

PGR2018-00047

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. PGR2018-00047
Patent 9,636,659 B2

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXHIBIT LIST	v
I. CLAIMS 1-15 OF THE ’659 PATENT ARE INVALID UNDER SECTION 101.....	1
A. <i>Alice</i> Step 1: The ’659 Patent Is Directed to the Abstract Idea of “Controlling a Video Game Display Based on a Received Selection of Panel Information”	1
1. The Claims Recite Result-Oriented Functions Without Describing Non-Abstract Means of Achieving Them.....	1
2. The ’659 Patent Does Not Recite a Specific, Structured User Interface	6
3. The ’659 Patent Provides No Improvement in Computer Functionality	9
4. The ’659 Patent Recites an Abstract “Way of Managing a Game and Playing a Game”	11
B. <i>Alice</i> Step 2: The Claims of the ’659 Patent Contain No Inventive Concept.....	13
1. The Claims Are Performed on a Generic Computer Performing Routine Functions.....	13
2. “Panels” are “well-understood, routine, and conventional”	14
3. The Independent Claims Do Not Recite a Means to Achieve “High Visual Effect”	15
C. The Dependent Claims 2-13 Are Directed to the Same Abstract Idea and Provide No Inventive Concept.....	16
D. Expert Testimony Is Not Required to Invalidate a Patent Under 35 U.S.C. § 101	20

**TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)**

	Page
E. Claim 1 Is Representative	22
II. CLAIMS 1-15 OF THE '659 PATENT ARE INVALID UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112(A)	23
A. No Written Description for “receives an instruction that the panel is disposed in the target division”	23
B. No Written Description for in which divisions the panel is ‘allowed’ to be disposed nor any designated ‘target’ division.	23
C. No Written Description for a panel that indicates that the character is displayed “as an animation”	24
III. CLAIMS 1-15 OF THE '659 PATENT ARE INVALID UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112(B) AS INDEFINITE	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Affinity Labs of Tex., LLC v. DIRECTV, LLC</i> , 838 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	4, 17, 18
<i>Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank Int'l</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Berkheimer v. HP Inc.</i> , 881 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	15, 16, 20, 22
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 561 U.S. 593 (2010).....	18, 19
<i>Core Wireless Licensing S.A.R.L. v. LG Elecs., Inc.</i> , 880 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	6, 7
<i>Data Engine Techs. LLC v. Google LLC</i> , 906 F.3d 999 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	8, 9
<i>DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.</i> , 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	9, 10
<i>Icon Health & Fitness, Inc. v. Strava, Inc.</i> , 849 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	21
<i>In re Marco Guldenaar Holding B.V.</i> , 911 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	12, 18, 20, 21
<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)	11, 20, 21
<i>In re TLI Commc 'ns. LLC Pat. Litig.</i> , 823 F.3d 607 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	21
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Capital One Bank</i> , 792 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	13
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 838 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	20, 21
<i>Internet Patents Corp. v. Active Network, Inc.</i> , 790 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(Continued)

	Page(s)
<i>McRO, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games Am. Inc.</i> , 837 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	1, 4, 5
<i>Mortg. Grader v. First Choice Loan Services</i> , 811 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	13
<i>Planet Bingo LLC v. VKGS LLC</i> , 576 Fed. App'x 1005 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	11, 12
<i>RecogniCorp, LLC v. Nintendo Co., Ltd.</i> , 855 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	17, 18, 19
<i>Smartflash LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , No. 2016-1059, 2017 WL 786431 (Fed. Cir. Mar. 1, 2017)	13
<i>Suffolk Techs., LLC v. AOL Inc.</i> , 752 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	21
<i>Trading Techs. Int'l, Inc. v. CQG, Inc.</i> , 675 F. App'x 1001 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	6, 7, 8, 9
<i>Tranxition, Inc. v. Lenovo (U.S.) Inc.</i> , 664 Fed. App'x 968 (Fed. Cir 2016)	17
<i>Two-Way Media Ltd. v. Comcast Cable Commc'n, LLC</i> , 874 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	1, 4, 5, 6
 STATUTES AND RULES	
35 U.S.C. § 101	20, 21, 22
35 U.S.C. § 112(B).....	25, 26

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.