

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SPACE EXPLORATION TECHNOLOGIES CORP.,  
Petitioner,

v.

BLUE ORIGIN LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2014-01378  
Patent 8,678,321 B2

---

Before KEN B. BARRETT, HYUN J. JUNG, and CARL M. DEFRANCO,  
*Administrative Patent Judges.*

DEFRANCO, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION  
Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.108*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Space Exploration Technologies Corp. (“SpaceX”) filed a Petition (“Pet.”) for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 8,678,321 B2 (“the ’321 patent”). The Petition challenges the patentability of claims 14 and 15 of the ’321 patent on the ground of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103.<sup>1</sup> Blue Origin LLC, the owner of the ’321 patent, did not file a Preliminary Response to the Petition.

We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a). After considering the Petition, we conclude that the challenged claims are not amenable to construction and we are unable to reach a determination on the reasonable likelihood that SpaceX would prevail on the ground asserted in the Petition. Accordingly, we do not institute *inter partes* review of claims 14 and 15.

## II. BACKGROUND

### A. *The ’321 Patent*

Space exploration is expensive, and a reusable launch vehicle (“RLV”) provides the potential for lower cost access to space. Ex. 1101, 1:55–2:3. The ’321 patent relates to landing and recovering an RLV at sea. *Id.* at 1:42–45. As disclosed, the RLV performs a controlled landing on a sea-going platform in a manner that reduces the amount of reconditioning necessary to reuse the RLV in a subsequent launch. *Id.* at 3:10–13, 5:29–36. The RLV comprises a lower, booster stage and an upper, payload stage. *Id.* at 3:13–15. After the RLV lifts off from a coastal launch site, the booster

---

<sup>1</sup>The remaining claims of the ’321 patent, claims 1–13, are the subject of another Petition filed by SpaceX in IPR2014-01376. Pet. 1.

stage propels the payload stage to a high-altitude flight profile. *Id.* at 3:42–44, Fig. 1. At a predetermined altitude, the booster stage cuts off its engines and separates from the payload stage. *Id.* at 3:64–66. The booster stage takes a trajectory over the ocean for reentry into the earth’s atmosphere, while the payload stage proceeds into orbit. *Id.* at 3:64–4:3. During reentry, the booster stage reorients itself into a “tail-first” position as it glides toward the sea-going platform. *Id.* at 4:3–8. Once the booster descends to a suitable position over the platform, the engines on the booster stage reignite to slow its descent. *Id.* at 4:51–55. The booster stage then performs a “vertical, powered landing” at low speed onto the deck of the sea-going platform. *Id.* at 4:55–57.

*B. The Challenged Claims*

Of the two challenged claims, claim 14 is independent and claim 15 depends therefrom. In particular, claim 14 recites:

14. A system for providing access to space, the system comprising:
  - a space launch vehicle, wherein the space launch vehicle includes one or more rocket engines;
  - a launch site;
  - a sea going platform;
  - means for launching the launch vehicle from the launch site a first time, wherein the means for launching include *means for igniting the one or more rocket engines* and launching the vehicle in a nose-first orientation;
    - means for shutting off the one or more rocket engines;*
    - means for reorienting the launch vehicle from the nose-first orientation to a tail-first orientation before landing;

*means for reigniting at least one of the one or more rocket engines when the launch vehicle is in the tail-first orientation to decelerate the vehicle;*

*means for landing at least a portion of the launch vehicle on the sea going platform in a body of water, wherein the*

*means for landing include means for landing in the tail-first orientation while the one or more rocket engines are thrusting; and*

*means for launching at least a portion of the launch vehicle from the launch site a second time.*

Ex. 1101, 10:45–67 (emphasis added).

*C. The Asserted Ground*

SpaceX challenges the patentability of claims 14 and 15 of the '321 patent on the single ground of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Ishijima,<sup>2</sup> Lane,<sup>3</sup> and Mueller.<sup>4</sup>

### III. ANALYSIS

A determination of obviousness over the prior art begins with claim construction. *See In re Hiniker Co.*, 150 F.3d 1362, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (emphasizing “the name of the game is the claim”). In an *inter partes* review, a claim in an unexpired patent is given “its broadest reasonable construction in light of the specification of the patent in which it appears.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b). Almost all of the limitations of claim 14 are written in “means-plus-function” format, as is the limitation of dependent claim 15.

---

<sup>2</sup> Y. Ishijima et al., *Re-entry and Terminal Guidance for Vertical Landing TSTO (Two-Stage to Orbit)*, AIAA GUIDANCE, NAVIGATION, AND CONTROL CONFERENCE AND EXHIBIT, PAPER 98-4120 (1998), at 192–200 (Ex. 1103).

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Patent No. 5,873,549, issued Feb. 23, 1999 (Ex. 1104).

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Patent No. 6,158,693, issued Dec. 12, 2000 (Ex. 1105).

In proposing constructions for each of the “means for” limitations, SpaceX attempts to identify corresponding structure in the Specification for the various recited functions as required by 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3). Pet. 18–22. After reviewing SpaceX’s proposed constructions, however, we determine that SpaceX errs in its construction of at least three of claim 14’s means-plus-function limitations, namely, the “means for igniting” the rocket engines, “means for shutting off” the rocket engines, and “means for reigniting” the rocket engines. *See id.* at 19–21. SpaceX’s proposed constructions are erroneous because they seek to broaden the scope of these limitations beyond what is permissible under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 6.

At the outset, we agree with SpaceX that claims 14 and 15 recite means-plus-function limitations invoking 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 6, because the various “means for” igniting, shutting off, and reigniting the engines are modified by functional language that does not include any structure for performing the recited functions. Construing means-plus-function limitations is a two-step process: (1) “define the particular function of the claim limitation”; and (2) “look to the specification and identify the corresponding structure for that function.” *Golight, Inc. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 355 F.3d 1327, 1333–34 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (internal quotations and citations omitted). As for the second step, the structure disclosed in the specification is “corresponding” structure “only if the specification or prosecution history clearly links or associates that structure to the function recited in the claim.” *Id.*

# 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.