



# 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

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
14/015,473	08/30/2013	Bradley BERMAN	KSG.094.PAT1	6205
111805	7590	07/01/2020	EXAMINER	
King Show Games, INC. 10275 Wayzata Blvd. Suite 300 Minnetonka, MN 55305			DOSHI, ANKIT B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3715	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/01/2020	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):

ip@ksg.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

*Ex parte* BRADLEY BERMAN

---

Appeal 2020-000067  
Application 14/015,473  
Technology Center 3700

---

Before STEFAN STAIKOVICI, EDWARD A. BROWN, and  
CHARLES N. GREENHUT, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

GREENHUT, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 134(a), Appellant<sup>1</sup> appeals from the Examiner's decision to reject claims 1–20. *See* Final Act. 1. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We AFFIRM.

---

<sup>1</sup> We use the term “Appellant” to refer to “applicant” as defined in 37 C.F.R. § 1.42. Appellant identifies the real party in interest as King Show Games, Inc. Appeal Br. 2.

### CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The claims are directed to a gaming device having multi-positional game elements. Claim 1, reproduced below, is illustrative of the claimed subject matter:

1. A gaming device comprising:
  - a game display for displaying game events;
  - a wager input device structured to receive physical items associated with currency values;
  - a memory configured to store a credit amount;
  - a player interface device for receiving inputs related to the game events; and
  - a processor configured to:
    - receive a signal from the wager input device indicating receipt of a physical item associated with a currency value;
    - increase the credit amount stored in memory based on the currency value associated with the received physical item;
    - receive a wager on a primary game event, the wager decreasing the credit amount stored in the memory;
    - display an outcome of the primary game event on the game display;
    - determine if a bonus game event is triggered;
    - when a bonus game event is triggered:
      - providing a plurality of six-sided game elements, selecting a number of cards in a deck of cards for use in the bonus game event, the number of selected cards corresponding to six times the number of game elements provided, assigning each selected card to one of the six positions of the game elements so that each position of each game element is associated with a card, randomizing the game elements to display one position of each of the game elements, evaluating a poker hand created by the displayed cards on the displayed positions of the game elements;
      - determining if a bonus terminating condition has been received, and repeating the selection of cards, assignment of cards to game elements, randomization of the game elements, and evaluation steps until a bonus terminating condition has been received; and

provide awards associated with the primary game event and bonus game event, where the credit amount stored in the memory is increased by the provided awards.

## REJECTION<sup>2</sup>

Claims 1–20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to patent-ineligible subject matter. Final Act. 2–3.

## OPINION

### *Principles of Law*

An invention is patent-eligible if it claims a “new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter.” 35 U.S.C. § 101. However, the Supreme Court has long interpreted 35 U.S.C. § 101 to include implicit exceptions: “[l]aws of nature, natural phenomena, and abstract ideas” are not patentable. *E.g.*, *Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l*, 573 U.S. 208, 216 (2014).

In determining whether a claim falls within an excluded category, we are guided by the Supreme Court’s two-step framework, described in *Mayo* and *Alice*. *See Alice*, 573 U.S. at 217–18 (citing *Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.*, 566 U.S. 66, 75–77 (2012)). In accordance with that framework, we first determine what concept the claim is “directed to.” *Id.* at 219 (“On their face, the claims before us are drawn to the concept of intermediated settlement, *i.e.*, the use of a third party to mitigate settlement risk.”); *see also Bilski v. Kappos*, 561 U.S. 593, 611 (2010) (“Claims 1 and 4 in petitioners’ application explain the basic concept of hedging, or protecting against risk.”).

---

<sup>2</sup> The Examiner’s rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been withdrawn. Adv. Act. Feb. 20, 2018.

Concepts determined to be abstract ideas, and thus patent ineligible, include certain methods of organizing human activity, such as fundamental economic practices (*Alice*, at 219–20; *Bilski*, 561 U.S. at 611); mathematical formulas (*Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 594–95 (1978)); and mental processes (*Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 69 (1972)). Concepts determined to be patent eligible include physical and chemical processes, such as “molding rubber products” (*Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 192 (1981)); “tanning, dyeing, making water-proof cloth, vulcanizing India rubber, smelting ores” (*id.* at 184 n. 7 (quoting *Corning v. Burden*, 56 U.S. 252, 267–68 (1853))); and manufacturing flour (*Benson*, 409 U.S. at 69 (citing *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 785 (1876))).

If the claim is “directed to” an abstract idea, we turn to the second step of the *Alice* and *Mayo* framework, where “we must examine the elements of the claim to determine whether it contains an ‘inventive concept’ sufficient to ‘transform’ the claimed abstract idea into a patent-eligible application.” *Alice*, at 221 (quotation marks omitted). “A claim that recites an abstract idea must include ‘additional features’ to ensure ‘that the [claim] is more than a drafting effort designed to monopolize the [abstract idea].’” *Id.* ((alteration in the original) quoting *Mayo*, 566 U.S. at 77). “[M]erely requir[ing] generic computer implementation[] fail[s] to transform that abstract idea into a patent-eligible invention.” *Id.*

The PTO recently published revised guidance on the application of § 101. *2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance*, 84 Fed. Reg. 50 (Jan. 7, 2019) (hereinafter “Memorandum”). Under Step 2A of that guidance, we first look to whether the claim *recites*:

- (1) any judicial exceptions, including certain groupings of abstract ideas (i.e., mathematical concepts, certain methods of organizing

human activity such as a fundamental economic practice, or mental processes); and

(2) additional elements that integrate the judicial exception into a practical application (*see* MPEP<sup>3[1]</sup> § 2106.05(a)–(c), (e)–(h)).

Only if a claim (1) recites a judicial exception and (2) does not integrate that exception into a practical application, do we then look, in Step 2B, to whether the claim:

(3) adds a specific limitation beyond the judicial exception that is not “well-understood, routine, conventional” in the field (*see* MPEP § 2106.05(d)); or

(4) simply appends well-understood, routine, conventional activities previously known to the industry, specified at a high level of generality, to the judicial exception.

### *Analysis*

The Examiner and Appellant have both selected claim 1 as representative of the claims before us. Final Act. 2–5; App. Br. 11. We will also do so. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv).

Neither Appellant nor the Examiner makes any distinctions between device and method claims. Our reviewing court has made clear “the basic character of a process claim drawn to an abstract idea is not changed by claiming only its performance by computers, or by claiming the process embodied in program instructions on a computer readable medium.” *See CyberSource Corp v. Retail Decisions, Inc.* 654 F.3d 1366, 1375–76 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (citing *In re Abele*, 684 F.2d 902 (CCPA 1982)).

---

<sup>3[1]</sup> Manual of Patent Examining Procedure.

Appeal 2020-000067

Application 14/015,473

Other than the basic componentry recited that can be found in nearly any electronic wagering game device, including a display, a wager input device, a memory, a player input device, and a processor, claim 1 predominantly recites the *acts* each of those elements, particularly the processor, is configured or operable to *perform*. Particularly in light of its broad and functionally-defined nature, holding claim 1 necessarily passes muster under § 101 simply because it is an apparatus claim would “exalt form over substance.” The fact that claims directed to a device were not at issue on appeal in *In re Smith*, 815 F.3d 816 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (App. Br. 13) in no way alters this analysis. This Board’s primary role is to review adverse decisions of examiners. *See Ex Parte Frye*, 94 USPQ2d 1072, 1077 (BPAI 2010) citing 37 C.F.R. § 41.50(a)(1) (“The Board, in its decision, may affirm or reverse the decision of the examiner in whole or in part on the grounds and on the claims specified by the examiner”). Although the Board is authorized to reject claims under 37 C.F.R. § 41.50(b), no inference should be drawn when the Board elects not to do so. *See* MPEP § 1213.02.

Appellant argues:

A careful review of claim 1 clearly indicates that the claim is directed to a specific type of gaming device that is operable to play a novel game using a unique combination of processes to provide entertainment and excitement not found on any other known gaming device.

App. Br. 12,<sup>4</sup> However, the *specifics* which Appellant regards as “clearly indicate[d]” are, to the best of our knowledge, not described in Appellant’s

---

<sup>4</sup> *See also* App. Br 13 (“claim 1 is directed to a specific gaming device that is operable to implement novel, non-obvious processes for a game that provides an improved gaming device that is different from any other previous gaming device”); App. Br. 14–15 (“the new novel claim elements

briefing, or apparent from the claim language itself. “[T]he Board will not, as a general matter, unilaterally review those uncontested aspects of the rejection.” *Frye* at 1075–76 (citations omitted). Arguments must address the Examiner’s action. 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv) (“The arguments shall explain why the examiner erred as to each ground of rejection contested by appellant”). The Board will not advocate for Appellants by scouring the record to see if the Board can identify some flaw in the Examiner’s findings of fact, articulated reasoning, or legal conclusions. *See, e.g., Halliburton Energy Services, Inc. v. M-ILLC*, 514 F.3d 1244, 1250 n.2 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (“A skeletal ‘argument’, really nothing more than an assertion, does not preserve a claim.... Judges are not like pigs, hunting for truffles buried in briefs.”) (citation omitted).

The only aspects of claim 1 argued with specificity are:

a wager input device structured to receive physical items associated with currency values, and a processor operable to receive a signal from the wager input device indicating that a physical item associated with a currency value has been received, increase the credit amount stored in the memory based on the currency value of the received physical item, and receive a signal to initiate a gaming activity in response to placement of a wager, the wager decreasing the credit amount stored in the memory.

App. Br. 14. Appellant points out what the claim recites in this regard, but does not go so far as to assert these elements are, alone or as part of an ordered combination, anything beyond well-understood, routine, and conventional aspects of generic gaming machines. Final Act. 4–5. Indeed,

---

of claim 1 provide a new gaming device that is different and a potential improvement over conventional gaming devices. Hence, claim 1 is not directed to patent-ineligible subject matter”)



Appellant likely could not reasonably make such an assertion without violation of rule 41.11(a) (“Duty of candor”).

Appellant’s Specification clearly and unequivocally touts one of the benefits of computerized gaming apparatus as being easy reconfigured for “[p]laying new games:”

Computer gaming devices can also be easily adapted to provide entirely new games of chance that might be difficult to implement using mechanical or discrete electronic circuits. Because of the ubiquity of computerized gaming machines, players have come to expect the availability of an ever wider selection of new games when visiting casinos and other gaming venues. Playing new games adds to the excitement of “gaming.”

Spec. p. 1, ll. 22–32. Thus, the Specification essentially admits that the disclosed and claimed invention is directed to using a conventional device to play a new game. It is conceivable that such activity could, in certain circumstances, amount to “significantly more” or an “inventive concept” in the context of a section 101 inquiry. Here, however, the purportedly novel game is recited in the claim and described in the Specification only as a series of abstract rules associated with the game’s play. *See, e.g.*, Spec. p. 9, (describing the indicia used); pp. 10–12 (describing the game rules); pp. 13, 16–18, 24–25 (describing the payout structure—so-called “financial obligations” (*see Alice*, 573 U.S. at 217–18)). Put simply, Appellant’s invention is directed to *rules* for playing a game. It is an idea that is conjured up entirely in the human mind and then communicated to other persons orally or in writing. Claim 1 is nothing more than a sequence of human actions involving financial obligations performed in accordance with a certain protocol or set of rules, and using conventional wagering apparatus. Modifying a conventional gaming machine by changing the rules is purely

Appeal 2020-000067

Application 14/015,473

an abstract idea that is not *sufficient* to amount to significantly more than the abstract idea itself. *In re Smith*, 815 F.3d at 818.

### CONCLUSION

The Examiner's rejection is AFFIRMED.

### DECISION SUMMARY

Claim(s)	35 U.S.C. §	Basis/Reference(s)	Affirmed	Reversed
1 – 20	101	abstract idea	1 – 20	

### TIME PERIOD FOR RESPONSE

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

AFFIRMED