

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

GREE, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SUPERCELL OY,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 2:19-cv-00310-JRG-RSP

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PLAINTIFF'S OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. LEGAL STANDARD..... 2

A. Claim Terms Are Presumed to Have Their Plain and Ordinary Meaning. 2

B. The Court Looks First to Intrinsic Evidence to Determine Claim Meaning. 3

C. Supercell Must Show Indefiniteness By Clear and Convincing Evidence..... 4

III. OVERVIEW OF THE YOSHIKAWA PATENTS 5

IV. DISPUTED CLAIM TERMS 7

A. “selected randomly” (Claims 1, 2, 3 of the ‘708 Patent) 7

B. “character” (Claims 1, 2, 3 of the ’708 Patent and Claims 2, 6, 14 of the ’832 Patent)..... 9

C. “displaying, during the virtual game, an item associated with the selected cell, which is determined by the server based on the selection request” (Claims 1 & 3 of the ’708 Patent)..... 11

D. “wherein each of a plurality of items extracted from an item information table pertaining to a user is associated with each of the plurality of the cells” (Claims 1, 2, 3 of the ’708 Patent) 12

E. “and at least one of the cells including a character which indicates a rarity value of an item associated with the at least one of the cells” (Claims 1, 2, 3 of the ’708 Patent) 13

F. “associating, in a memory of the game server, each of a plurality of cells with each of extracted items extracted from the memory” / “a memory in which each of a plurality of cells is associated with each of extracted items extracted from the memory” / “associating, in a memory of the computer, each of a plurality of cells with each of extracted items extracted from the memory” (Claims 1, 4, 9 of the ’832 Patent) 13

G. “[sending information to a user terminal for displaying, in a virtual game,] a sheet comprising the plurality of cells and obtainable item information” (Claims 1, 4, 9 of the ’832 Patent) 15

H. “send[ing] information for differentiating, in the virtual game, a display of the one cell from another cell of the plurality of cells in the sheet, wherein the differentiating of the display of the one cell is done in response to the selection request to select the one cell” (Claims 1, 4, 9 of the ’832 Patent)..... 16

I. “providing” / “provide” (Claims 1, 4, 9 of the ’832 Patent)..... 18

V. CONCLUSION..... 19

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Federal Cases

Alcatel USA Res. Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.,
 No. 6:06 CV 500, 2008 WL 2625852 (E.D. Tex. June 27, 2008) passim

Hill-Rom Servs., Inc. v. Stryker Corp.,
 755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 2, 4

Hoganas AB v. Dresser Indus., Inc.,
 9 F.3d 948 (Fed. Cir. 1993) 18

Home Diagnostics, Inc. v. LifeScan, Inc.,
 381 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2004) 1, 7

In re Gardner,
 427 F.2d 786 (C.C.P.A. 1970) 14

Liquid Dynamics Corp. v. Vaughan Co.,
 355 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2004) 3, 4

Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.,
 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995),
aff'd, 517 U.S. 370 (1996) 3

McCarty v. Lehigh Valley R.R. Co.,
 160 U.S. 110 (1895)..... 16

Merck & Co., Inc. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.,
 347 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2003) 4

Merck & Co., Inc. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.,
 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005) 3, 4, 16

Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.,
 572 U.S. 898 (2014)..... 4, 5, 13

O2 Micro Int’l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.,
 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008) passim

Perdiem Co, LLC v. IndusTrack LLC,
 No. 2:15-cv-727-JRG-RSP, 2016 WL 3633627 (E.D. Tex. July 7, 2016)..... 14

Pfizer, Inc. v. Alkem Labs. LTD.,
 No. 13-1110-GMS, 2014 WL 12798743 (D. Del. Dec. 2, 2014) 19

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) passim

Power-One, Inc. v. Artesyn Techs., Inc.,
599 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2010) 2

Source Vagabond Sys. Ltd. v. Hydrapak, Inc.,
753 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 16, 17

Summit 6, LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.,
802 F.3d 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2015) passim

Teva Pharm. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.,
789 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 5

U.S. Surgical Corp. v. Ethicon, Inc.,
103 F.3d 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1997) 3

Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.,
90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996) 3, 4

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.