

Attorney Docket No. 024004-0000019

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| Inventors: Matthew KELLY, <i>et al.</i> |) | MAIL STOP: |
| Case No.: Unassigned |) | <i>Patent Board</i> |
| Patent No.: 5,816,918 C1 |) | Patent Trial and Appeal Board |
| Application No.: 08/746,755 |) | Issued Date: October 6, 1998 |
| Reexamination Control No.: |) | Reexamination Certificate Date: June |
| 90/006,601 |) | 30, 2014 |
| For: PRIZE REDEMPTION SYS- |) | Filing Date: November 14, 1996 |
| TEM FOR GAMES |) | |

**PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT REVIEW
PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. §321, AIA §18, AND 37 C.F.R. §§42.300-42.304**

Table of Contents

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----------|
| I. | PRELIMINARY STATEMENT | 1 |
| II. | GROUND FORS STANDING – 37 C.F.R. §42.304(a) | 1 |
| | A. At Least One Challenged Claim Is Unpatentable | 1 |
| | B. The ‘918 Patent Is a Covered Business Method Patent | 1 |
| | 1. The ‘918 Patent Claims a Method or Apparatus Used in the Practice, Administration, or Management of a Financial Product or Service | 2 |
| | 2. The ‘918 Patent Is Not a Technological Invention | 9 |
| | C. Petitioner Has Been Sued for Infringement of the ‘918 Patent and Is Not Estopped from Challenging the ‘918 Patent Claims | 12 |
| | D. The Petition Is Timely Under 37 C.F.R. §42.303 | 13 |
| | E. Real Party-in-Interest | 13 |
| | F. Related Matters..... | 14 |
| | G. Lead and Back-Up Counsel; Service Information | 14 |
| | H. Supporting Evidence | 15 |
| III. | STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED FOR EACH CLAIM CHALLENGED | 15 |
| | A. Claims for which Review is Requested | 15 |
| | B. Statutory Grounds of Challenge..... | 15 |
| | C. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art..... | 16 |
| | D. Claim Construction | 16 |
| | 1. “Game Apparatus” | 17 |
| | 2. “Receiving Means for Receiving Monetary Input from Said Player”..... | 18 |
| | 3. “Means for Providing a Prize Selection Menu on Said Display Device” | 19 |
| | 4. “Means for Providing a Specific Prize Goal During Said Game of Skill Played on Said Game Apparatus” | 20 |
| | 5. “Means for Selecting a Prize Credit Game for Receiving Said Prize Credits Based on Said Game Score” | 21 |
| | 6. “Means for Selecting a Tournament Game” | 22 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| IV. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE..... | 22 |
| A. The Challenged Claims Are Unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §101..... | 23 |
| B. None of the Independent Challenged Claims Are Directed to Patent Eligible Subject Matter..... | 26 |
| 1. Exemplary Claim – Claim 15 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 26 |
| a. Claim 15 Claims an Abstract Idea | 28 |
| b. Claim 15 Does Not Claim “Significantly More” than the Ineligible Concept Itself | 31 |
| 2. Claim 1 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 34 |
| 3. Claim 21 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 36 |
| 4. Claims 34, 38, and 45 Claim Ineligible Subject Matter | 39 |
| 5. Claim 39 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 41 |
| 6. Claim 47 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 43 |
| 7. Claim 59 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 45 |
| 8. Claim 73 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 47 |
| C. The Dependent Claims Are Also Directed to Patent-Ineligible Subject Matter | 50 |
| 1. Claim 2 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 50 |
| 2. Claim 3 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 51 |
| 3. Claims 4 and 11 Claim Ineligible Subject Matter | 51 |
| 4. Claims 5 and 62 Claim Ineligible Subject Matter | 53 |
| 5. Claim 6 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 54 |
| 6. Claim 7 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 54 |
| 7. Claim 8 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 55 |
| 8. Claim 9 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 56 |
| 9. Claim 10 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 56 |
| 10. Claims 12 and 18 Claim Ineligible Subject Matter | 57 |
| 11. Claims 13 and 19 Claim Ineligible Subject Matter | 58 |
| 12. Claims 14, 58, and 72 Claim Ineligible Subject Matter | 59 |
| 13. Claim 16 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 60 |
| 14. Claim 17 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 60 |
| 15. Claim 20 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 61 |
| 16. Claims 22 and 74 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 62 |
| 17. Claims 23, 57, 60, and 61 Claim Ineligible Subject Matter | 62 |
| 18. Claims 24 and 75 Claim Ineligible Subject Matter | 64 |
| 19. Claim 25 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 64 |
| 20. Claim 26 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 65 |

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 21. | Claims 27, 55, 70, and 76 Claim Ineligible Subject Matter | 66 |
| 22. | Claim 28 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 67 |
| 23. | Claim 29 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 68 |
| 24. | Claim 30 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 68 |
| 25. | Claim 31 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 69 |
| 26. | Claims 32, 33, and 77 Claim Ineligible Subject Matter | 69 |
| 27. | Claim 46 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 70 |
| 28. | Claim 48 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 71 |
| 29. | Claims 49 and 53 Claim Ineligible Subject Matter | 72 |
| 30. | Claims 50 and 51 Claim Ineligible Subject Matter | 73 |
| 31. | Claim 52 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 74 |
| 32. | Claims 54 and 65 Claim Ineligible Subject Matter | 74 |
| 33. | Claims 56 and 71 Claim Ineligible Subject Matter | 75 |
| 34. | Claim 63 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 76 |
| 35. | Claim 64 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 76 |
| 36. | Claim 66 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 77 |
| 37. | Claim 67 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 78 |
| 38. | Claim 68 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 78 |
| 39. | Claim 69 Claims Ineligible Subject Matter | 79 |

V. CONCLUSION, REQUEST FOR JUDGMENT, AND FEES.....80

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Cases

| | |
|---|------------|
| <i>Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank International</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014) | passim |
| <i>Apple Inc. v. SightSound Techs., LLC</i> , CBM2013-00020, Paper 14 (Oct. 8, 2013) | 6, 7, 8, 9 |
| <i>Bally Gaming, Inc. v. eUniverse, Inc.</i> , Case No. 3:03-cv-0062-LRH-VPC (D. Nev.) | 13, 14 |
| <i>Bally Gaming, Inc. v. WorldWinner, Inc.</i> , Case No. 3:03-cv-0063-LRH-VPC (D. Nev.) | 14 |
| <i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 130 S. Ct. 3218 (2010) | 23, 24 |
| <i>Bloomberg Inc. v. Markets-Alert PTY Ltd.</i> , CBM2013-00005, Paper 18 (Mar. 29, 2013) | 10 |
| <i>buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc.</i> , 765 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2014) | 25, 34 |
| <i>Content Extraction v. Wells Fargo Bank</i> , 776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014) | 24 |
| <i>CRS Advanced Technologies v. Frontline Technologies, Inc.</i> , CBM2012-00005, Paper 17 (Jan. 23, 2013) | 6, 7, 10 |
| <i>CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011) | 29, 52 |
| <i>Diamond v. Diehr</i> , 450 U.S. 175 (1981) | 30, 31 |
| <i>EnOcean GmbH v. Face Int'l Corp.</i> , 742 F.3d 955 (Fed. Cir. 2014) | 18 |
| <i>Gottschalk v. Benson</i> , 409 U.S. 63 (1972) | 23, 29 |
| <i>Mayo Collaborative Svcs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.</i> , 132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012) | passim |
| <i>OIP Technologies, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , No. 2012-1696, 2015 WL 3622181 (Fed. Cir. June 11, 2015) | passim |
| <i>Planet Bingo, LLC v. VKGS LLC</i> , 576 Fed. Appx. 1005 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (unpublished) | 33 |
| <i>SAP America, Inc. v. Versata Development Group, Inc.</i> , CBM2012-00001, Paper 70 (June 11, 2013) | 16 |

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.