

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SUPERCELL OY,
Petitioner

v.

GREE, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case PGR2018-00036
U.S. Patent No. 9,662,580

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR POST GRANT
REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,662,580**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325 (D).....	2
III. OVERVIEW OF THE RELEVANT PORTIONS OF THE ‘580 PATENT	9
IV. THE PETITION DOES NOT MEET ITS BURDEN UNDER <i>ALICE</i> OR <i>BERKHEIMER</i>	13
A. The Petition’s Analysis Regarding a Representative Claim Is Legally Deficient.....	13
B. The Petition Does Not Address the Features of Dependent Claim 2	14
C. The Petition Does Not Address Dependent Claim 3.....	15
D. The Petition Does Not Address Dependent Claim 4.....	16
E. The Petition Does Not Address Dependent Claims 5-6.....	17
V. THE CLAIMS ARE SUBJECT MATTER ELIGIBLE.....	17
A. The Petition Fails to Properly Address the Claims Under Step One of <i>Alice</i>	18
B. The ‘580 Specification and Claims Describe A Specific Manner of Improving Multiplayer Online Battle Games	20
C. The Claims of the ‘580 Patent Are Necessarily Rooted In Computer Technology	23
D. The Claims of the ‘580 Patent Recite A Specific Manner of Achieving A Result	30
E. <i>McRO</i> and <i>Data Engine</i> Support the Patentability of the ‘580 Claims.....	35

F.	The Claims Recite Technical Improvements to Computers and Video Game Technology	42
G.	The Inquiry Must End At Step One of the <i>Alice</i> Analysis.....	45
VI.	PETITIONER’S ARGUMENTS FAIL UNDER STEP TWO OF <i>ALICE</i>	46
A.	The Claims Recite an Inventive Concept.....	47
B.	The Claims Capture A Technological Improvement to Video Game Technology	48
C.	The <i>Apple v. Ameranth</i> Case Is Not Analogous.....	53
D.	The Petition’s Step Two <i>Alice</i> Arguments Do Not Address the Actual Claim Language.....	55
E.	Recent USPTO Guidance In Light of <i>Berkheimer</i>	58
F.	Petitioner Provides No Evidence That the Claim Limitations Are Well-Understood, Routine, and Conventional.....	59
G.	The Dependent Claims Recite Additional Inventive Features.....	61
VII.	THE BOARD RECOGNIZES, AND PATENT OWNER AGREES, THAT THE PETITION’S § 112(B) ARGUMENTS ARE WITHOUT MERIT	66
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	69

..

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
Cases	
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int'l</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	19, 37, 47
<i>Apple Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1229 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	53, 54
<i>Berkheimer v. HP, Inc.</i> , 881 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	passim
<i>Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, Nat'l Ass'n</i> , 776 F.3d at 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	47
<i>Core Wireless Licensing S.A.R.L v. LG Elecs., Inc.</i> , 880 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	passim
<i>Data Engine Techs. LLC v. Google LLC</i> , 906 F.3d 999 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	passim
<i>DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.</i> , 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	19
<i>Diamond v. Diehr</i> , 450 U.S. 175 (1981).....	32, 46, 56
<i>Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	23, 27, 46
<i>Fox Factory, Inc. v. SRAM, LLC</i> , IPR2016-01876, Paper 8 (PTAB Apr. 3, 2017)	3
<i>In re TLI Commc'ns</i> , 823 F.3d 607 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	32, 46, 56
<i>Internet Patents Corp. v. Active Network, Inc.</i> , 790 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	19, 46

...

<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	33, 34, 38
<i>Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.</i> , 566 U.S. 66 (2012).....	47
<i>McRO, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games Am. Inc.</i> , 837 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	passim
<i>OIP Techs., Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 788 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	58
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	33, 34, 38
<i>SAS Inst., Inc., v. Iancu</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018).....	66
<i>Thales Visionix Inc. v. United States</i> , 850 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	23
<i>Ultramercial, Inc. v. Hulu, LLC</i> , 772 F.3d 709 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	19
<i>Ziegmann, N.P.Z., Inc., v. Stephens</i> , IPR2015-01860, Paper 13 (PTAB Sept. 6, 2017)	3

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	2
--------------------------	---

Other Authorities

H.R. REP. NO. 112-98, pt. 1, at 48 (2011).....	3
--	---

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.