

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SUPERCELL OY,
Petitioner,

v.

GREE INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case PGR2018-00039 (Patent 9,669,308 B2)
Case PGR2018-00036 (Patent 9,662,580 B2)

Record of Oral Hearing
Held June 20, 2019

Before MICHAEL W. KIM, LYNNE H. BROWNE, and
CARL M. DEFRANCO, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

Case PGR2018-00039 (Patent 9,669,308 B2)

Case PGR2018-00036 (Patent 9,662,580 B2)

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

JENNIFER BUSH, ESQUIRE
GEOFF MILLER, ESQUIRE
MICHAEL SACKSTEDER, ESQUIRE
Fenwick & West, LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 84041
650-988-8500
JBush-PTAB@fenwick.com, gmiller@fenwick.com,
msacksteder@fenwick.com

ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:

JESSE O. COLLIER, ESQUIRE
B. GRAHAM NELSON, ESQUIRE
OLIFF PLC
277 South Washington Street
Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
703-836-6400
pgrdocket@oliffcom, jcollier@oliff.com, bnelson@oliff.com

SID V. PANDIT, ESQUIRE
TIMOTHY J. MAIER, ESQUIRE
ANDREW RAMOS, ESQUIRE
DANIEL J. EHRLICH, ESQUIRE
Maier & Maier PLLC
345 South Patrick Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
703-740-8322
patent@maierandmaier.com, svp@maierandmaier.com,
tjm@maierandmaier.com

Case PGR2018-00039 (Patent 9,669,308 B2)

Case PGR2018-00036 (Patent 9,662,580 B2)

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Thursday, June 20, 2019, commencing at 9:02 a.m., at the United States Patent and Trademark Office, USPTO Madison Building, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

1

PROCEEDINGS

2

- - - - -

3

JUDGE KIM: All right. Welcome. Today, we're going to have -- we'll be arguing two cases, PGR2018-00039 and - 00036. 39 will go first and then we will have a break and then do 36 afterwards.

6

So regarding 39 -- I'm Michael Kim. On the line with us, we have Judge Lynne Browne and Carl DeFranco.

8

And a few housekeeping things. One, again, they can't see the slides or not very well, so if you could just refer to any slides or exhibits by number and page, we'd greatly appreciate it. Also, for in and out, if we could please restrict that times when counsel changes, we'd appreciate it.

12

So with that, we'll begin with appearances, starting with Petitioner.

13

MS. BUSH: Good morning, Your Honor. Jennifer Bush, lead counsel for Petitioner, Supercell OY, and I have with me backup counsel, Michael Sacksteder and Geoff Miller.

16

JUDGE KIM: All right. About how much time would you like to reserve for reply?

18

MS. BUSH: I'd like to reserve 15 minutes for rebuttal.

19

JUDGE KIM: And Patent Owner?

20

MR. COLLIER: Your Honor, Jesse Collier, lead counsel for GREE, Patent Owner, and I'm with co-counsel Graham Nelson, and we'd also like to reserve 15 minutes for rebuttal.

23

JUDGE KIM: Okay. Great. And then because there's a motion to amend the 00039 case, the way it's structured, even though technically

24

1 Patent Owner presented motion to amend, Petitioner, if you want to address
2 it in your opening remarks, you can at that time.

3 Great. I think we're all set. So unless anyone upholds anything else,
4 Ms. Bush, you can begin.

5 MS. BUSH: Good morning, Your Honors.

6 So we're talking today about PGR2018-00039. This refers to
7 Patent 9,669,308, which I'll be referring to as the '308
8 Patent as we go along, and this case is about two different modes that can be
9 used for video game battle and the claims described determining which of
10 those modes to use, based on certain conditions being met including user
11 input.

12 Slide 2, please? So we're starting out here with some language that
13 was just in the decision granting institution, which is a statement by the
14 Board that they were persuaded that Petitioner showed that the claims are
15 directed to -- there is a typo here actually. It's determining a procedure for a
16 video game battle based on user input, as what the claim is directed to and
17 that that was an abstract idea.

18 And then, secondly, that the additional elements in Claims 1 through 8 do
19 not transform the abstract idea into patent-eligible subject matter.

20 Slide 3. The claims are directed to the abstract idea of determining a
21 procedure for a video game battle based on user input. And we have just
22 here, Figure 13, which just is a flow-chart as you can see. And we're really
23 talking about a -- sort of a decision tree aspect right around Step

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.