IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SUPERCELL OY,
Petitioner

v.

GREE, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case PGR2018-00066
U.S. Patent No. 9,873,044

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR POST GRANT REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,873,044

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. DENIAL OF INSTITUTION OF POST-GRANT REVIEW OF THE PARENT PATENT 3

III. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(D) 4

IV. OVERVIEW OF RELEVANT PORTIONS OF THE '044 PATENT 16

V. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART 20

VI. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 21

A. Petitioner's Proposed Constructions Do Not Follow the Law Governing Claim Construction 22

B. Petitioner's Proposed Construction of the Term "Incentive" Does Not Account for the Intrinsic Evidence 23

C. The Term "Enable Invitation" Is Not Recited By the Claims of the '044 Patent 26

D. The Term "Detect Access" Is Not Recited By the Claims of the '044 Patent 28

E. Petitioner's Proposed Construction of the Term "Specific Matter" Does Not Account for the Intrinsic Evidence 30

VII. THE PETITION FAILS TO PROPERLY ADDRESS THE CLAIMS UNDER STEP ONE OF *ALICE* 32

A. Legal Framework 32

B. Petitioner's Identification of the Inventive Concept Is Incorrect 34

C. The Petition Does Not Analyze the Claims As A Whole Under *Alice* Step One 36

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

D. The Petition Erroneously Asserts That the Specification Does Not Disclose Informing A Player of the Incentives 41

E. The Petitioner's Preemption Argument Fails Because It Is Based On An Unreasonable Construction of "Incentives" 43

F. Petitioner Incorrectly Asserts That A Specific Means For Performing the Claimed Methods Is Not Recited 44

G. Petitioner's Argument Regarding A Longstanding Commercial Practice Is Based On An Incomplete Consideration of the Claim Terms 46

VIII. THE PETITION FAILS TO PROPERLY ADDRESS THE CLAIMS UNDER STEP TWO OF *ALICE* 47

A. Legal Framework 47

B. Petitioner's Identification of the Inventive Concept Is Incorrect 48

C. Petitioner's *Berkheimer* Analysis Is Incorrect 49

D. The Petition Fails to Provide Any Evidence That the Claims Are Well-Understood, Routine, Conventional Activities 52

E. Petitioner Does Not Properly Address the Claims As An Ordered Combination 54

IX. THE PETITION DOES NOT PERFORM A COMPLETE ANALYSIS OF THE DEPENDENT CLAIMS 58

A. The Petition Does Not Address Step One of *Alice* for Any of the Dependent Claims 58

B. The Petition's Analysis of the Dependent Claims Is Based On the Flawed Premise That the Claims Do Not Cover the Inventive Concept 59

C. Petitioner Does Not Address the Dependent Claims In Their Entirety And Provides No Evidence To Support Its Conclusions 60

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

X. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO SHOW THAT ONE OR MORE OF THE '044 PATENT CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112 60

A. The Petition Fails to Show That Claims 1-10 Lack Adequate Written Description Support Under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a) 61

1. Petitioner Fails to Consider the Perspective of a POSITA 62

2. Petitioner's Argument Improperly Relies On the Absence of Claim Terminology In the Specification 64

3. Petitioner's Argument is Based on Its Flawed Claim Construction 68

B. The Petition Fails to Show That Claims 1-10 Are Indefinite Under 35 U.S.C. § 112(b) 69

XI. CONCLUSION 72

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Alcon Research Ltd. v. Barr Labs., Inc.,
745 F.3d 1180 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 61

Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int'l,
134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014) ..... passim

Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.,
796 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Circ. 2015) 61

Aqua Prods., Inc. v. Matal,
872 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 21

Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.,
598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) 62

Autogiro Co. of Am. v. United States,
384 F.2d 391 (Ct. Cl. 1967) 23

BASCOM Global Internet Servs., Inc. v. AT&T Mobility LLC,
827 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 55

Berkheimer v. HP Inc.,
881 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2018) 33, 50, 52

Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.,
815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 63, 64, 65

Capon v. Eshhar,
418 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2005) 62, 68

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.