UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD SUPERCELL OY, Petitioner, v. GREE, INC., Patent Owner. Case IPR2020-01628

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.207

U.S. Patent No. 9,561,439



TABLE OF CONTENTS

			Page	
I.	Intro	oduction	1	
II.	The Petition Should Be Denied Under § 314(a)			
	A.	Factor 1: whether the court granted a stay or evidence exists that one may be granted if a proceeding is instituted	7	
	B.	Factor 2: proximity of the court's trial date to the Board's projected statutory deadline for a final written decision	9	
	C.	Factor 3: investment in the parallel proceeding by the court and the parties	16	
	D.	Factor 4: overlap between issues raised in the petition and in the parallel proceeding	21	
	Е.	Factor 5: whether the petitioner and the defendant in the parallel proceeding are the same party	29	
	F.	Factor 6: other circumstances that impact the Board's exercise of discretion, including the merits	29	
	G.	Holistic Analysis of Fintiv Factors	33	
III.		tioner Has Not Demonstrated a Reasonable Likelihood of Success he Single Ground Advanced in the Petition.	34	
	A.	The Asserted Prior Art References Do Not Disclose Nor Suggest Each and Every Limitation of the Challenged Claims	35	
		i. Englman Does Not Disclose Nor Suggest "Storing a Correspondence Between the Plurality of Users and the One or More Groups"	36	
		ii. Englman Does Not Disclose Nor Suggest Allocating the "Game Item When It Is Determined That All the Required Game Pieces Have Been Provided Within a Predetermined Period of Time During Which the Group Event Is Taking Place"	38	



	B.	Petitioner's Alleged Motivations to Combine Are Insufficient42
IV.	Con	clusion49



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Amazon.com, Inc. v. Vocalife LLC, IPR2020-00864, Paper 22 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 28, 2020)
Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc., IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2020)passim
Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc., IPR2020-00019, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. May 13, 2020) passim
Apple Inc. v. Maxell, Ltd., IPR2020-00203, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. July 6, 2020)passim
Apple Inc. v. Maxell, Ltd., IPR2020-00407, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 11, 2020)
Apple Inc. v. Optis Cellular Technology, LLC, IPR2020-00465, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 17, 2020)28
Bumble Bee Foods, LLC v. Kowalski, IPR2014-00224, Paper 18 (P.T.A.B. June 5, 2014)48
Comcast Cable Communications, LLC v. Rovi Guides, Inc., IPR2020-00800, -00801, -00802, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 22, 2010)
Edwards Lifesciences Corp. v. Evalve, Inc., IPR2019-01479, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 26, 2020)
E-One, Inc. v. Oshkosh Corp., IPR2019-00161, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. May 15, 2019)17
Google LLC v. Personalized Media Communications, LLC, IPR2020-00719, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 31, 2020)
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)45
In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd., 829 F 3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 35, 43



Intel Corporation v. VLSI Technology LLC, IPR2020-00106, Paper 17 (P.T.A.B. May 5, 2020)
Kinetic Techs., Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc., IPR2014-00529, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 23, 2014)
Kranos Corporation v. Apalone, Inc., IPR2020-00501, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. July 16, 2020)
KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007)
Next Caller Inc. v. TrustID, Inc., IPR2019-00961, -00962, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 16, 2019)
NHK Spring Co., Ltd. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc., IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 12, 2018)
Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)
Realtime Data LLC v. Actian Corp., No. 6:15-CV-463-RWS-JDL, 2016 WL 9340796 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 29, 2016)
Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co., 357 F.3d 1270 (Fed. Cir. 2004)
Saint Lawrence Commc'ns LLC v. ZTE Corp., No. 2:15-cv-349-JRG, 2016 WL 7338600 (E.D. Tex. July 15, 2016)
Sand Revolution II, LLC v. Cont'l Intermodal Group-Trucking LLC, IPR2019-01393, Paper 24 (P.T.A.B. June 16, 2020)
Sand Revolution II, LLC v. Continental Intermodal Gr., IPR2019-01393, Paper 18 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 6, 2020)
Securus Technologies, Inc. v. Global Tel*Link Corp., 701 F. App'x 971 (Fed. Cir. 2017)
Sensonics, Inc. v. Aerosonic Corp., 81 F.3d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1996)



DOCKET

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.

