

Patent No. 9,636,583 —Petition for Post Grant Review

Filed on behalf of Supercell Oy

By:

JENNIFER R. BUSH, Reg. No 50,784

MICHAEL J. SACKSTEDER

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.

Post Grant Review No. _____
Patent 9,636,583 B2

**PETITION FOR POST GRANT REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT 9,636,583**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. MANDATORY NOTICES (37 CFR § 42.8(A)(1)).....	1
A. Real Party-In-Interest (37 CFR § 42.8(b)(1))	1
B. Notice of Related Matters (37 CFR § 42.8(b)(2)).....	1
C. Designation of Lead and Backup Counsel (37 CFR § 42.8(b)(3))	2
D. Service of Information (37 CFR § 42.8(b)(4)).....	2
III. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS	2
A. Timing	2
B. Grounds for Standing (37 CFR § 42.104(a))	2
IV. DESCRIPTION OF THE '583 PATENT.....	3
A. Specification.....	3
1. Functionality	3
2. System Description	8
B. Prosecution History	10
V. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE UNDER 37 CFR § 42.104(B) AND RELIEF REQUESTED	11
A. Effective Filing Date of the Challenged Claims	11
B. Claims for Which PGR Is Requested, Precise Relief Requested, and Specific Statutory Grounds on Which the Challenge Is Based [37 CFR § 42.104(b)(1) & 37 CFR § 42.104(b)(2)].....	11

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
C. Claim Construction (37 CFR § 42.104(b)(3)).....	11
1. The Claimed Invention.....	12
VI. IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT AT LEAST ONE OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE '583 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE.....	16
A. Claims 1-15 of the '583 Patent Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for Failing to Be Directed Toward Patent-Eligible Subject Matter	16
B. Legal Standard.....	17
1. 35 U.S.C. § 101 Bars Claims that Recite Abstract Ideas and Lack an Inventive Concept.	17
C. Section 101 Was Not Addressed During Prosecution.	19
D. Alice Step 1: The '583 Patent Claims the Abstract Idea of Displaying a Video Game Based on Stored Panel Information.....	21
E. Alice Step 2: Claims 1-15 of the '583 Patent Do Not Disclose An “Inventive Concept” Sufficient to Transform Their Ineligible Abstract Idea into a Patent-Eligible Invention.....	26
F. The Dependent Claims Add Nothing Inventive.....	29
G. Claims 1-15 of the '583 Patent Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a) for Lack of Written Description.....	31

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
1. Claims 1-15 of the '583 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a) because the specification of the '583 patent fails to provide adequate written description of a points set for the first user, storage, selection of a panel according to the points set, and decreasing the points set by disposing a panel.	32
2. Claims 1-15 of the '583 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a) for lack of written description because the specification of the '583 patent fails to provide adequate written description of a target division for disposing of a selected panel and the panel being allowed to be disposed in the target division.....	36
H. Claims 1-15 of the '583 Patent Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 112(b) as Indefinite	39
V. CONCLUSION.....	42

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Affinity Labs of Tex., LLC v. DIRECTV, LLC</i> 838 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>All. Research Mtg. Says. v. Troy</i> , 659 F.3d 1345	31
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1229 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	27
<i>BASCOM Global Internet Services, Inc. v. AT&T Mobility LLC</i> , 827 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	18, 19
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 561 U.S. 593 (2010).....	31
<i>Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.</i> , 776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	13
<i>Elec. Power Grp., LLC v. Alstom S.A.</i> , 830 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	23, 25
<i>Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	<i>passim</i>
<i>GREE, Inc. v. Supercell K.K.</i> , Case 2017 (Yo) No. 22165	2
<i>In re Anderson</i> , 1997 U.S. App. Lexis 167 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 6, 1997)	40
<i>In re Cohn</i> , 438 F.2d 989, 169 USPQ 95 (CCPA 1971).....	39

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.