

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SUPERCELL OY,
Petitioner

v.

GREE, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case: PGR2018-00029
U.S. Patent No. 9,636,583

PATENT OWNER'S SUR-REPLY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.1

II. The Claims Are Not Directed to an Abstract Idea.1

 A. The Claims are Not Abstract Under the Office’s Revised Guidance.2

 B. Petitioner’s Own Arguments Demonstrate the Claims are Patent Eligible.5

 C. The Claims are Analogous to Other Claims Found Not Abstract by the
Federal Circuit.7

 1. Ancora Technologies.....7

 2. DDR.....10

 3. Trading Technologies.....12

 D. Petitioner’s Arguments Ignore the Precedent Above and the Evidence of
Record.....14

III. Alternatively, the Claims Recite an Inventive Concept.17

 A. A New Type of Information Supplies the Inventive Concept.17

 B. *In re Smith*.19

 C. Petitioner Has Presented No Evidence of What Was Well-Understood,
Routine, or Conventional.....20

IV. Petitioner Presents No Evidence Regarding § 112.....21

V. Conclusion.24

Patent Owner's Exhibit List

Exhibit No.	Exhibit Description
2001	April 26, 2018 "Guidance on the impact of SAS on AIA trial proceedings," <i>available at</i> https://www.uspto.gov/patents-application-process/patent-trial-and-appeal-board/trials/guidance-impact-sas-aia-trial
2002	Declaration of David Crane
2003	JP2007252696 and Machine Translation of Description
2004	Biography of Steven D. Moore
2005	<i>Not used</i>
2006	<i>Not used</i>
2007	U.S.P.T.O. 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance, effective January 7, 2019
2008	Remarks by Director Iancu at the Intellectual Property Owners Association 46th Annual Meeting, Sept. 24, 2018, <i>available at</i> https://www.uspto.gov/about-us/news-updates/remarks-director-iancu-intellectual-property-owners-46th-annual-meeting

I. Introduction.

Petitioner's Reply presents no new evidence of what it contends was well-understood, routine, or conventional. Instead, Petitioner presents new arguments that appeared nowhere in the Petition about why the claims are allegedly abstract and invalid under § 112. As explained herein, the claims are patentable under *Alice*, and Petitioner has failed to meet its burden under § 112.

II. The Claims Are Not Directed to an Abstract Idea.

The claims are not directed to an abstract idea and the analysis ends at step one. *First*, under the Office's revised §101 guidance, the claims are not directed to abstract ideas because they do not recite mathematical concepts, methods of organizing human activity, or mental processes. *Second*, under this guidance the claims recite a practical application of Petitioner's alleged abstract ideas because the claims as a whole are an improvement to known video-game user interfaces and game mechanics. *Third*, the claims are analogous to other claims found patentable under *Alice*.

In the Reply, Petitioner belatedly presents a new argument not found anywhere in the Petition—namely, that the '583 patent is directed to a “way of managing a game and playing a game.” Paper 33 (“Reply”), at 9. This argument should be rejected at least because Petitioner never raised it in the Petition, and this contradicts Petitioner's previous assertions that the '583 patent is directed to

“*displaying* a video game based on stored panel information.” Paper 1 (“Pet.”), at 21 (emphasis added). Petitioner’s contradictory arguments are an admission that the claims are directed to more than *either* of Petitioner’s two alleged abstract ideas by themselves, and are therefore patentable.

The remaining arguments in the Reply regarding *Alice* fail to prove the claims are abstract. Software can make non-abstract improvements to computer technology just as hardware can. *Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.*, 822 F.3d 1327, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2016). The Federal Circuit has frequently found claims that recite functional results non-abstract. And as explained below, the claims of the ’583 patent are analogous to those found patentable in other cases.

A. The Claims are Not Abstract Under the Office’s Revised Guidance.

On January 7, 2019, the Office promulgated revised guidance regarding the analysis under § 101. *See* Ex. 2007. This guidance was not available to Patent Owner prior to submission of the Response. *See* Paper 26. Petitioner did not address this guidance in its Reply.

Under this revised guidance, three “groupings” of abstract ideas are identified:

- “Mathematical concepts”;
- “Certain methods of organizing human activity”; and
- “Mental processes.”

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.