

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

EPIC GAMES, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

INGENIOSHARE, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2022-00295
Patent No. 10,492,038

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD, PTAB
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. SUMMARY OF WHY THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED.....	1
A. The Board Should Deny Institution Based On The <i>Fintiv</i> Factors	1
B. The Board Should Deny Institution Based On The Merits	1
III. STATEMENT OF FACTS	2
A. The Parallel District Court Proceeding	2
B. The Claims Of The '038 Patent.....	4
C. The Specification Of The '038 Patent	4
D. Petitioner's Definitions And Prior Art	5
E. Tanigawa (Exhibit 1010).....	5
IV. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BASED ON <i>FINTIV</i>	7
A. The first factor that the PTAB considers is whether the court granted a stay or whether evidence exists that one may be granted if an IPR is instituted	8
B. The second factor that the PTAB considers is the proximity of the court's trial date to the projected statutory deadline for the PTAB's final written decision	9
C. The third factor that the PTAB considers is the investment in the parallel proceeding by the court and the parties	9
D. The fourth factor that the PTAB considers is the overlap between issues raised in the petition and in the parallel proceeding	10
E. The fifth factor that the PTAB considers is whether the petitioner and the defendant in the parallel proceeding are the same party	12
F. The sixth factor that PTAB considers is whether other circumstances impact the PTAB's exercise of discretion, including the merits	12
V. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BASED ON THE MERITS.....	12
A. Claim Construction.....	12
B. The Specification Of The '038 Patent Teaches That The "Network-Based Portal" Is At The Server-Side Of A Network.....	13

C. Tanigawa’s User Interface Does Not Teach A “Network-Based Portal”14
VI. CONCLUSION.....17

PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit 2001	Complaint
Exhibit 2002	Epic Games Inc.'s Preliminary Invalidation Contentions
Exhibit 2003	Order Setting Markman Hearing
Exhibit 2004	Epic Games Inc.'s Opening Claim Construction Brief

...

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.107, the Patent Owner, IngenioShare, LLC hereby submits the following Preliminary Response to the Petition for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 10,492,038, Case No. IPR2022-00295. For the reasons explained herein, the Petition should be denied.

II. SUMMARY OF WHY THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED

A. The Board Should Deny Institution Based On The *Fintiv* Factors

The Petition should be denied because Petitioner has raised the same invalidity arguments (and substantially more) in a parallel district court proceeding and the district court's trial date precedes the Board's deadline for a final written decision. Moreover, Petitioner is taking inconsistent positions before the district court and the Board that the district court is better suited to address and resolve. As a result, efficiency, fairness, and merits dictate the Board's discretionary denial of institution in view of the district court's earlier comprehensive trial date.

B. The Board Should Deny Institution Based On The Merits

All proposed grounds of unpatentability rest on a fundamental flaw. Each challenged claim requires a "network-based portal." Each ground of unpatentability presented in the Petition relies on the assertion that this limitation is satisfied in the cited art by client-side functionality. This is contrary to the use of the term "network-based portal" in the specification, which universally indicates that the network-based portal is at the server-side. Nothing in the '038 Patent

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.