

Patent No. 9,873,044 —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 9,873,044 B2

---

**PETITION FOR POST GRANT REVIEW OF  
U.S. PATENT 9,873,044**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	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)) .....	1
D. Service of Information (37 CFR § 42.8(b)(4)).....	2
III. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS .....	2
A. Timing .....	2
B. Grounds for Standing (37 CFR § 42.204(a)) .....	2
IV. DESCRIPTION OF THE '044 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.....	11
A. Effective Filing Date of the Challenged Claims .....	11
B. 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)].....	11
C. Claim Construction (37 CFR § 42.204(b)(3)).....	11

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**(continued)**

	<b>Page</b>
1. The Claimed Invention.....	12
2. Construction of Certain Claim Terms.....	18
a. “Incentive”.....	18
b. “Enable Invitation”.....	19
c. “Detect Access”.....	20
d. “Specific Matter”.....	23
VI. IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT AT LEAST ONE OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE ’044 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE.....	24
A. Claims 1-10 of the ’044 Patent Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for Failing to Be Directed Toward Patent-Eligible Subject Matter.....	24
B. Legal Standard.....	25
1. 35 U.S.C. § 101 Bars Claims that Recite Abstract Ideas and Lack an Inventive Concept.....	25
C. Current Section 101 Guidance Was Not Addressed During Prosecution.....	29
D. Alice Step 1: The ’044 Patent Claims the Abstract Idea of Enabling a Player to Invite Another Player to a Social Game, Detecting Access to the Game, and Giving the Player “Incentive” Rewards.....	35
1. The ’044 Patent Recites Only Generalized Steps and Fails to Claim a Technological Improvement.....	35

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**(continued)**

	<b>Page</b>
2. Enabling a Player to Invite Another Player to a Social Game, Detecting Access to the Game, and Giving the Player “Incentive” Rewards is a Longstanding Commercial Practice.....	42
E. Alice Step 2: Claims 1-10 of the ’044 Patent Do Not Disclose an “Inventive Concept” Sufficient to Transform Their Ineligible Abstract Idea into a Patent-Eligible Invention.....	44
1. The independent claims fail to disclose an “inventive concept” because the purported improvement over prior art is not captured in the claim language.....	44
2. The claim limitations, individually and as an ordered combination, are well-understood, routine, and conventional. ....	46
F. The Dependent Claims Add Nothing Inventive.....	51
G. Claims 1-10 of the ’044 Patent Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a) for Lack of Written Description.....	54
1. Claims 1-10 of the ’044 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a) because the specification of the ’044 patent fails to provide adequate written description of enabling a first terminal device to send invitation information to a second terminal device.....	56
2. Claims 1-10 of the ’044 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a) because the specification of the ’044 patent fails to provide adequate written description of detecting when the second terminal device is operated to access the landing screen. ....	58

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**(continued)**

	<b>Page</b>
3. Claims 1-10 of the '044 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a) because the specification of the '044 patent fails to provide adequate written description of giving incentives.....	61
H. Claims 1-10 of the '044 Patent Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 112(b) as Indefinite .....	62
V. CONCLUSION.....	67

# 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.