767 Fifth Avenue
7 New York, New York 10153-0119

8 By: Elizabeth Stotland Weiswasser, Esquire

9 A T T O R N E Y F O R D E F E N D A N T :
10

11 Sutton McAughan Deaver PLLC
12 Three Riverway, Suite 900
13 Houston, Texas 77056

14 By: Robert J. McAughan, Jr., Esquire

15 A L S O P R E S E N T :
16

17 Mr. Anthony Matheny
18 Ms. Suzanne F. Day
19 Mr. Chris Lonvick
20 Mr. Bill Hartley, Videographer

21 R E P O R T E D B Y :
22

23 Ms. Edith A. Boggs
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

[REDACTED]

Q. (BY MR. MCAUGHAN) Now, if we go on in the claim, the claim requires that as a part of this introduction step, you produce a treated liquid hydrocarbon where the viscosity of the treated liquid hydrocarbon is not less than the viscosity of the liquid hydrocarbon prior to treatment with the drag reducing polymer. Do you see that?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. As of the date Lubrizol filed the complaint alleging this patent was infringed, what evidence did it have that Baker Hughes introduced a polymer into a

1 hydrocarbon such that the viscosity of the treated
2 liquid hydrocarbon was not less than the viscosity of
3 the liquid hydrocarbon prior to treatment?

4 A. The DRA polymers are not capable of reducing the
5 viscosity of the treated liquid hydrocarbon. They
6 simply don't work that way in a technical -- from a
7 technical perspective.

8 Q. What do you mean by that?

9 A. By that, I mean when you dissolve a polymer in a
10 solvent, the viscosity does not decrease. The viscosity
11 can only increase when a polymer is dissolved in a
12 solvent.

13 Q. Now, is that true for all polymers --

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. -- and all solvents?

16 A. Yes, it is.

17 Q. So, any time you have a polymer dissolving in a
18 solvent, you will have the viscosity of the treated
19 solvent being not less than the viscosity of the solvent
20 prior to treatment; is that correct?

21 A. That is correct.

22 Q. Okay. And that's going to be true of all drag
23 reducing polymers and all hydrocarbons?

24 A. That's the nature of how the drag reduction
25 works.