

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

AIA review number: **PGR2025-00075**

Petitioner: OneSource Solutions International, Inc.

PGR Case:

OneSource Solutions International, Inc. ("OSSSI"), Petitioner, v. Hippocratic AI, Inc., Patent Owners.

Case No.: **U.S. Patent No. 12,142,371** B1 PETITION FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 12,142,371 B1 ("the '371 Patent")

Request for authorization to file limited reply to Patent Owner Preliminary Response

Dear Board,

Petitioner respectfully requests authorization to file a short paper responding to the procedural arguments in Patent Owner's Preliminary Response in PGR2025 00075.

The POPR does more than address the statutory grounds. It raises threshold procedural challenges that, if accepted, could dispose of the proceeding before the Board reaches the merits. In particular, Patent Owner argues that

1. the petition should be treated as untimely under 35 U.S.C. § 321(c) because Petitioner filed a corrected petition on August 27, 2025,
2. the corrected petition allegedly contains substantive changes that violated the Board's August 22, 2025 Notice of Filing Date Accorded, which limited Petitioner to regulatory corrections and prohibited new grounds, and
3. the petition is defective because the challenged patent is allegedly "not in evidence."

Petitioner believes these characterizations are inaccurate and that a limited reply would assist the Board and the Director in evaluating the proper procedural posture under 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.5, 42.23, 42.24(c), and 42.208(c).

The record currently contains only Patent Owner's account of these issues. Petitioner seeks a brief opportunity to explain that

1. the petition filed on August 11, 2025 has already been accorded that same date as its filing date by the Board, as expressly stated in the August 22 Notice of Filing Date Accorded, which provides that "The petition for post grant review filed in the above proceeding has been accorded the filing date of August 11, 2025."
2. the August 22 Notice identified only regulatory defects, including the word count certification, service, exhibit labeling, exhibit list, and counsel designation requirements, and expressly barred substantive changes such as new grounds.
3. the August 27 corrections complied with that directive by adding the required certifications and trimming text to meet the type volume limit, while leaving unchanged

all challenged claims, all patents and printed publications relied upon, and all statutory grounds under sections 101, 103, and 112, and

4. Patent Owner's contention that the challenged patent is "not in evidence" does not present a jurisdictional or statutory bar to institution because the patent is already before the Office as the subject of this PGR, the petition quotes and challenges specific claims of that patent, and any exhibit designation issue is purely ministerial and can, if the Board believes necessary, be cured by leave to file the patent as a numbered exhibit.

The only change to the evidentiary mix in the corrected petition was deletion of one cumulative non patent literature citation and related surplus argument. Petitioner did not introduce any new prior art, did not add any new obviousness combination, and did not alter the relief requested. Petitioner intends to show, with pinpoint citations to the original and corrected petitions and to the Board's own notice, that this was a regulatory clean up of the type contemplated by the rules, not the filing of a new petition outside the nine month window.

If authorized, Petitioner proposes a reply of no more than five pages, confined strictly to these procedural points and without any new grounds or new evidence, other than the challenged patent itself if the Board determines that a separate exhibit is required. Petitioner is not seeking to relitigate the merits at the preliminary stage, only to ensure that the Director and the panel have both sides of the timeliness, alleged substantive change, and "patent in evidence" issues before deciding whether to institute.

Petitioner respectfully requests the Board's guidance on whether such a limited paper would be permitted and, if so, the appropriate title, page limit, and due date.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.6(e) and 42.205, the undersigned certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing AIA review number PGR2025-00075 was served on the following party on **December 13, 2025**:

Name of Party or Attorney of Record:

Alfred Hoyte
IP Consulting Group

Method of Service:

☒ Email

James H. Hall

james@chzfirm.com

Stephen D. Zinda

stephen@chzfirm.com

Date: December 13, 2025

Signature: /Alfred Hoyte/

Name: Alfred Hoyte

Registration No. : 33512

Address:

7734 16th St NW

Washington DC 20012

Telephone: 202-459-8435

Email: alfredhoyte.ipconsulting@gmail.com

Respectfully submitted,

Alfred Hoyte

/Alfred Hoyte/

12/13/2025

/Harold Arkoff/

HAROLD ARKOFF, MD

CEO OSSI

12/13/2025