

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Playtika Ltd. and Playtika Holding Corp.,
Petitioners,

v.

NexRF Corp.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2021-00951
Patent 8,747,229

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
LIST OF EXHIBITS.....	v
I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	1
II. THE '229 PATENTED INVENTION.....	6
A. Definition of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	6
B. Background of the Invention.....	7
1. The '229 Patent Claims and Describes a Centralized Gaming Server that Communicates a Plurality of Game Outcome Images to a Remote Player's Network Access Device.....	9
III. ARGUMENT: THE BOARD SHOULD CONFIRM THE PATENTABILITY OF ALL CHALLENGED CLAIMS.....	12
A. Joshi Does Not Render Claims 1, 9, and 17 Obvious (Ground 1)	12
1. Element [1e]: Joshi's Server Communicates Reel Position Numbers, Not a " <i>plurality of images corresponding to the at least one random game outcome,</i> " to a Network Access Device.....	12
a. Petitioner's Argument Misconstrues Joshi's Reel Positions As a "plurality of images"	18
b. In Joshi's System, a Remote Player's PC Converts Reel Positions into Images for Display, Not the Casino Server	23
c. Petitioner's Argument that an HTTP Server "Can Be Used to Transmit Images" Fails as a Matter of Law	24

2.	Element [1c]: Joshi Teaches a Decentralized System and Does Not Enable a “ <i>centralized gaming server</i> ” System.....	26
a.	Joshi Describes a Decentralized Gaming System.....	27
b.	Joshi’s Prosecution History Describes a Decentralized System	29
c.	Joshi’s Suggestion to Have the Game Software “Reside in the Casino Server” Would Not Have Enabled a POSA to Create a New Centralized Gaming System Architecture	31
d.	The <i>Wands</i> Factors: Substantial Experimentation Required, with No Guidance, Working Examples, or Predictability For a POSA to Create a New Centralized System Architecture	33
3.	Element [1d]: Joshi Fails to Disclose, Teach, or Suggest “a <i>paytable module associated with the centralized gaming server.</i> ”	42
a.	Joshi’s Slot Machine Determines the Payout, Not the Server	43
b.	Joshi Does Not Disclose the Claimed “paytable module” as Applied to Claims 9 and 17.....	47
B.	Finlayson Adds Nothing to Petitioner’s Analysis (Ground 2)	49
C.	All of the Grounds in the Petition Fail with Grounds 1-2.....	55
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	55

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Adidas AG v. Nike, Inc.</i> , 963 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	53
<i>Apple Inc. v. Corephotonics, Ltd.</i> , 861 Fed. Appx. 443 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	32
<i>Arthrocare Corp. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 406 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	29
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk–Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	3, 25
<i>Edwards Lifesciences LLC v. Cook Inc.</i> , 582 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	17
<i>Elan Pharms., Inc. v. Mayo Found.</i> , 346 F.3d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	32
<i>Envtl. Designs, Ltd. v. Union Oil Co.</i> , 713 F.2d 693 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	50
<i>Exacq Techs., Inc. v. JDS Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00568 (PTAB June 14, 2016)	54
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	25, 26
<i>In re Wands</i> , 858 F.2d 731, 737 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	32
<i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGO Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	53
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	25, 26
<i>Micro-Tech Co., Ltd. v. Boston Scientific Scimed, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00185 (PTAB May 4, 2020)	54

<i>Minnesota Mining and Mfg. Co. v. Chemque, Inc.</i> , 303 F.3d 1294 (Fed.Cir.2002)	32
<i>MobileMedia Ideas LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , 780 F.3d 1159 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	41
<i>Raytheon Techn's v. General Electric Co.</i> , 993 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	4, 31
<i>Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.</i> , 357 F.3d 1270 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	50
<i>Square, Inc. v. Cooper</i> , IPR2014-00158, 2014 WL 2093424 (PTAB May 15, 2014)	52
<i>TF3 Ltd. v. Tre Milano, LLC</i> , 894 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	17
<i>Winner Int'l Royalty Corp. v. Wang</i> , 202 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	52
<u>Regulations</u>	
37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a)	54

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.