

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

ONESOURCE SOLUTIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC., Petitioner,
v.
HIPPOCRATIC AI, INC., Patent Owner.

PGR2025-00075
U.S. Patent No. 12,142,371 B1

**PETITIONER'S PRELIMINARY REPLY
ADDRESSING PROCEDURAL DEFECTS RAISED IN PATENT OWNER'S
POPR**

Pursuant to the Board's January 14, 2026 authorization, Petitioner files this 3-page Preliminary Reply, limited to the procedural-defect issues raised in Patent Owner's Preliminary Response.

I. The Petition remains entitled to its accorded August 11, 2025 filing date.

Patent Owner contends the Petition is time-barred under 35 U.S.C. § 321(c) because Petitioner filed a corrected petition on August 27, 2025 and allegedly made "substantive changes." That theory conflicts with the Board's Notice of Filing Date Accorded (Paper 3), which expressly states that the Petition "has been accorded the filing date of August 11, 2025," identifies only ministerial defects, and instructs that "No substantive changes (e.g., new grounds) may be made to the petition." The accorded August 11, 2025 filing date controls; Petitioner filed the corrected petition within the five-business-day period ordered in Paper 3, and made no substantive changes.

Petitioner's August 27 submission complied with Paper 3: it made only regulatory/ministerial corrections and trimmed text to satisfy the type-volume limit (including removing a cumulative non-patent literature citation). It did not add challenged claims, statutory grounds, prior art, or unpatentability theories. Under PTAB rules and precedent, ministerial corrections, especially those ordered and made within the Board-set correction window, do not reset the petition's filing date or create a time-bar windfall. Patent Owner's reliance on nonprecedential IPR orders (e.g., Nuna and ThroughPuter) is inapposite; in a precedential PGR decision, the Board rejected the "time-bar windfall" theory and preserved the petition's original filing date after a corrective filing.

See 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(c) (grant of a motion to correct a clerical/typographical mistake "does not change the filing date of the petition"); Adello Biologics LLC v. Amgen Inc., PGR2019-00001, Paper 11 at 4-5 (PTAB Feb. 14, 2019) (precedential) (rejecting time-bar "windfall" based on corrective filing and maintaining original filing date); DynaEnergetics Europe GmbH v. QinetiQ Ltd., PGR2023-00003, Paper 8 at 4-5 (PTAB Apr. 13, 2023) (corrected certificate of service "shall relate back to and be accorded" the petition's original filing date).

Accordingly, the Petition remains entitled to the Board-accorded August 11, 2025 filing date, and Patent Owner's § 321(c) argument should be rejected.

II. "Patent not in evidence" is, at most, a curable ministerial exhibit issue.

Patent Owner also asserts institution should be denied because Petitioner did not file the challenged patent as a separately numbered exhibit and therefore the patent is "not in evidence." That contention elevates form over substance in a proceeding where the challenged patent is the subject of the PGR and the Petition challenges and quotes specific claims.

Notably, Patent Owner itself "presently has no exhibits," and its argument identifies, at most, a correctable exhibit-designation formality, not a statutory or jurisdictional defect requiring denial of institution.

Paper 3 did not identify any defect requiring denial on this ground. If the Board believes a separately numbered copy of the '371 patent would be helpful, Petitioner can promptly file it as a numbered exhibit (see 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(a)) in the manner the Board directs, consistent with the Board's authority under 37 C.F.R. § 42.5(a)-(b).

III. Conclusion

For these reasons, Patent Owner's procedural-defect arguments concerning timeliness and "patent in evidence" do not warrant denial of institution.

Respectfully submitted,

Alfred Hoyte

/Alfred Hoyte/

Date: January 18, 2026

Registration No. : 33512

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 reply for AIA review number PGR2025-00075 PETITIONER'S PRELIMINARY REPLY ADDRESSING PROCEDURAL DEFECTS RAISED IN PATENT OWNER'S POPR was served on the following party on January 18, 2026:

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

Trials@USPTO.GOV PTACTS_System@uspto.gov

Date: January 18, 2026

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/

Registration No. : 33512

01/18/2026