

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

CRUSOE ENERGY SYSTEMS, LLC  
Petitioner

v.

UPSTREAM DATA INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case PGR2023-00039  
Patent No. 11,574,372

---

**PATENT OWNER'S OBJECTIONS TO PETITIONER'S EVIDENCE**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b) and the Federal Rules of Evidence (“FRE”), Patent Owner Upstream Data Inc. submits the following objections to evidence submitted by Petitioner Crusoe Energy Systems, LLC with its Petition. These objections are timely filed and served within ten business days of the Board's decision to institute trial in this proceeding.

**Exhibit 1006**

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1006 as lacking relevance to the instituted grounds (*see* FRE 401 and 402), including due to the Petitioner not having presented sufficient evidence regarding the public availability of Exhibit 1006 or its source. This Exhibit should further be excluded because the date and source of the Exhibit are indeterminant and thus any purported relevance would be substantially outweighed by a danger of unfair prejudice and confusion (*see* FRE 403). To the extent Petitioner relies on the content of this Exhibit for the truth of the matter asserted, Patent Owner objects to the Exhibit as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802) that does not fall under any exceptions (including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807). Patent Owner further objects to this Exhibit as lacking authentication (*see* FRE 901) because sufficient evidence has not been provided to establish the authenticity of this exhibit. Exhibit 1006 purports to be brochure from the Wayback Machine and is alleged to be dated March 5, 2016, but is not

otherwise sufficiently authenticated.

### **Exhibit 1007**

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1007 as lacking relevance to the instituted grounds (*see* FRE 401 and 402), including due to the Petitioner not having presented sufficient evidence regarding the public availability of Exhibit 1007 or its source. This Exhibit should further be excluded because the date and source of the Exhibit are indeterminant and thus any purported relevance would be substantially outweighed by a danger of unfair prejudice and confusion (*see* FRE 403). To the extent Petitioner relies on the content of this Exhibit for the truth of the matter asserted, Patent Owner objects to the Exhibit as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802) that does not fall under any exceptions (including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807). Patent Owner further objects to this Exhibit as lacking authentication (*see* FRE 901) because sufficient evidence has not been provided to establish the authenticity of this exhibit. Exhibit 1007 purports to be CryptoKube Bitcoin Mining Data Center Tour video that is apparently undated, and related statements offered regarding the date of the video are vague and/or made without personal knowledge.

### **Exhibit 1008**

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1008 for the reasons provided above as to

Exhibit 1007 as Exhibit 1008 purports to be a transcript of the audio portion of Exhibit 1007. Exhibit 1008 is not otherwise appropriate evidence in this proceeding. The purported transcript (Exhibit 1008) of the offered video (Exhibit 1007) is objected to as lacking relevance to the instituted grounds (*see* FRE 401 and 402), including due to the Petitioner not having presented sufficient evidence regarding the public availability of Exhibit 1007 or its source. This Exhibit 1008 (along with Exhibit 1007) should further be excluded because the date and source of the information presented in this Exhibit 1008 are indeterminant and thus any purported relevance would be substantially outweighed by a danger of unfair prejudice and confusion (*see* FRE 403). To the extent Petitioner relies on the content of this Exhibit for the truth of the matter asserted, Patent Owner objects to the Exhibit as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802) that does not fall under any exceptions (including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807). Patent Owner further objects to this Exhibit as lacking authentication (*see* FRE 901) because sufficient evidence has not been provided to establish the authenticity of this exhibit. Exhibit 1008 purports to be a transcript of Exhibit 1007 (that is subject to Patent Owner's objection based on authenticity) and is apparently undated, and related statements offered regarding the accuracy of the transcript and the date of the associated video are vague and/or made without personal knowledge.

**Exhibit 1013**

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1013 as lacking relevance to the instituted grounds (*see* FRE 401 and 402), including due to the Petitioner not having presented sufficient evidence regarding the public availability of Exhibit 1013 or its source. This Exhibit should further be excluded because the date and source of the Exhibit are indeterminant and thus any purported relevance would be substantially outweighed by a danger of unfair prejudice and confusion (*see* FRE 403). To the extent Petitioner relies on the content of this Exhibit for the truth of the matter asserted, Patent Owner objects to the Exhibit as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802) that does not fall under any exceptions (including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807). Patent Owner further objects to this Exhibit as lacking authentication (*see* FRE 901) because sufficient evidence has not been provided to establish the authenticity of this exhibit. Exhibit 1013 purports to be an article allegedly published in 2015, but is incomplete and the portion provided is not otherwise sufficiently authenticated.

**Exhibit 1015**

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1015 as lacking relevance to the instituted grounds (*see* FRE 401 and 402), including due to the Petitioner not having presented sufficient evidence regarding the public availability of Exhibit 1015 or

# 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.