

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No 9,561,439

Filed on behalf of Supercell Oy

By:

RAJIV P. PATEL, Reg. No 39,327
BRIAN HOFFMAN, Reg. No. 39,713
JENNIFER R. BUSH, Reg. No. 50,784
KEVIN X. McGANN, Reg. No. 48,793
MICHAEL J. SACKSTEDER (*pro hac vice*)
GEOFFREY R. MILLER (*pro hac vice*)
EMILY J. BULLIS (*pro hac vice*)
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Telephone: (650) 988-8500
Facsimile: (650) 938-5200

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SUPERCCELL OY,
Petitioner

v.

GREE, INC.,
Patent Owner

Inter Partes Review No. _____
Patent 9,561,439 B2

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 9,561,439**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR A PETITION FOR <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW.....	1
A. Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. §42.104(a)).....	1
B. Fees for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review (37 C.F.R. §42.15(a)).....	1
C. Mandatory Notices (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b))	1
D. Designation of Lead and Backup Counsel (37 CFR §42.8(b)(3))	2
III. THRESHOLD FOR REVIEW (35 U.S.C. §314(A)).....	3
IV. IDENTIFICATION OF CLAIMS BEING CHALLENGED.....	3
V. OVERVIEW OF THE ‘439 PATENT	4
A. Effective Filing Date of the Challenged Claims	4
B. Background of the Purported Invention	4
C. ‘439 Patent Description	5
D. Prosecution History	9
VI. CLAIM INTERPRETATION	11
A. “cooperatively participate in the game” – claims 1, 6, 7.....	12
B. “parameter value” – claims 1, 6, 7	13
C. “ranking point” – claim 5	14
VII. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	15
VIII. OVERVIEW OF THE PRIOR ART	15

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
A. The features of the ‘439 patent were common in gaming long before the alleged invention.....	15
B. Englman.....	20
C. Ronen.....	25
D. Schulhof.....	28
IX. GROUND I: CLAIMS 1-7 ARE RENDERED OBVIOUS BY ENGLMAN, RONEN, AND SCHULHOF.....	30
A. Englman, Ronen, and Schulhof Render Obvious Independent Claim 1	30
1. Englman and Ronen teach “a game control method carried out by a game control device...”	30
2. Englman teaches “grouping the plurality of users ...,” as recited in claim 1	33
3. Englman teaches “storing a correspondence ...,” as recited in claim 1	33
4. Englman and Ronen teach “transmitting information ...,” as recited in claim 1.....	34
5. Englman teaches “storing a parameter value ...,” as recited in claim 1	36
6. Englman teaches “monitoring progress ... and updating the parameter value ...,” as recited in claim 1	38
7. Englman and Schulhof teach “providing at least one of a plurality of game pieces ...,” as recited in claim 1	40
8. Englman teaches “storing allocation information ...,” as recited in claim 1	43

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
9. Englman teaches “determining whether all the required game pieces have been provided ...,” as recited in claim 1	44
10. Englman teaches “allocating ... the game item ...,” as recited in claim 1	46
11. The embodiments of providing of ribbons, medals, and trophies in Englman also teaches elements of claim 1	48
B. Englman and Ronen teach “different game pieces [being] respectively provided to the first plurality of users” as recited in claim 2	49
C. Englman teaches “deleting the allocation information ...” as recited in claim 3	51
D. Englman teaches “periodically causing an event to occur ...” as recited in claim 4	52
E. Englman teaches “storing a ranking point ...” as recited in claim 5	53
F. Englman teaches “storing a reward ...” as recited in claim 5	54
G. Englman teaches “a processor,” “a determining unit,” and a “memory allocation unit” as recited in claim 6	55
H. Englman teaches “a non-transitory computer readable recording medium” as recited in claim 7	56
I. A POSITA would have been motivated to combine Englman, Ronen, and Schulhof	57
X. THE PETITION SHOULD NOT BE DENIED UNDER §§314 OR 325	62
A. Section 325(d) Is Inapplicable Because Petition Does Not Assert Art Previously Evaluated by the Office.	62

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
B. The Board Should Not Deny Institution Under Section 314(a).....	63
XI. CONCLUSION.....	65

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.