

Filed on behalf of Game Show Network, LLC and WorldWinner.com, Inc.

By: Brenton R. Babcock

Ted M. Cannon

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

2040 Main Street, 14th Floor

Irvine, CA 92614

Tel.: (949) 760-0404

Fax: (949) 760-9502

Email: BoxGSN@Knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Game Show Network, LLC and WorldWinner.com, Inc.,

Petitioners,

v.

Patent Owner of

U.S. Patent 6,174,237 to Stephenson

Case IPR TBD

PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW OF

U.S. PATENT NO. 6,174,237

PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 312 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.108

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
I. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1).....	1
A. Real Party-In-Interest Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)	1
B. Related Matters Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)	1
C. Lead and Back-up Counsel Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)	1
D. Service Information Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4).....	2
II. GROUNDS FOR STANDING UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a).....	2
III. INTRODUCTION	2
A. The '237 Patent relates generally to online tournaments.....	2
B. Stephenson merely extended a common tournament format to Internet games between human and computer players	3
C. Walker, which the Patent Examiner did not consider, anticipates or renders obvious the claims of the '237 Patent.....	4
IV. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	8
V. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	9
VI. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	9
A. “game of skill”	9
B. “playing a game of skill in a qualifying round between a single player and the host computer”	10
C. “playing said game of skill in a playoff round between said player and the host computer simultaneously along with other players”	13
D. Steps (b) and (c) of Claim 1	15

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
E. “said game of skill is based on the memory reaction of the player”	17
F. Reservation of rights to rebut Stephenson claim construction.....	17
G. Reservation of rights to advocate different claim constructions, or that the claim phrases are indefinite, in district court litigation	18
VII. EXPLANATION OF WHY THE CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE.....	18
A. Claims 1-6 and 8-19 are Anticipated by Walker.....	18
1. Walker anticipates Claim 1	19
2. Walker anticipates Claim 2.....	30
3. Walker anticipates Claim 3.....	30
4. Walker anticipates Claim 4.....	31
5. Walker anticipates Claim 5.....	32
6. Walker anticipates Claim 6.....	32
7. Walker anticipates Claim 8.....	33
8. Walker anticipates Claim 9.....	33
9. Walker anticipates Claim 10.....	34
10. Walker anticipates Claim 11.....	35
11. Walker anticipates Claim 12.....	35
12. Walker anticipates Claim 13.....	36
13. Walker anticipates Claim 14.....	36

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
14. Walker anticipates Claim 15	37
15. Walker anticipates Claim 16	38
16. Walker anticipates Claim 17	38
17. Walker anticipates Claim 18	39
18. Walker anticipates Claim 19	39
B. Alternatively, Claims 1-6 and 8-19 Would Have Been Obvious in View of Walker	40
1. Claim 1 would have been obvious even assuming minor differences between the Walker disclosure and Claim 1	41
a. Claim 1 would have been obvious even assuming that Walker does not expressly disclose two separate steps (b) and (c)	41
b. Claim 1 would have been obvious even assuming that Walker does not expressly disclose determining that the player is classified within a qualifying performance level that is one of the performance levels recited in limitation (b)	42
c. Claim 1 would have been obvious even assuming that Walker does not expressly disclose a game in a qualifying round between a single player and the host computer	44
d. Claim 1 would have been obvious even assuming that Walker does not expressly disclose awarding performance level awards after a qualifying round	45

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
e. Claim 1 would have been obvious even assuming that Walker does not expressly disclose generating subsequent player rankings after a tournament.....	47
2. Dependent Claims 2-6 and 8-19 would have been obvious even assuming minor differences between the disclosure of Walker and Claim 1.....	47
3. Claim 4 would have been obvious even assuming that Walker does not explicitly disclose multiple levels of awards after a qualifying round	48
4. Claim 6 would have been obvious even assuming that Walker does not expressly disclose exactly four performance levels	48
C. Claim 7 Would Have Been Obvious in View of Walker.....	50
D. Reservation of rights to rebut any other differences between Walker’s disclosure and the claims raised by Stephenson.....	52
VIII. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS, EVEN IF CONSIDERED, FAIL TO OVERCOME THE EVIDENCE OF OBVIOUSNESS.....	53
IX. THE GROUNDS FOR UNPATENTABILITY RELY ON NEW PRIOR ART NEVER CONSIDERED BY THE PATENT OFFICE AND RAISE NEW ISSUES IN WHICH PETITIONERS WILL LIKELY PREVAIL.....	54
X. CONCLUSION.....	55

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.