

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 PGR2023-00052

Patent No. 11,574,372

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
FOR POST GRANT REVIEW**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. '372 PATENT.....	2
A. Overview of '372 Patent	2
B. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	5
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	5
IV. BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE ON ANY GROUNDS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112(a), 112(b) OR 112(f).....	5
A. Ground 1 (indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. § 112(b))	5
1. Petitioner Does Not Apply Correct Legal Framework.....	5
2. “Blockchain Mining Devices”	9
a. “Blockchain Mining Devices” is Not Indefinite Because Intrinsic Evidence Provides Reasonable Certainty	10
b. Petitioner’s “Alternative” Constructions Ignore Claim Language and Rely on Extrinsic Evidence.....	12
c. Petitioner’s “First Construction” Violates Nautilus	15
d. Petitioner’s “Second Construction” is Incorrect.	21
e. Claims and Specification are Consistent	25
3. “Mining Processor”	27
4. “Adapted to Mine Transactions”	33
B. Ground 2 (written description under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a))	38
1. “Blockchain Mining Devices”	38
C. Ground 3 (indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C § 112(f)).....	42
1. “Controller” Denotes a Known Class of Structures	42
2. “Controller” is Not a Nonce Word.....	51
3. Petitioner Improperly Sweeps In Claims Without “Controller”	54
4. Specification Discloses Sufficient Structure for “Controller” Claims	57

a.	Claim 13.....	57
b.	Claim 14.....	59
c.	Claim 15.....	60
d.	Claim 16.....	61
V.	35 U.S.C. § 314(a) CONSIDERATIONS	62
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	64

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Amazon.com, Inc. v. AC Technologies S.A.</i> , IPR2015-01803, Paper 10 (PTAB March 8, 2016)	51
<i>Animal Care Sys., Inc. v. Hydropac/Lab Prod., Inc.</i> , No. 13-CV-00143-MSK-BNB, 2015 WL 535566 (D. Colo. 2015).....	36
<i>Apex v. Raritan Computer, Inc.</i> , 325 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	43, 49
<i>Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Marchon Eyewear, Inc.</i> , 672 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	35
<i>Barkan Wireless IP Holdings, L.P. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. 2:18-CV-28-JRG, 2019 WL 49790 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 7, 2019).....	53
<i>In re Cohn</i> , 438 F.2d 989 (CCPA 1971)	25, 26
<i>Convolve, Inc. v. Compaq Computer Corp.</i> , 812 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	17
<i>Dionex Softron GmbH v. Agilent Techs., Inc.</i> , 811 F. App'x 630 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	55, 56
<i>Goss Int'l Ams., Inc. v. Graphic Mgmt.</i> , 739 F. Supp. 2d 1089 (N.D. Ill. 2010).....	52
<i>Interval Licensing LLC v. AOL Inc.</i> , 766 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	8
<i>Intex Recreation Corp. v. Team Worldwide Corp.</i> , PGR2019-00015, Paper 41 (PTAB. Apr. 29, 2020).....	50
<i>Liebel–Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	55
<i>Markem–Imaje v. Zipher Ltd.</i> , 2011 WL 5837087 (D.N.H. Nov. 21, 2011).....	52

...

<i>Maxell Ltd. v. Huawei Device USA Inc.</i> , 297 F. Supp. 3d 668 (E.D. Tex. 2018).....	53
<i>Ex Parte Miyazaki</i> , 89 U.S.P.Q.2d 1207 (BPIA 2008), 2008 WL 5105055	6, 7
<i>MTD Products Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 933 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Nature Simulation Systems Inc. v. Autodesk, Inc.</i> , 50 F.4th 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2022)	9
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. 898 (2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Nevro Corp. v. Boston Scientific Corporation</i> , 955 F.3d 35 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	7, 8, 9
<i>Personalized Media Commc'ns, LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , 952 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	14
<i>Ruckus Wireless, Inc. v. Innovative Wireless Solutions, LLC</i> , 824 F.3d 999 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	14, 29
<i>S3 Inc. v. NVIDIA Corp.</i> , 259 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	59, 60
<i>Sound View Innovations, LLC v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , No. 16-cv-116 (RGA), 2017 WL 2221177 (D. Del. May 19, 2017).....	53
<i>Subotincic et al. v. Ontario Inc.</i> , 2012 WL 3112005 (C.D. Cal., June 14, 2012).....	51, 52
<i>Sysmex Corp. v. Beckman Coulter, Inc.</i> , Civil Action No. 19-1642-RGA-CJB, 2021 WL 125970 (D. Del., Apr. 6, 2021)	52, 53
<i>Thorner v. Sony Computer Entertainment America LLC</i> , 669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	55
<i>Va. Innovation Scis., Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , Civil Action No. 4:18-cv-474, 2019 WL 4259020 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 9, 2019)	53

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.