

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

High 5 Games, LLC,

Petitioner,

v

Konami Gaming, Inc.,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-01935

U.S. Patent No. 8,096,869

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY
RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iii

I. Introduction..... 1

II. Claim Construction.....2

 A. “Randomly Selected Anew” Requires No Construction.....5

 B. “Notional, Non-visible Inner Reel” Is Construed as a Random Selection Algorithm9

 C. “Virtual Rotation” and “Virtual Spinning” is Construed as Execution of or Executing the Random Selection Algorithm of the Notional, Non-visible Inner Reel14

 D. “Subset of Said Plurality of Symbols” Requires No Construction16

 E. “Fixed for Each Game Played” Requires No Construction18

 F. “Identical Symbol” Requires No Construction20

 G. “Probability of Selection” Requires No Construction21

III. The Petition filed against U.S. Patent No. 8,096,869 fails to meet the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.104(b)(3) and (4) and Must Be Denied.21

IV. High5 Has Failed to Meet the Minimum Threshold Showing that it is Reasonably Likely to Prevail in Proving Obviousness of Any Claim22

 A. High5 Failed to Fully and Properly Consider the Asserted References as a Whole and the Proposed Combinations Do Not Disclose Each and Every Limitation.....24

 1. Grounds 1 & 2 Should Not Be Instituted Because High5 Failed to Consider Sekine’s Teaching Away from the Proposed Combination.....26

 2. Ground 1 Should Not Be Instituted Because Combination Fails to Disclose Each and Every Limitation as Claimed28

 3. Proposed Combination in Ground 2 Fails to Disclose Each and Every Limitation as Claimed and Ground 2 Should Not Be Instituted34

4.	Grounds 3 and 4 Should Not Be Instituted Because the Combination Fails to Disclose Each and Every Limitation as Claimed.....	39
B.	High5 Failed to Provide Sufficient Obviousness Rationales in View of <i>KSR</i>	43
V.	Conclusion.....	46

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>AbTox Inc. v. Exitron Corp.</i> , 122 F.3d 1019 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	3
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics, Inc. v. Verinata Health, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00277, Paper No. 10 (P.T.A.B. 2013)	3
<i>Ball Aerosol v. Limited Brands</i> , 555 F.3d 984 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	45
<i>Biotec Biologische Naturverpackungen GmbH & Co. KG v. Biocorp, Inc.</i> , 249 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	4
<i>C.R. Bard, Inc. v. United States Surgical Corp.</i> , 388 F.3d 858 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	21
<i>CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.</i> , 288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	3
<i>Crocs Inc. v. International Trade Commission</i> , 598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	44
<i>Cross Med. Products, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	3
<i>Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Applera Corp.</i> , 599 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	25
<i>GE Lighting Solutions, LLC v. AgiLight, Inc.</i> , 750 F.3d 1304 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	11
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	23, 24, 44
<i>Honeywell Int’l. Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 341 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	25
<i>In re Chevalier</i> , 500 F. App’x 932 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	46
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	45
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	24, 26

<i>In re McLaughlin</i> , 443 F.2d 1392 (CCPA 1971).....	45
<i>In re Rinehart</i> , 531 F.2d 1048, 189 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1976)	41
<i>International Securities Exchange, LLC v. Chicago Board Options Exchange, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00099, Paper No. 12 (P.T.A.B. 2014)	23
<i>KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	passim
<i>On Demand Mach. Corp. v. Ingram Indus.</i> , 442 F.3d 1331, 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	4
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	7
<i>Power MOSFET Techs., LLC v. Siemens AG</i> , 378 F.3d 1396, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	25
<i>Primos, Inc. v. Hunter's Specialties, Inc.</i> , 451 F.3d 841 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	3
<i>Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.</i> , 713 F.2d 1530, 218 USPQ 871 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	43
<i>Superguide Corp. v. DirecTV Enterprises, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 870 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	18, 20
<i>Toro Co. v. White Consol. Indus.</i> , 199 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	4
<i>United States v. Adams</i> , 383 U.S. 39 (1966)	44
<i>W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.</i> , 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), <i>cert. denied</i> , 469 U.S. 851 (1984)	27
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 103	26
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	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.