

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SUPERCELL OY,
Petitioner,

v.

GREE, INC.,
Patent Owner.

PGR2020-00034
Patent 10,300,385 B2

Before LYNNE H. BROWNE, HYUN J. JUNG, and
AMANDA F. WIEKER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

WIEKER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Denying Petitioner's Request for Rehearing of
Decision Denying Institution of Post-Grant Review
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

Supercell Oy (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition for post-grant review of claims 1–18 (“challenged claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 10,300,385 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’385 patent”). Paper 1 (“Pet.”). GREE, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 7 (“Prelim. Resp.”). With our authorization, Petitioner filed a Preliminary Reply (Paper 8, “Prelim. Reply”) and Patent Owner filed a Preliminary Sur-reply (Paper 9, “Prelim. Sur-reply”).

In its papers, Patent Owner requested that the Board exercise discretion under 35 U.S.C. § 324(a) to deny institution of the Petition, due to the advanced state of a district court parallel proceeding¹ between the parties in which substantially similar issues have been presented. Prelim. Resp. 2–27 (citing *NHK Spring Co. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.*, IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018) (precedential); *Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.*, IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020) (precedential) (“*Fintiv Order*”)); *see also generally* Prelim. Sur-reply. Petitioner disagreed and argued that the public interest in review of patent quality counsels in favor of institution. Prelim. Reply 1–2; *see generally id.* at 1–6.

On September 3, 2020, the Board issued a Decision denying institution pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 324(a). Paper 13 (“Dec.”). The Decision explains that the statutory text of §§ 314(a) and 324(a) provides discretion to deny institution of a petition and consider “events in other proceedings related to the same patent, either at the Office, in district courts, or the ITC.”

¹ *GREE, Inc. v. Supercell OY*, No. 2:19-cv-00200 (E.D. Tex.) (the “parallel proceeding”). Pet. 1; Paper 4, 2.

Dec. 5–6 (citing Consolidated Trial Practice Guide November 2019 (“TPG”)² at 58). The Decision explains that the Board considers several factors when determining whether to institute trial in parallel with a proceeding pending in another forum. *Id.* at 6. In the Decision, the Board determined that although *NHK Spring* and the *Fintiv* Order applied discretion under § 314(a)—not § 324(a), the relevant statute that applies to post-grant review (“PGR”) proceedings—“the pertinent statutory language is the same in both section 314(a) and section 324(a)” and “the overall policy justifications associated with the exercise of discretion—inefficiency, duplication of effort, and the risk of inconsistent results—apply to post-grant review proceedings under 35 U.S.C. § 324(a).” *Id.* at 7. As such, the Decision weighs the factors set forth in the *Fintiv* Order in determining whether to institute review. *Id.* at 7; *see also id.* at 9–25. Based upon that analysis, the Board exercised discretion to deny institution of post-grant review.

On October 5, 2020, Petitioner filed a Request for Rehearing of the Decision. Paper 14 (“Req.”). We have considered Petitioner’s Request and, for the reasons below, determine that Petitioner has not shown that we abused our discretion in denying the Petition. Accordingly, the Request for Rehearing is denied.

B. Request for Rehearing Standards

When rehearing a decision on institution, the Board reviews the decision for an abuse of discretion. 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c). An abuse of discretion may arise if the decision is based on an erroneous interpretation of

² Available at <https://www.uspto.gov/TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated>.

law, if a factual finding is not supported by substantial evidence, or if an unreasonable judgment is made in weighing relevant factors. *Star Fruits S.N.C. v. U.S.*, 393 F.3d 1277, 1281 (Fed. Cir. 2005); *Arnold P’ship v. Dudas*, 362 F.3d 1338, 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *In re Gartside*, 203 F.3d 1305, 1315–16 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

Additionally, 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d) further provides that “[t]he burden of showing a decision should be modified lies with the party challenging the decision,” i.e., Petitioner, and “[t]he request must specifically identify all matters the party believes the Board misapprehended or overlooked, and the place where each matter was previously addressed in a motion, an opposition, or a reply.”

C. *Petitioner’s Arguments*

In its Request, Petitioner makes three main arguments, which we address below:

- (1) “the Board misapprehended facts regarding Factors 2 and 6 [of the *Fintiv* Order] that, when properly considered, tip the balance in favor of institution”;
- (2) “the Board’s reliance on *NHK-Fintiv* is misplaced” because this is a PGR proceeding, not an IPR proceeding; and
- (3) “exercising discretion based on the *NHK-Fintiv* factors is improper” because “the *NHK-Fintiv* framework . . . prescribes a new standard for institution but was not promulgated via the requisite regulation.”

Req. Reh’g 2, 8, 10 (heading capitalization omitted), 11 (same).

II. DISCUSSION

A. *Fintiv* Order Factors 2 and 6

1. Factor 2 – The Trial Date

This factor considers the “proximity of the court’s trial date to the Board’s projected statutory deadline for a final written decision.” *Fintiv* Order, Paper 11 at 5–6. Petitioner contends that “the Board’s willingness to take the court’s schedule at ‘face value’ caused the Board to misapprehend the trial date,” which has since changed. Req. Reh’g 2–4 (citation omitted). According to Petitioner, “the trial date continues to shift and the true date of the trial is, at present, uncertain,” which tilts this factor in Petitioner’s favor. *Id.* at 4 (citing *Sand Revolution II, LLC v. Cont’l Intermodal Grp.*, IPR2019-01393, Paper 24 (PTAB June 16, 2020) (informative)).

We are not persuaded that we abused our discretion in considering this factor. At the time of our Decision, trial was scheduled in the parallel proceeding for December 7, 2020, approximately nine months before our final written decision would have been due, if we were to institute trial. Dec. 10–11. As such, this gap in timing created a cognizable risk of inconsistent results and duplication of efforts, which weighed toward denying institution. *Id.* at 6, 11–12. Additionally, the Decision notes that some uncertainty exists regarding trial dates, as Petitioner again argues in its Request. *Id.* at 11; Req. Reh’g 3–4. However, the Decision goes on to determine that *even if* trial in the parallel proceeding was delayed by two months, consistent with Petitioner’s prior requested delay, the proximity of the trial date to our final written decision would *still* favor denying institution. Dec. 12 (citing Ex. 2002, 2). As such, Petitioner has not shown that the Board misapprehended the trial date.

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.