

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
WACO DIVISION**

**INGENIOSHARE, LLC,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**EPIC GAMES, INC.,**

Defendant.

**Civil Action No. 6:21-cv-00663-ADA  
JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**EPIC GAMES INC.'S PRELIMINARY INVALIDITY CONTENTIONS**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
| I.   | INTRODUCTION .....   | 1  |
| II.  | THE '727 PATENT .....  | 3  |
|      | A.    Identification of Prior Art, Basis for Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C.<br>§§ 102, 103 and Claim Charts..... | 3  |
|      | 1.    Anticipation.....  | 3  |
|      | 2.    Obviousness .....  | 6  |
|      | B.    Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 .....   | 15 |
|      | C.    Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 .....   | 17 |
| III. | THE '038 PATENT .....  | 18 |
|      | A.    Identification of Prior Art, Basis for Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C.<br>§§ 102, 103 and Claim Charts..... | 18 |
|      | 1.    Anticipation.....  | 19 |
|      | 2.    Obviousness .....  | 21 |
|      | B.    Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 .....   | 30 |
|      | C.    Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 .....   | 33 |
| IV.  | THE '810 PATENT .....  | 34 |
|      | A.    Identification of Prior Art, Basis for Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C.<br>§§ 102, 103 and Claim Charts..... | 34 |
|      | 1.    Anticipation.....  | 34 |
|      | 2.    Obviousness .....  | 36 |
|      | B.    Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 .....   | 45 |
|      | C.    Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 .....   | 47 |
| V.   | THE '407 PATENT .....  | 48 |
|      | A.    Identification of Prior Art, Basis for Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C.<br>§§ 102, 103 and Claim Charts..... | 48 |

1. Anticipation.....48

2. Obviousness .....51

B. Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ..... 60

C. Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 ..... 62

VI. DOCUMENT PRODUCTION ACCOMPANYING INVALIDITY  
CONTENTIONS.....63

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Defendant Epic Games, Inc. (“Epic Games”) hereby provides by and through its attorneys its Preliminary Invalidity Contentions for United States Patent Nos. 10,708,727 (“the ’727 Patent”), 10,492,038 (“the ’038 Patent”), 10,142,810 (“the ’810 Patent”), and 8,744,407 (“the ’407 Patent”) (collectively the “patents-in-suit”). The citation of prior art and the accompanying exhibits may, in part, be based on IngenioShare, LLC’s (“Plaintiff” or “IngenioShare”) apparent view as to the scope of the asserted claims as reflected in its Infringement Contentions. Epic Games does not accept Plaintiff’s apparent reading of the claims as reflecting the proper scope of the claims.

Epic Games’ Preliminary Invalidity Contentions reflect present knowledge and contentions, and Epic Games reserves the right, to the extent permitted by the Court and the applicable statutes and rules, to modify and supplement its Preliminary Invalidity Contentions in the event that additional invalidity grounds are identified, whether in response to any amendment by Plaintiff of its Infringement Contentions, otherwise becoming aware of additional prior art or further material information, including, without limitation, discovery from Plaintiff or third parties; discovery concerning the alleged priority, conception, and reduction to practice dates for any of the asserted claims; or any other basis in law or in fact. Additionally, Epic Games reserves the right to modify its contentions should IngenioShare change which claims it is asserting in this case.

Epic Games’ Preliminary Invalidity Contentions are made in a variety of alternatives and do not represent Epic Games’ agreement or view as to the meaning, definiteness, written description support for, or enablement of any claim contained therein. Epic Games’ contentions herein are not, and should in no way be seen as, admissions or adoptions as to any particular claim scope or construction, or as any admission that any particular claim element is met in any particular

way. Epic Games objects to any attempt to imply claim constructions from any identification of potential prior art. Additionally, Epic Games' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions may use Plaintiff's improper assertions of infringement and improper applications of the claims to understand Plaintiff's view of the scope of the asserted claims. Epic Games does not agree with Plaintiff's application of the claims and denies infringement. Further, to the extent an accused product or feature comprises or arises from prior art, Epic Games contends, without admitting purported infringement, that the patents-in-suit are anticipated and/or made obvious in light of that prior art and Plaintiff's own Infringement Contentions.

In those instances where Epic Games asserts that the claims are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (e.g., no written description, not enabled, and/or indefinite), Epic Games has applied the prior art in part in accordance with Epic Games' assumptions that IngenioShare: (1) contends those claims are definite, (2) finds written description support for those claims, and (3) contends that those claims are enabled. However, Epic Games' prior-art invalidity contentions do not necessarily represent Epic Games' agreement or view as to the meaning, definiteness, written description support for, or enablement of any claim contained therein, or that the patents-in-suit properly disclose structures corresponding to functions in claims governed by 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 6. In fact, Epic Games notes numerous grounds for invalidity on such bases below.

Much of the art identified in the attached exhibits reflects common knowledge and the state of the art before the filing date of the patents-in-suit. In many instances where a particular contention calls for combining references, any one of a number of references can be combined. The inclusion of certain exemplary combinations of prior-art references does not exclude other combinations based upon the claim charts attached hereto.

# 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.