

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

GREE, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SUPERCELL OY,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 2:19-cv-00413-JRG-RSP

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**GREE, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT SUPERCELL OY'S
MOTION TO DISMISS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. RESPONSE TO SUPERCCELL’S STATEMENT OF ISSUES	1
III. LEGAL STANDARDS	2
A. Standard for Dismissal under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6).....	2
B. Standard for Patent Eligibility under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and <i>Alice</i>	2
IV. SUMMARY OF THE SUZUKI PATENTS AND CHALLENGED CLAIMS	4
V. SUPERCCELL FAILS TO ESTABLISH THAT THE CLAIMS RECITE AN ABSTRACT IDEA UNDER <i>ALICE</i> STEP 1	6
A. Supercell Improperly Describes the Claims at a High Level of Abstraction that Ignores Nearly Every Claim Element.	6
B. The Claims Are Drafted Such that there is No Risk of Pre-Emption.	9
C. Supercell’s Reliance on the Federal Circuit’s Non-Precedential Decision in <i>Planet Bingo</i> and other Cases is Misplaced.....	10
D. Supercell’s Motion Fails to Address the Examiner’s Prior Finding that the Claims do not Recite an Abstract Idea.....	14
E. Supercell Fails to Address GREE’s Pleadings which are Presumed True at the 12(b)(6) Stage.	15
VI. SUPERCCELL FAILS TO CARRY ITS BURDEN OF ESTABLISHING THE CLAIMS FAIL <i>ALICE</i> STEP 2	16
A. Supercell Fails to Address GREE’s Well-Pled Allegations, which are Presumed to be True at the 12(b)(6) Stage.	16
B. Supercell Fails to Shoulder its Burden of Establishing the Claims Fail <i>Alice</i> Step 2 by Clear and Convincing Evidence.	19
VII. SUPERCCELL FAILS TO CARRY ITS BURDEN WITH RESPECT TO THE DEPENDENT CLAIMS.....	21
VIII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ISSUES RENDER SUPERCCELL’S MOTION PREMATURE	23

IX. IF THE COURT IS INCLINED TO GRANT ANY PART OF SUPERCELL'S
MOTION, GREE SHOULD BE GRANTED LEAVE TO AMEND.....25

X. CONCLUSION.....26

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<u>Cases</u>	
<i>Aatrix Software, Inc. v. Green Shades Software, Inc.</i> , 882 F.3d 1121 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	18, 24, 25
<i>Alarm.com Inc. v. ipDatatel, LLC</i> , 383 F. Supp. 3d 719 (S.D. Tex. 2019)	25
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l</i> , 573 U.S. 208 (2014)	passim
<i>Ancora Techs. v. HTC Am., Inc.</i> , 908 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	7, 13
<i>Bascom Glob. Internet Servs., Inc. v. AT&T Mobility LLC</i> , 827 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	3, 17, 19
<i>Berkheimer v. HP Inc.</i> , 881 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	passim
<i>Bowlby v. City of Aberdeen</i> , 681 F.3d 215 (5th Cir. 2012)	2
<i>Carroll v. Fort James Corp.</i> , 470 F.3d 1171 (5th Cir. 2006)	25
<i>Cave Consulting Grp., Inc. v. Health Care Serv. Corp.</i> , No. 6-17-CV-00344-RWS, 2018 WL 703247 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 5, 2018).....	20
<i>Cellspin Soft, Inc. v. Fitbit, Inc.</i> , 927 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	1, 17, 18
<i>Coleman v. Dretke</i> , 409 F.3d 665 (5th Cir. 2005)	14
<i>Core Wireless Licensing S.A.R.L. v. LG Electronics, Inc.</i> , 880 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	7
<i>Courtesy Prods. L.L.C. v. Hamilton Beach Brands, Inc.</i> , No. 13-2012-SLR-SRF, 2015 WL 6159113, at *6 n.7	14
<i>Data Engine Techs. LLC v. Google LLC</i> , 906 F.3d 999 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	7, 13

DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.,
773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 7, 13

Doe v. United States,
831 F.3d 309 (5th Cir. 2016) 2

Elkay Mfg. Co. v. Ebco Mfg. Co.,
192 F.3d 973 (Fed. Cir. 1999) 15

Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.,
822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 3, 6, 19

FairWarning IP, LLC v. Iatric Sys., Inc.,
No. 8:14-CV-2685-T-23MAP, 2015 WL 3883958 (M.D. Fla. June 24, 2015)..... 20

Foman v. Davis,
371 U.S. 178 (1962)..... 25

Garmin USA, Inc. v. Cellspin Soft, Inc.,
140 S. Ct. 907 (2020)..... 1

GREE, Inc. v. Supercell OY,
Civ. No. 2:19-cv-00161, Dkt. 58, at 4 11, 16

In re Marco Guldenaar Holding B.V.,
911 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2018) 11, 24

In re Smith,
815 F.3d 816 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 11, 19, 24

In re TLI Commc’ns LLC Patent Litig.,
823 F.3d 607 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 9, 17

Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Symantec Corp.,
838 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 12

Masel v. Villarreal,
924 F.3d 734 (5th Cir. 2019) 25

Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.,
566 U.S. 66 (2012)..... 3

McRO, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games Am. Inc.,
837 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 9, 10, 18

MyMail, Ltd. v. ooVoo, LLC,
934 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2019) 2, 3, 15, 23

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.