

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 PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.1

II. The '583 Patent.....1

III. The Alleged Grounds of Invalidity.9

IV. The Petition Fails to Prove Any Claim is Ineligible Under § 101.10

 A. Legal Standard for Invalidity Under § 101.....11

 B. The Petition Fails to Meet its Burden Under *Alice* and *Berkheimer*.12

 1. Claim 1 is not representative of all claims of the '583 patent.....13

 2. Petitioner engages in pure speculation as to the Examiner’s state of mind. 14

 3. Petitioner fails to analyze—or even mention—all of the limitations of claim 1. 15

 4. The petition paraphrases the dependent claims and provides no actual analysis.18

 5. Petitioner offers no evidence to contradict the specification of the '583 patent.19

 C. The Claims are Subject-Matter Eligible.24

 1. The '583 patent is not directed to an abstract concept.25

 2. Alternatively, the claims recite the requisite “inventive concept.”30

V. The Claims Have Sufficient Written Description.34

 A. Legal Standard for the Written Description Requirement of § 112(a).34

 B. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....35

 C. The Petitioner Fails to Meet its Burden Under § 112(a).36

 D. The '583 Patent Contains Sufficient Written Description for the Claims.38

VI. The Claims are Definite.....44

 A. Legal Standard for Definiteness.45

 B. The Petition Fails to Meet its Burden.45

C. A Person of Ordinary Skill Would Understand the Scope of the Claim Terms
at Issue.47

VII. The Petition Should Be Denied in its Entirety.49

VIII. Conclusion.50

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

I. Introduction.

The petition should be denied. Petitioner's alleged grounds of invalidity under § 101 and § 112 are nothing more than mere attorney argument and are unsupported by any evidence. Although Petitioner contends the claims of the '583 patent are patent-ineligible, Petitioner ignores the actual language of the challenged claims in the petition and fails to provide any evidence of what was well-understood, routine, and conventional in the art. Petitioner's assertions that the claims lack sufficient written description and are indefinite are also nothing more than attorney argument and fail to analyze the claims from the perspective of a person of ordinary skill. Notwithstanding Petitioner's failure to meet its burden, the challenges raised in the petition also fail on their merits. The invention disclosed in the '583 patent is a technological improvement to graphical user-interfaces. The '583 patent's claims are definite and its disclosure satisfies the written description requirement. The Board should deny Petitioner's request and not institute review.

II. The '583 Patent.

The '583 patent generally discloses "a game program and a game processing method of a game in which a plurality of characters battle against each other." Ex. 1001, 1:21-23. According to the '583 patent, "card game[s] in which the user plays against other users or against the computer using cards collected in the

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.