

PGR-2018-00029
Petitioner's Reply to Patent Owner's Response

Filed on behalf of Supercell Oy

By:
JENNIFER R. BUSH, Reg. No 50,784
MICHAEL J. SACKSTEDER
GEOFFREY R. MILLER
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

SUPERCELL OY,
Petitioner

v.

GREE, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Post Grant Review No. PGR2018-00029
Patent 9,636,583 B2

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF EXHIBITS	vi
I. CLAIMS 1-15 OF THE ’583 PATENT ARE INVALID UNDER SECTION 101	1
A. <i>Alice</i> Step 1: The ’583 Patent is Directed to the Abstract Idea of “Displaying a Video Game Based on Stored Panel Information”	1
1. The Claims Recite Result-Oriented Functions Without Non-Abstract Means of Achieving Them.....	1
2. The ’583 Patent Does Not Recite a Specific, Structured User Interface.....	4
3. The ’583 Patent Provides No Improvement in Computer Functionality	7
4. The ’583 Patent Recites an Abstract “Way of Managing a Game and Playing a Game”	9
B. <i>Alice</i> Step 2: The Claims Contain No Inventive Concept.....	10
1. The Claims are Performed on a Generic Computer Using Routine Computer Functions.....	10
2. “Panels” are “well understood, routine, and conventional”	13
3. The Independent Claims Do Not Recite a Means to Achieve “High Visual Effect”	14
C. The Dependent Claims 2-13 Are Directed to the Same Abstract Idea and Provide No Inventive Concept.....	15
D. Expert Testimony Is Not Required to Invalidate a Patent Under 35 U.S.C. § 101	19
E. Claim 1 Is Representative	22

II.	CLAIMS 1-15 OF THE ’583 PATENT ARE INVALID UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112(A).....	23
A.	The Specification Fails to Provide Adequate Written Description for the “Allowed” Limitation.	23
III.	CLAIMS 1-15 OF THE ’583 PATENT ARE INVALID UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112(B) AS INDEFINITE.....	25
IV.	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH TYPE-VOLUME LIMITATION.....	27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Affinity Labs of Tex., LLC v. DIRECTV, LLC</i> , 838 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	4, 13, 16, 17
<i>Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank Int'l</i> , 134 S.Ct. 2347 (2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Ancora Techs., Inc. v. HTC Am., Inc.</i> , 908 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	7
<i>Berkheimer v. HP Inc.</i> , 881 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 561 U.S. 593 (2010).....	17, 18
<i>Data Engine Techs. LLC v. Google LLC</i> , 906 F.3d 999 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	4, 5, 6
<i>DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.</i> , 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	7, 8
<i>Icon Health & Fitness, Inc. v. Strava, Inc.</i> , 849 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	20
<i>In re Marco Guldenaar Holding B.V.</i> , 911 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	10, 17, 18, 20
<i>In re Packard</i> , 751 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	25
<i>In re Smith</i> , 815 F.3d 816 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	9, 10, 18, 20
<i>In re TLI Commc'ns. LLC Pat. Litig.</i> , 823 F.3d 607 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	20
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 838 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	19, 21

Patent No. 9,636,583 — Petitioner’s Reply to Patent Owner’s Response

<i>Internet Patents Corp. v. Active Network, Inc.</i> , 790 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	19
<i>Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.</i> , 132 S.Ct. 1289 (2012).....	19
<i>McRO, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games Am. Inc.</i> , 837 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	1
<i>Mortg. Grader v. First Choice Loan Services</i> , 811 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	11
<i>Planet Bingo LLC v. VKGS LLC</i> , 576 Fed. App’x. 1005 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	9, 10
<i>RecogniCorp, LLC v. Nintendo Co., Ltd.</i> , 855 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	16, 17, 18
<i>Reiffin v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 214 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	24
<i>Smartflash LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , 2017 WL 786431 (Fed. Cir. Mar. 1, 2017).....	11
<i>Suffolk Techs., LLC v. AOL Inc.</i> , 752 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	20
<i>Supercell Oy v. GREE, Inc.</i> , PGR2018-00047, Paper No. 21	23
<i>Trading Techs. Int’l, Inc. v. CQG, INC.</i> , 675 F. App’x 1001 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	4, 7
<i>Tranxition, Inc. v. Lenovo (U.S.) Inc.</i> , 664 Fed. App’x 968 (Fed. Cir 2016)	16
<i>Two-Way Media Ltd. v. Comcast Cable Commc’n., LLC</i> , 874 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	1, 4
<i>Vasudevan Software, Inc. v. MicroStrategy, Inc.</i> , 782 F.3d 671 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	24
STATUTES AND RULES	
35 U.S.C. § 101	19, 20, 21
35 U.S.C. § 112(A)	22, 23

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.