



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Table with 5 columns: APPLICATION NO., FILING DATE, FIRST NAMED INVENTOR, ATTORNEY DOCKET NO., CONFIRMATION NO.
14/846,443 09/04/2015 Roger M. Snow 3286-12425.1(PA4206.ap-C1 4530

66137 7590 10/30/2018
TRASKBRITT, P.C. /Bally Gaming, Inc.
PO Box 2550
Salt Lake City, UT 84110

Table with 1 column: EXAMINER

DENNIS, MICHAEL DAVID

Table with 2 columns: ART UNIT, PAPER NUMBER

3711

Table with 2 columns: NOTIFICATION DATE, DELIVERY MODE

10/30/2018

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTOMail@traskbritt.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte ROGER M. SNOW
and LOUIS J. CASTLE II¹

Appeal 2018-001462
Application 14/846,443
Technology Center 3700

Before LINDA E. HORNER, JOHN C. KERINS, and JAMES P. CALVE,
Administrative Patent Judges.

CALVE, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION ON APPEAL
STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Office Action finally rejecting claims 1–20. Appeal Br. 6. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We AFFIRM.

¹ Bally Gaming, Inc. and Scientific Games Corporation are identified as the real parties in interest. Appeal Br. 4. Bally Gaming, Inc. also is the applicant pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.46.

CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 1 and 13 are independent. Claim 1 is reproduced below.

1. A method of administering a wagering game over a network, comprising:
 - providing at least one server of a gaming system;
 - providing, by the at least one server, a client for execution on a user device connected to the network and associated with a player, the player being remote from the at least one server;
 - the client receiving from the user device, and communicating to the at least one server, an indication of an ante wager associated with the player to qualify the player to participate in the wagering game;
 - the client receiving from the user device, and communicating to the at least one server, an indication of a bonus wager associated with the player;
 - the gaming system adding the ante wager and the bonus wager to a game pot;
 - the at least one server determining a set of player cards defining a partial player hand including a selected number of randomized playing cards from a set of playing cards;
 - the at least one server communicating to the user device the partial player hand for display on a display associated with the user device;
 - the at least one server determining a partial dealer hand including a selected number of randomized playing cards from the set of playing cards equal to the selected number of randomized playing cards forming the partial player hand;
 - the at least one server receiving, from the client, a first game play election of a check, the first game play election input at the user device and selected by the player associated with the user device from first game play options consisting of the check and a play wager election of a play wager amount not exceeding a first predetermined maximum multiple of the ante wager;

- the at least one server determining a set of community cards including randomized playing cards from the set of playing cards;
- the at least one server communicating to the user device the set of community cards for display on the display associated with the user device;
- after receiving the first game play election of the check, the at least one server receiving, from the client, a second game play election input at the user device and selected by the player associated with the user device from second game play options consisting of a fold and a play wager election of a play wager amount not exceeding a second predetermined maximum multiple of the ante wager;
- the gaming system adding the play wager amount to the game pot;
- the at least one server determining a poker hand for the player associated with the user device, the poker hand for the player formed from the partial player hand and the set of community cards;
- the at least one server determining a poker hand for the dealer formed from the partial dealer hand and the set of community cards;
- the at least one server resolving the ante wager and any play wager associated with the user device based at least in part on a comparison of the poker hand for the player to the poker hand for the dealer and determining a payout to be distributed from the game pot to the player for the poker hand for the player outranking the poker hand for the dealer; and
- the at least one server resolving the bonus wager associated with the player.

REJECTION

Claims 1–20 are rejected as directed to patent-ineligible subject matter under the judicial exception to 35 U.S.C. § 101.

ANALYSIS

Appellants argue claims 1–20 as a group with claim 1 as exemplary. Appeal Br. 12–31. We select claim 1 as representative, with claims 2–20 standing or falling with claim 1. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv).

Claim 1 is directed to a “method of administering a wagering game over a network” with “at least one server of a gaming system.” Appeal Br. App’x 1. The at least one server provides “a client for execution on a user device connected to the network.” *Id.* The at least one server determines and communicates a set of cards defining a partial play hand and a set of community cards, and also receives first and second game play elections made by a player at the user device. The client receives from the user device and communicates to the at least one server various wager options (ante wager, bonus wager) and first and second game play elections. Players can input their wagers and game play elections into the user device, which also displays partial player hands and community card sets. *Id.* at 1–3.

Appellants disclose that their wagering game transcends the particular environment in which it is played, e.g., on a table or automated device or with a computer, processor, monitor, cash receptors, etc. *See* Spec. ¶ 26.

Appellants argue that claim 1 recites a “new” wagering game, i.e., one with *unconventional wagering rules*. Appeal Br. 14–17, 27–31. These rules allow a player to remain in the game with an option of checking (to stay in the game without making an additional wager) or making a specific wager amount in a first play wager. *Id.* at 27–31; Spec. ¶ 4. The wagering rules limit the size of bets as game play progresses to multiples of play wagers made earlier in the game. Appeal Br. 28–29; Spec. ¶ 4. Players form hands from a partial player hand and community cards. *Id.* at 28; Spec. ¶¶ 6, 27.

We analyze patent-eligibility under *Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int'l*, 134 S. Ct. 2347, 2355 (2014) and *Mayo Collaborative Services v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.*, 566 U.S. 66 (2012). First, we consider whether the claims are directed to a patent-ineligible concept such as a law of nature, natural phenomena, or abstract idea. *Alice*, 134 S. Ct. at 2355. If so, we consider the claim elements individually and as an ordered combination to determine whether additional elements transform the claims into a patent-eligible application. *Id.* This search for an inventive concept in the second step seeks an element, or a combination of elements “sufficient to ensure that the patent in practice amounts to significantly more than a patent upon the [ineligible concept] itself.” *Id.* We also consider whether the claims fall within a statutory category of section 101. *See Aatrix Software, Inc. v. Green Shades Software, Inc.*, 882 F.3d 1121, 1125 (Fed. Cir. 2018).²

Alice Step One: Are the Claims Directed to an Abstract Idea?

We agree with the Examiner’s finding that claim 1 is directed to a set of rules to administer a wagering game. Final Act. 2. The Examiner finds that claim 1 recites a set of dealing rules, wagering rules (ante wager, fold, play wager), game play election rules, “determining” rules, “predetermined event” and “resolving” rules (comparison of player and dealer poker hands). *Id.*; Ans. 4–5. The Examiner correctly reasons that the rules are comparable to the blackjack wagering rules held to be an abstract idea in *In re Smith*, 815 F.3d 816 (Fed. Cir. 2016). Final Act. 2; Ans. 4–5.

² Reciting a “method of administering a wagering game” does not, by itself, make claim 1 patent eligible. *See CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.*, 654 F.3d 1366, 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (regardless of the statutory category a claim invokes, the underlying invention is considered for patent-eligibility); Appeal Br. 14–15 (“a *new* poker-based wagering method”).

The Examiner determines the claimed server, user device, client, and wagers and cards are non-unique, traditional, wagering game elements that implement the abstract wagering game rules. *See* Final Act. 2–3.

We agree with the Examiner that the Federal Circuit’s holding in *In re Smith* is controlling and determinative of the issue in this appeal. Final Act. 2; Ans. 4–5. *In re Smith* examined the patent eligibility of a claim directed to a “method of conducting a wagering game” with a deck of playing cards that the dealer deals according to game rules while accepting and resolving wagers of players. *Smith*, 815 F.3d at 817–18.

In re Smith, a precedential decision, held that claims directed to rules for conducting a wagering game are comparable to fundamental economic practices held to be abstract by the Supreme Court. *Smith*, 815 F.3d at 818. In *Smith*, the court held that claims directed to a “method of conducting a wagering game” are drawn to an abstract idea much like the method of exchanging financial obligations in *Alice* and the method of hedging risk in *Bilski v. Kappos*, 561 U.S. 593, 611 (2010). *Id.* at 819.

Like the claim in *Smith*, claim 1 recites a “method of administering a wagering game” according to game rules that involve a client on a user device receiving an ante and a bonus wager from a player, a partial player hand of cards being determined and displayed, a player making a first game play election (check or a play wager) and a second game play election (fold or a play wager) determining community cards, and then determining poker hands for the dealer and players, and resolving all received wagers. Appeal Br. Appx. 1–3; Final Act. 2–3; Ans. 4–5. Like the claim in *Smith*, claim 1 therefore allows players to exchange financial obligations with dealers and hedge risk by placing wagers in various amounts or checking.

The Specification’s disclosure “relates to wagering games, casino table wagering games, casino table playing card wagering games, computer-implemented wagering games, and variants of casino table wagering games that use poker ranks in determining outcomes.” Spec. ¶ 2. In particular, the claims are directed to a “variant game of Hold ‘Em poker” that allows for rules of play wherein one player or all players are allowed to remain in the game with an option of checking (which means staying in the game without making an additional wager) or making specific wagering amounts in first play wagers. *Id.* ¶ 4. As games progress, the permitted amounts of wagers decrease with increasing information. *Id.* ¶¶ 4, 28, 29. Games based on the disclosed wagering rules can be carried out in environments ranging from dealers using decks of cards to computer-generated visual representations of dealers and cards over networks such as the Internet to remote players. *Id.* ¶¶ 6–9. Appellants also disclose that “illustrations presented herein are not meant to be actual views of any particular act in a method of administering a wagering game . . . but are merely idealized representations employed to describe illustrative embodiments.” *Id.* ¶ 22.

Thus, the claimed method of administering wagering game rules on a server, user device, and network does not remove claim 1 from the realm of an abstract idea. To the contrary, the claimed components provide one of many conventional environments to implement the wagering game rules. *Cf.* Appeal Br. 22. The server provides a client to a user device, determines partial hands for a player and dealer and a set of community cards, receives player game play elections, and determines player and dealer poker hands and resolves wagers. The user device receives and communicates player actions and displays cards. Appeal Br. Appx. 1–3; *see* Reply Br. 2–5.

Appellants argue that a patent eligible method can be implemented on conventional equipment. Appeal Br. 20. Although checking, folding, and play wagers limits are known (*id.* at 15–16), Appellants argue that claim 1 recites unconventional rules because the underlying game is unconventional (*id.* at 27–31). Appellants argue that claim 1 recites these features as partial player and dealer hands, first game play election consisting of a check and play wager, a second game play election of a fold and play wager, and not exceeding predetermined maximum multiples of ante wagers. *Id.* at 28–29.

Even if these contentions are true, “[t]he ‘novelty’ of any element or steps in a process, or even of the process itself, is of no relevance in determining whether the subject matter of a claim falls within the § 101 categories of possibly patentable subject matter.” *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 188–89 (1981). *See also Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.*, 566 U.S. 66, 88–90 (2012) (the patent eligibility of an abstract idea does not depend on its alleged novelty or non-obviousness); *SAP America, Inc. v. InvestPic, LLC*, 898 F.3d 1161, 1163 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (“No matter how much of an advance in the finance field the claims recite, the advance lies entirely in the realm of abstract ideas, with no plausibly alleged innovation in the non-abstract application realm. An advance of that nature is ineligible for patenting.”); *Two-Way Media, Ltd. v. Comcast Cable Commc’ns, LLC*, 874 F.3d 1329, 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (“Eligibility and novelty are separate inquiries.”); *Synopsys, Inc. v. Mentor Graphics Corp.*, 839 F.3d 1138, 1151 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (“But, a claim for a *new* abstract idea is still an abstract idea.”); *Versata Develop. Grp., Inc. v. SAP Am., Inc.*, 793 F.3d 1306, 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (affirming unpatentability of claims that improved an abstract idea, but not a computer’s performance).

Even if claim 1 recites unconventional wagering rules, as Appellants argue (Appeal Br. 28–31), claim 1 still is directed to rules for a wagering game, which *In re Smith* held to be akin to fundamental economic practices considered abstract by the Supreme Court. *Smith*, 815 F.3d at 818. The alleged nonabstract nature of the claimed rules is based on the alleged new or unconventional way they are grouped together in a wagering game. See Appeal Br. 27–30 (the gaming system adds an ante wager and a bonus wager to a game pot, server communicates to a user device a partial player hand and determines a partial dealer hand, a first game play election of a check, a play wager amount not exceeding first predetermined maximum multiple of the ante wager). We are not persuaded that the claimed wagering game rules are distinguishable from those in *Smith* just because they recite different abstract wagering rules. Here, as in *Smith*, the claimed wagering game and game play rules allow players and dealers to exchange financial obligations based on probabilities related to cards that are dealt.

That claim 1 may not preempt “an entire field” is not relevant to whether it is directed to an abstract idea, because “the exclusion applies if a claim involves a natural law or phenomenon or abstract idea, even if the particular natural law or phenomenon or abstract idea at issue is narrow.” *buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc.*, 765 F.3d 1350, 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (citing *Mayo*, 566 U.S. at 88–89); see also *Two-Way Media*, 874 F.3d at 1339 (if claims are patent ineligible, preemption concerns are fully addressed and mooted); *Ariosa Diagnostics, Inc. v. Sequenom, Inc.*, 788 F.3d 1371, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (holding that “[w]hile preemption may signal patent ineligible subject matter, the absence of complete preemption does not demonstrate patent eligibility”).

The claimed wagering rules differ from rules held to be patent-eligible under *Alice* Step One in *McRO, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games Am. Inc.*, 837 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2016). In *McRO*, the claimed rules were directed to a patentable, *technological improvement* over existing, manual 3-D animation techniques and achieved an *improved technological result* in conventional industry practice. *Id.* at 1316. The claimed process automatically animated 3-D characters using particular information and techniques to produce accurate, realistic lip synchronization and facial expressions in the animated characters. *Id.* at 1313, 1316. The claims “focused on a specific asserted improvement in computer animation, i.e., the automatic use of rules of a particular type.” *Id.* at 1314. The order of specific, limited rules “renders information into a specific format that is [used to create] a sequence of synchronized, animated characters.” *Id.* at 1315; *see SAP America*, 898 F.3d at 1167 (the claims in *McRO* were directed to the creation of something physical—the display of lip synchronization and facial expressions of animated characters on screens for viewing by human eyes).

Here, claim 1 does not involve an improvement in wagering game *technology*. Cards are dealt, and wagers are made and resolved. The rules essentially involve gathering, processing, analyzing, and communicating information, albeit for a wagering card game, which are abstract concepts. *See Two-Way Media*, 874 F.3d at 1337–38; *Elec. Power Grp., LLC v. Alstom S.A.*, 830 F.3d 1350, 1355–56 (Fed. Cir. 2016); *TLI Commc’ns LLC Patent Litig.*, 823 F.3d 607, 611 (Fed. Cir. 2016); *Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.*, 822 F.3d 1327, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2006) (step one of *Alice* asks whether the claims focus on specific improvements in computer capabilities, or a process that merely invokes computers as a tool).

Alice Step Two: Do the Claims Contain an “Inventive Concept”?

We also agree with the Examiner that claim 1 does not recite any additional elements that are sufficient to amount to significantly more than the abstract idea of a set of rules for a wagering card game. Final Act. 2–3; Ans. 5–6. The Examiner finds that the rules, considered individually or as an ordered combination, represent traditional wagering game elements that do not transform the abstract idea of wagering game rules into a patent-eligible application. Final Act. 3; Ans. 6.

Appellants argue that claim 1 recites “*unconventional* overall ordered combinations of method acts” and “unconventional features that contribute to, and are therefore significant to, the solution provided by the claimed methods, and the solution is provided by way of an inventive concept, and not just mere generic application of abstract ideas.” Appeal Br. 38. These arguments are not persuasive because they do not explain why a particular order of abstract wagering game rules provides an inventive concept that transforms the abstract idea into a patent eligible application. *Smith* left open the possibility that claims directed to a game using a new or original deck of cards could survive step two of *Alice*. *Smith*, 815 F.3d at 819.

However, Appellants do not assert that the claimed method implements the abstract wagering game play rules on inventive cards or new game systems.

Instead, the Specification discloses that many different wagering games exist for home and casino environments, and the games must be exciting, uncomplicated, and easy to learn to avoid frustrating players. Spec. ¶ 3. New games must meet these criteria and be sufficiently different from old games to entice players to the new game. *Id.* Appellants then argue that their game is “new” because of the wagering rules used. Reply Br. 2–8.

Appellants describe their wagering game as a variant of Hold ‘Em poker that includes different wagering rules such as the option of checking or making specific wagering amounts in the first play wagers. *Id.* ¶ 4. All of the alleged innovations relate to an unconventional combination and order of wagering game rules.³ Appeal Br. 35–39. However, a claim directed to individual, or an ordered combination of, rules related to game play and wagering (dealing cards, making and resolving different types of wagers in different amounts) does not provide an inventive concept sufficient to transform the claimed subject matter into a patent-eligible application of the abstract idea. *See Smith*, 815 F.3d at 819; Appeal Br. 34–36, 40–41.

Even if claim 1 recites an unconventional ordered combination of wagering game rules for poker, claim 1 still is directed to the abstract idea of wagering. *See Smith*, 815 F.3d at 819; *see also Synopsys*, 839 F.3d at 1151 (“But a claim for a *new* abstract idea is still an abstract idea.”); *Versata*, 793 F.3d at 1335 (affirming unpatentability of claims that improved an abstract idea rather than computer performance).

Unlike the rules in *McRO*, the claimed wagering rules in this case do not transform a 3-D image of a dealer or player, nor do they improve a user device or display of the wagering game. The claimed wagering rules and their generic computer and game implementation merely allow players to exchange and resolve financial obligations based on probabilities and the distribution of the cards. *See Smith*, 815 F.3d at 818–19; Reply Br. 6–7. They make the game exciting while being easy to learn. *See Spec.* ¶ 2.

³ To emphasize this point, Appellants also argue that the additional elements required to make abstract wagering rules patent-eligible are not limited to physical elements or other implementing items and do not have to be tied to a machine or transform an article to be patentable. *Id.* at 31–34.

Appellants' arguments regarding preemption (Appeal Br. 13–17, 39–41; Reply Br. 8–9) are resolved by our § 101 analysis. *Two-Way Media*, 874 F.3d at 1339 (where patent claims are deemed patent ineligible, “preemption concerns are fully addressed and made moot”); *Ariosa Diagnostics*, 788 F.3d at 1379 (“questions on preemption are inherent in and resolved by the § 101 analysis.”). Thus, we sustain the rejection of claims 1–20.

DECISION

We affirm the rejection of claims 1–20.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

AFFIRMED