Patent No. 9,770,659 — Petition for Post Grant Review

Filed on behalf of Supercell Oy

By:
JENNIFER R. BUSH, Reg. No 50,784
MICHAEL J. SACKSTEDER
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.

Patent 9,770,659

PETITION FOR POST GRANT REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT 9,770,659



TABLE OF CONTENTS

			Page
I.	INT	RODUCTION	1
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES (37 CFR § 42.8(A)(1))		1
	A.	Real Party-In-Interest (37 CFR § 42.8(b)(1))	1
	B.	Notice of Related Matters (37 CFR § 42.8(b)(2))	1
	C.	Designation of Lead and Backup Counsel (37 CFR § 42.8(b)(3))	2
	D.	Service of Information (37 CFR § 42.8(b)(4))	2
III.	ADI	DITIONAL REQUIREMENTS	2
	A.	Timing	2
	B.	Grounds for Standing (37 CFR § 42.204(a))	3
IV.	DESCRIPTION OF THE '659 PATENT		3
	A.	Specification	3
		1. Functionality	3
		2. System Description	8
	B.	Prosecution History	10
V.	IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE UNDER 37 CFR § 42.204(B) AND RELIEF REQUESTED		12
	A.	Effective Filing Date of the Challenged Claims	12
	В.	Claims for Which PGR Is Requested, Precise Relief Requested, and Specific Statutory Grounds on Which the Challenge Is Based [37 CFR § 42.204(b)(1) & 37 CFR § 42.204(b)(2)]	12



Patent No. 9,770,659 — Petition for Post Grant Review

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

			Page
	C.	Claim Construction (37 CFR § 42.204(b)(3))	13
		1. The Claimed Invention	13
VI.	OF T	MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT AT LEAST ONE THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE '659 PATENT IS ATENTABLE	16
	A.	Claims 1-15 of the '659 Patent Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for Failing to Be Directed Toward Patent-Eligible Subject Matter	16
	B.	Legal Standard	17
		35 U.S.C. § 101 Bars Claims that Recite Abstract Ideas and Lack an Inventive Concept.	17
	C.	Section 101 Was Not Addressed During Prosecution.	22
	D.	Alice Step 1: The '659 Patent Claims the Abstract Idea of Controlling a Video Game Display Based on a Received Selection of Panel Information	24
	E.	Alice Step 2: Claims 1-15 of the '659 Patent Do Not Disclose An "Inventive Concept" Sufficient to Transform Their Ineligible Abstract Idea into a Patent-Eligible Invention.	29
		1. The independent claims fail to disclose an "inventive concept" because the purported improvement over prior art is not captured in the claim language	29
		2. The claim limitations, individually and as an ordered combination, are well-understood, routine, and conventional.	31
	F.	The Dependent Claims Add Nothing Inventive	36



TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

			Page
	G.	Claims 1-15 of the '659 Patent Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a) for Lack of Written Description	38
		1. Claims 1-15 of the '659 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a) because the specification of the '659 patent fails to provide adequate written description of receiving a panel selection from the first user, disposing panels on the basis of the received panel selection, and receiving an instruction regarding panel disposition.	40
		2. Claims 1-15 of the '659 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a) for lack of written description because the specification of the '659 patent fails to provide adequate written description of a target division for disposing of a selected panel, the panel being allowed to be disposed in the target division, and the character displayed as an animation when disposed in the target	
		division.	43
	Н.	Claims 1-15 of the '659 Patent Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 112(b) as Indefinite	47
V.	CON	NCLUSION	52



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
Affinity Labs of Tex., LLC v. DIRECTV, LLC 838 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	passim
Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int'l, 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014)	passim
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1229 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	32, 33
Atl. Research Mtg. Says. v. Troy, 659 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	38
BASCOM Global Internet Services, Inc. v. AT&T Mobility LLC, 827 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	19, 22
Berkheimer v. HP Inc., Appeal 2017-1437, 2018 WL 774096 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 8, 2018)	passim
Bilski v. Kappos, 561 U.S. 593 (2010)	35, 38
Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., 776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	14, 20
Elec. Power Grp., LLC v. Alstom S.A., 830 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	26, 28
Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp., 822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	passim
GREE, Inc. v. Supercell K.K., Case 2017 (Yo) No. 22165	2
In re Anderson, 1997 U.S. App. Lexis 167 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 6, 1997)	48



DOCKET

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.

