

NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

## United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

2007-1505

RATTLER TOOLS, INC.,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

BILCO TOOLS, INC.  
and WILLIAM COYLE,

Defendants-Appellees.

Thomas S. Keaty, Keaty Professional Law Corporation, of New Orleans, Louisiana, argued for plaintiff-appellant.

Christopher H. Riviere, Law Office of Christopher H. Riviere, APLC, of Thibodaux, Louisiana, and Loren G. Helmreich, Browning Bushman P.C., of Houston, Texas, argued for defendants-appellees.

Appealed from: United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana

Chief Judge Helen G. Berrigan

NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

## United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

2007-1505

RATTLER TOOLS, INC.,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

BILCO TOOLS, INC.  
and WILLIAM COYLE,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana in consolidated cases nos. 05-CV-0293 and 05-CV-3777, Chief Judge Helen G. Berrigan.

---

DECIDED: May 22, 2008

---

Before RADER and SCHALL, Circuit Judges, and ZOBEL, District Judge.\*

SCHALL, Circuit Judge.

### DECISION

Rattler Tools, Inc. (“Rattler”) appeals from the judgment of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana dismissing Rattler’s claims against Bilco Tools, Inc. and William Coyle (collectively “Appellees”) for patent infringement and

---

\* Honorable Rya W. Zobel, District Judge, United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, sitting by designation.

for trade secret misappropriation and unfair competition under Louisiana state law. Rattler Tools, Inc. v. Bilco Tools, Inc., Nos. 05-0293 & 05-3777 (E.D. La. July 9, 2007).

We affirm.

## DISCUSSION

### I.

Rattler brought suit against Appellees in the Eastern District of Louisiana for infringement of claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,216,787; claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,308,781; claims 1 and 10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,354,386; claims 1 and 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,357,539; and claims 1, 8, 12, and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,491,117. The patents relate to retrieval tools that employ magnets to remove scraps of metal from oil wells. Rattler also asserted state law claims against Appellees, alleging that Appellees had misappropriated Rattler's trade secrets in violation of the Louisiana Uniform Trade Secrets Act ("LUTSA") and had engaged in unfair competition under the Louisiana Unfair Trade Practices Act ("LUTPA").

The district court conducted a bench trial and, in a post-trial decision, ruled in favor of Appellees and ordered dismissal of Rattler's patent infringement and state law claims. Rattler Tools, Inc. v. Bilco Tools, Inc., Nos. 05-0293 & 05-3777, slip op. at 60 (E.D. La. July 6, 2007). With respect to infringement, the court construed all limitations of the asserted claims and then found that the accused products and methods did not meet any of the thirteen limitations of the ten asserted claims. See generally id.

The district court also dismissed Rattler's state law claims. With respect to the LUTSA claim, the court concluded that Rattler had not offered sufficient proof that Appellees had misappropriated any trade secrets belonging to Rattler. Id. at 54. With

respect to the LUTPA claim, the court determined that Rattler had not proven that Appellees engaged in “any unethical or unscrupulous acts” that would constitute unfair competition. Id. at 56.

## II.

On appeal, Rattler contends that the district court erred in its construction of twelve of the thirteen limitations of the ten claims at issue. It requests a different claim construction for each of these limitations. Rattler urges us to remand the case to the district court for it to conduct an infringement analysis of each asserted claim based upon what it argues is the correct claim construction. Rattler also contends that we should reverse the district court’s dismissal of its state law claims. We have considered all of Rattler’s arguments. Having done so, we see no reason to disturb the careful and thorough post-trial decision of the district court. We therefore affirm the judgment of the court in favor of Appellees dismissing Rattler’s claims.