

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 PRELIMINARY RESPONSE  
FOR POST GRANT REVIEW  
U.S. PATENT NO. 11,574,372**

Mail Stop Patent Board  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	OVERVIEW OF '372 PATENT .....	1
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	4
	A. Petitioner’s Construction Of “Blockchain Mining Devices” And “Mining Processor” Is Not Supported By The Intrinsic Record.....	4
	B. Petitioner’s Construction Of A “A Continuous Flow Of Combustible Gas” Is Inconsistent With The Intrinsic Record.....	7
	C. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	9
IV.	NON-OBVIOUSNESS GROUNDS .....	10
	A. Ground 1.....	10
	1. No Motivation to Combine .....	10
	a. Ground 1 is based on hindsight.....	10
	b. Prior art teaches away from proposed combination.....	17
	c. Petition does not address reasonable expectation of success.....	18
	d. Petitioner’s own patents illustrate nonobviousness .....	21
	e. Petitioner’s experts demonstrate hindsight of alleged motivation to combine.....	23
	2. Board Should Exercise Discretion Under 325(d) to Deny Institution .....	24
	a. Becton-Dickinson Factor One: the similarities and material differences between the asserted art and the prior art involved during examination.....	26
	b. Becton-Dickinson Factor Two: the cumulative nature of the asserted art and the prior art evaluated during examination.....	33
	c. Becton-Dickinson Factor Three: the extent to which the asserted art was evaluated during examination, including whether the prior art was the basis for rejection .....	34
	d. Becton-Dickinson Factor Four: the extent of the overlap between the arguments made during examination and the manner in which	

Petitioner relies on the prior art or Patent Owner distinguishes the prior art .....34

e. Becton-Dickinson Factor Five: whether Petitioner has pointed out sufficiently how the Examiner erred in its evaluation of the asserted prior art .....36

f. Becton-Dickinson Factor Six: the extent to which additional evidence and facts presented in the Petition warrant reconsideration of prior art or arguments .....37

g. Petitioner has not demonstrated material error by examiner .....38

B. Ground 2.....39

    1. No Motivation to Combine or Reasonable Expectation of Success .....39

    2. Board Should Exercise Discretion Under Section 325(d) to Deny Institution .....43

C. Ground 3.....45

    1. No Motivation to Combine or Reasonable Expectation of Success .....45

    2. Board Should Exercise Discretion Under Section 325(d) to Deny Institution .....50

D. Ground 4.....51

    1. No Motivation to Combine or Reasonable Expectation of Success .....51

    a. Motivation to combine is based on hindsight and is contradicted by references .....51

    b. Petition fails to establish reasonable expectation of success .....55

    c. Szmigielski teaches away .....56

    d. Petitioner’s own patents support nonobviousness .....57

        2. Board Should Exercise Discretion Under Section 325(d) to Deny Institution .....58

- 1. Becton-Dickinson Factor One: the similarities and material differences between the asserted art and the prior art involved during examination .....58
  - a. MAGS.....58
  - b. Polivka.....60
- 2. Becton-Dickinson Factor Two: the cumulative nature of the asserted art and the prior art evaluated during examination .....62
- 3. Becton-Dickinson Factor Three: the extent to which the asserted art was evaluated during examination, including whether the prior art was the basis for rejection.....63
- 4. Becton-Dickinson Factor Four: the extent of the overlap between the arguments made during examination and the manner in which Petitioner relies on the prior art or Patent Owner distinguishes the prior art.....64
- 5. Becton-Dickinson Factor Five: whether Petitioner has pointed out sufficiently how the Examiner erred in its evaluation of the asserted prior art.....65
- 6. Becton-Dickinson Factor Six: the extent to which additional evidence and facts presented in the Petition warrant reconsideration of prior art or arguments .....66
- 7. Petitioner has not demonstrated material error by examiner.....66
- E. Ground 5.....67
  - 1. No Motivation to Combine or Reasonable Expectation of Success .....67
  - 2. Board Should Exercise Discretion Under Section 325(d) to Deny Institution .....70
- V. THE CLAIMS RECITE PATENT ELIGIBLE SUBJECT MATTER ..... 72
- VI. CONCLUSION..... 85

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	14
<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH</i> , IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (PTAB Feb.13,2020).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Becton, Dickinson &amp; Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (PTAB Dec. 15, 2017) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	20
<i>CSL Behring GMBH v. Shire Viropharma Inc.</i> , IPR2019- 00459, Paper 8 ((PTAB Jul. 2, 2019).....	38
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended–Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> ,676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	12
<i>Edge Endo, LLC v. Maillefer Instruments Holding, S.A.R.L.</i> , IPR2018-01349, Paper 15 (PTAB Jan. 14, 2019) .....	39
<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Teva Pharms. Int’l GmbH</i> , 8 F.4th 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2021) .....	40, 68
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984) .....	21
<i>InTouch Technologies, Inc. v. VGO Communications, Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	13, 18, 23, 58
<i>Juniper Networks, Inc., v. Correct Transmission, LLC</i> , IPR2021-000682, Paper 26 (PTAB Oct. 3, 2022).....	40, 68

# 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.