Filed: July 9, 2013

Filed on behalf of: Junior Party Zynga Inc. By: Brenton R. Babcock

Frederick S. Berretta Eric M. Nelson Derek Bayles

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

2040 Main Street, 14th Floor

Irvine, CA 92614 Tel: (949) 760-0404 Fax: (949) 760-9502

E-mail: BoxZynga@knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Zynga Inc. Junior Party (Application 10/658,836

Inventors: Rolf E. Carlson and Michael W. Saunders),

v.

IGT Senior Party (Patent 7,168,089

Inventors: Binh T. Nguyen, Michael M Oberberger and Gregory Hopkins Parrott).

Patent Interference No. 105,747 (RES) (Technology Center 2400)

ZYNGA SUBSTANTIVE MOTION 3 (For Judgment That IGT's Involved Claims Are Unpatentable)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

| I. | STAT | STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED | | | | 1 | |
|------|---|---|----------------|--------------------|---|---|--|
| II. | EXHIBITS CITED; STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS | | | | | | |
| III. | SUM | SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT | | | | | |
| IV. | REAS | TED RELIEF SHOULD BE GRANTED | 2 | | | | |
| | A. | The Claims of the Nguyen '089 Patent Are Invalid Because They Would Have Been Obvious | | | | | |
| | | 1. Claim Construction | | | | | |
| | | | a. | Relev Art | ant Field and Person Having Ordinary Skill in the | 4 | |
| | | | b. | The C | Claim Terms | 4 | |
| | | | | i. | "Gaming Software" | 4 | |
| | | | | ii. | "Software Authorization Agent" | 5 | |
| | | | | iii. | "Gaming Device" | 5 | |
| | B. | The Independent Claims of the Nguyen '089 Patent Would Have Been Obvious in View of the Carlson '834 Patent | | | | | |
| | | 1. | The S | Scope an | nd Content of the Carlson '834 Patent | 6 | |
| | | 2. | the N Autho | Nguyen orizing | '834 Patent Differs from the Independent Claims of '089 Patent in that It Teaches a System for the Transfer of Gaming Information But Not 'tware' | 7 | |
| | | 3. | Indep Nonfi | endent unctiona | "Gaming Software" Limitations Recited in the Claims of the Nguyen '089 Patent are Merely al Descriptive Material, they are Not Entitled to reight | 7 | |
| | | 4. | | | Would Have Been Obvious in View of Carlson's leplay Embodiment | 8 | |
| | | | a. | "A No | etwork Interface " and "a Processor" | 9 | |
| | | | b. | a Fir | eive Gaming Software Transfer Requests From st Gaming Device for the Transfer of Gaming vare " | 9 | |



$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{TABLE OF CONTENTS} \\ \textit{(cont'd)} \end{array}$

Page No.

| | c. | "Approve or Reject the Gaming Software Transaction Request" | 10 |
|----|-----------------|--|----|
| | d. | "Send an Authorization Message to the First Gaming Device" | 10 |
| | e. | "The Gaming Software is for a Game of Chance Played on a Gaming Machine" | 11 |
| 5. | Claim Remot | 123 Would Have Been Obvious in View of Carlson's e Gameplay Embodiment | 12 |
| | a. | "The First Gaming Device and the Second Gaming Device Are Separate from the Software Authorization Agent" | 13 |
| 6. | | 84 Would Have Been Obvious in View of Carlson's e Gameplay Embodiment | 13 |
| | a. | "Receiving a Gaming Software Transaction Request from the Second Gaming Device" | 13 |
| | b. | "Transferring the Gaming Software to the Second Gaming Device" | 15 |
| 7. | Claims Remot | s 65 Would Have Been Obvious in View of Carlson's e Gameplay Embodiment | 15 |
| 8. | Claim Remot | 28 Would Have Been Obvious in View of Carlson's e Gameplay Embodiment | 17 |
| | a. | "Receiving a Gaming Software Download Request Message with Gaming Software Transaction Information" | 17 |
| | b. | "Validating the Gaming Software Download Request Using the Gaming Software Transaction Information" | 18 |
| 9. | | 1 Would Have Been Obvious in View of Carlson's e Gameplay Embodiment | 18 |
| | a. | "Authenticating an Identity of the First Gaming Device" | 19 |
| | b. | "Generating a Gaming Software Transaction Record Comprising Gaming Software Transaction Information That Is Used to Approve or Reject the Transfer of Gaming Software" | 20 |
| | | Juining Duitware | (|



$\begin{array}{c} {\bf TABLE~OF~CONTENTS}\\ (cont'd) \end{array}$

Page No.

| | | 10. | Claim 52 Would Have Been Obvious in View of Carlson's Remote Gameplay Embodiment | 20 |
|------|--------|--------|---|----------|
| | | | a. "Querying a Gaming Software Transaction Database for a Set of Gaming Software Transaction Information Requested by the Gaming Device And Sending the Requested Gaming Software Transaction Information to the Gaming Device" | 21 |
| | C. | Obvio | ndependent Claims of the Nguyen '089 Patent Would Have Been us in View of the Combination of the Carlson '834 Patent and the '634 Patent | 22 |
| | | 1. | The "Gaming Software" Limitations of the Independent Claims of the Nguyen '089 Patent Are Taught by the Wells '634 Patent | 22 |
| | | 2. | It Would Have Been Obvious to Combine the Carlson '834 Patent and the Wells '634 Patent in the Manner Recited by the Independent Claims of the Nguyen '089 Patent | 23 |
| | D. | | Dependent Claims of the Nguyen '089 Patent Would Have Been us in View of the Carlson '834 Patent and Other Prior Art | 23 |
| V. | CONC | CLUSIC |)N | 24 |
| LIST | OF EXI | HIBITS | CITEDAp | pendix 1 |
| STAT | EMEN | Γ OF M | IATERIAL FACTSAp | pendix 2 |



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page No(s).

| Agilent Techs., Inc. v. Affymetrix, Inc., 567 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2009) | 3 |
|--|---------|
| Ex Parte Curry, 84 U.S.P.Q.2d 1272 (B.P.A.I. 2005) | 3 |
| Ex Parte Nehls, 88 U.S.P.Q.2d 1883 (B.P.A.I. 2008) | 3 |
| Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1 (1966) | 3 |
| Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) | 3 |
| Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc., 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996) | 3 |
| Yorkey v. Diab, 605 F.3d 1297 (Fed. Cir. 2010) | 4 |
| OTHER AUTHORITIES | |
| 35 U.S.C. § 102 | 1, 2 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 103 | 1. 2. 3 |



DOCKET A L A R M

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.

