

Filed: June 12, 2019

Filed on behalf of PalTalk Holdings, Inc.
By: Douglas R. Wilson
doug.wilson@armondwilson.com
Michelle E. Armond
michelle.armond@armondwilson.com
ARMOND WILSON LLP
9442 Capital of Texas Hwy North,
Plaza 1, Suite 500
Austin, Texas 78759
Tel: (512) 343-3622
Fax: (512) 345-2924

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

**RIOT GAMES, INC. and
VALVE CORP.,**
Petitioners,

v.

PALTALK HOLDINGS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00132¹
Patents 6,226,686 & 6,226,686 C1

**PATENT OWNER'S NOTICE OF APPEAL TO THE
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT**

¹ Case IPR2018-01243 has been joined with this proceeding.

Riot Games, Inc. v. PalTalk Holdings, Inc.
IPR2018-00132, IPR2018-01243

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(4)(A), 35 U.S.C. §§ 141(c), 142, and 319, 37 C.F.R. §§ 90.2(a) and 90.3, and Rule 4(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, Patent Owner PalTalk Holdings, Inc. (“PalTalk”) hereby appeals to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit from the Final Written Decision (Paper 36) entered on May 14, 2019 (attached hereto as Attachment A), and from all underlying orders, decisions, rulings, and opinions that are adverse to PalTalk related thereto and included therein.

In particular, PalTalk identifies the following issues on appeal: the determination that Claims 1, 3, 7, 12, 18, 22-27, 36, 41-46, 55, and 58-63 of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,226,686 and 6,226,686 C1 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103, any finding or determination supporting or relating to these issues; and all other procedural and substantive issues decided adversely to PalTalk in any order, decision, ruling, or opinion by the Board in both IPR2018-00132 and IPR2018-01243.

PalTalk is concurrently providing true and correct copies of this Notice of Appeal, along with the required fees, with the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office and the Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

Riot Games, Inc. v. PalTalk Holdings, Inc.
IPR2018-00132, IPR2018-01243

ARMOND WILSON LLP

June 12, 2019

/Douglas R. Wilson/
Douglas R. Wilson (Reg. No. 54,542)

Counsel for Patent Owner
PALTALK HOLDINGS, INC.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

RIOT GAMES, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

PALTALK HOLDINGS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00132¹
Patent 6,226,686 & 6,226,686 C1²

Before THU A. DANG, KARL D. EASTHOM, and NEIL T. POWELL,
Administrative Patent Judges.

DANG, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

FINAL WRITTEN DECISION
Inter Partes Review
35 U.S.C. § 318(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73

¹ The panel joined Petitioner Valve Corp. and Case IPR2018-01243 to the instant proceeding. *See* Paper 34.

² The Petition challenges original claims and claims issued pursuant to an ex parte reexamination.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

Riot Games Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 1, 3, 7, 12, 18, 22–27, 36, 41–46, 55, and 58–63 of U.S. Patent No. 6,226,686 (Ex. 1002, “the ’686 patent”). Paper 1 (“Pet.”). PalTalk Holdings, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 6 (“Prelim. Resp.”). Pursuant to our prior authorization (Paper 8, “Order”), Petitioner filed a Reply to the Patent Owner Preliminary Response (Paper 9, “Reply to Prelim. Resp.”) as to the issue of Patent Owner’s claim constructions, and Patent Owner filed a Preliminary Sur-Reply (Paper 10, “Prelim. Sur-Reply”).

We instituted trial to determine whether claims 1, 3, 7, 12, 18, 22–27, 36, 41–46, 55, and 58–63 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on the combination of Aldred and RFC 1692 either alone or in combination with Ulrich or Denzer. *See* Paper 11 (“Institution Decision” or “Inst. Dec.”). After institution of trial, Patent Owner filed a Request for Rehearing. Paper 14 (“Reh’g. Req.”). We denied Patent Owner’s Request for Rehearing. Paper 18 (“Rehearing Decision” or “Reh’g Dec.”).

Patent Owner then filed a Response. Paper 22 (“PO Resp.”). Petitioner filed a Reply to Patent Owner’s Response. Paper 25 (“Pet. Reply”). Pursuant to our prior authorization (Paper 26, “Order”), Patent Owner filed a Sur-Reply to Petitioner’s Reply (Paper 30, “PO Sur-Reply”).

Oral argument was conducted on February 13, 2019.

We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6. This decision is a Final Written Decision under 35 U.S.C. § 318(a) as to the patentability of

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.