

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

EPIC GAMES, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

INGENIOSHARE, LLC,
Patent Owner

U.S. PATENT NO. 10,708,727

Case IPR2022-TBD

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §312 AND 37 C.F.R. §42.104**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. MANDATORY NOTICES2

 A. Real Party-In-Interest2

 B. Related Matters.....2

 C. Counsel and Service Information.....2

 D. 37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(4): Service Information.....3

III. PAYMENT OF FEES UNDER 37 C.F.R. §42.1033

IV. CERTIFICATION OF GROUNDS FOR STANDING3

V. OVERVIEW OF CHALLENGE AND RELIEF REQUESTED4

 A. Prior Art Printed Publications4

 B. Relief Requested.....5

VI. DISCRETIONARY DENIAL IS NOT APPROPRIATE HERE.....6

 A. The '727 Patent Has Not Been Subject to a Prior Petition6

 B. The Presented Grounds and Argument Are Dissimilar to the Art
 and Arguments Previously Presented to the Office7

 1. *Becton Dickinson* Factors7

 2. The '727 Claims Are a Subset of Claims Directed to
 Substantially Overlapping Subject Matter7

 C. Efficiency, Fairness, and the Merits Support the Exercise of the
 Board's Authority to Grant the Petition8

VII. OVERVIEW OF THE TECHNOLOGY13

 A. Network Protocols.....13

 A. Modes of Internet Communications.....16

VIII. THE '727 PATENT20

A.	Claims.....	21
B.	Summary of the Specification.....	21
C.	Summary of the Prosecution History	23
D.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	25
IX.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	25
X.	OVERVIEW OF THE PRIOR ART	25
A.	Overview of Diacakis.....	25
B.	Overview of Tanigawa	30
C.	Overview of Hullfish.....	33
D.	Overview of Loveland.....	33
E.	Overview of Takahashi	34
XI.	SPECIFIC GROUNDS FOR PETITION.....	35
A.	Ground I: Claims 1–6, 15, and 17 Are Rendered Obvious by Diacakis	35
1.	Independent Claim 1	35
2.	Dependent Claim 2	47
3.	Dependent Claim 3	48
4.	Dependent Claim 4	49
5.	Dependent Claim 5	50
6.	Dependent Claim 6	50
7.	Dependent Claim 15	51
8.	Dependent Claim 17	52
B.	Ground II: Claims 7–9 Are Rendered Obvious by Diacakis and Loveland.....	53
1.	Motivation to Combine.....	53
2.	Dependent Claim 7	57
3.	Dependent Claim 8	58
4.	Dependent Claim 9	58

..

C.	Ground III: Claim 16 Is Rendered Obvious by Diacakis and Takahashi.....	59
1.	Motivation to Combine	59
2.	Dependent Claim 16	62
D.	Ground IV: Claims 1–3, 6, 15, and 17 Are Rendered Obvious by Tanigawa and Hullfish	63
1.	Motivation to Combine Tanigawa and Hullfish	63
2.	Independent Claim 1	67
3.	Dependent Claim 2	80
4.	Dependent Claim 3	81
5.	Dependent Claim 6	81
6.	Dependent Claim 15	82
7.	Dependent Claim 17	83
E.	Ground V: Claims 7–9 Are Rendered Obvious by Tanigawa, Hullfish, and Loveland	84
1.	Motivation to Combine Tanigawa, Hullfish, and Loveland.....	84
2.	Dependent Claim 7	86
3.	Dependent Claim 8	87
4.	Dependent Claim 9	87
F.	Ground VI: Claim 16 Is Rendered Obvious by Tanigawa, Hullfish, and Takahashi.....	87
1.	Motivation to Combine Tanigawa, Hullfish, and Takahashi	87
2.	Dependent Claim 16	90
XII.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS	90
XIII.	CONCLUSION.....	91

...

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. Med-El Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH</i> , IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 13, 2020).....	7
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2020).....	8
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. May 13, 2020)	9, 11
<i>Apple Inc. v. Seven Networks</i> , IPR2020-00235, Paper 10.....	10
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Koss Corp.</i> , IPR2021-00381, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. July 2, 2021).....	9
<i>Arbor Glob. Strategies LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. 2:19-cv-00333-JRG-RSP, 2021 WL 66531 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 7, 2021)	9
<i>Becton, Dickinson, & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2017)	7
<i>Bowtech Inc. v. MCP IP, LLC</i> , IPR2019-00383, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 6, 2019).....	7
<i>Brunswick Corp. v. Volvo Penta of the Ams., LLC</i> , IPR2020-01512, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. March 11, 2021)	11
<i>DyStar Textilfarben GmbH & Co. Deutschland KG v. C.H. Patrick Co.</i> , 464 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Fasteners for Retail, Inc. v. RTC Indus., Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00994, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 5, 2019).....	7
<i>Gen. Plastic Indus. Co. v. Canon Kubushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 6, 2017).....	6

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.