UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SPORTRADAR AG,
Petitioner

v.

SPORTSCASTR INC.,
(D/B/A PANDA INTERACTIVE),
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00273
U.S. Patent No. 11,039,218

PETITIONER'S SHOWING OF GOOD CAUSE FOR PARALLEL PETITIONS

Sportradar AG ("Petitioner") requests IPR of claims 1-30 of U.S. Patent No. 11,039,218 ("the '218"). Ex.1009. As explained in the Petition, the instant IPR petitions are "copycat" petitions raising the same grounds and relying on substantively the same evidence as the petitions in IPR2024-01310 & IPR2024-01311 filed on August 22, 2024 by Genius Sports LTD ("Genius"), and Petitioner intends to seek joinder with the -01310 and -01311 IPRs in the event they are instituted by the Board. *See* Petition at 1. Petitioner is also contemporaneously filing "copycat" parallel petitions separately challenging claims 1-9, 19-25, and 27-30 of U.S. Patent No. 10,805,687 ("the '687") claims 1-9, 19-25, and 27-30 of U.S. Patent No. 10,425,697 ("the '697").

1. REASONS WARRANTING TWO PETITIONS

PO is asserting 30 claims from '218 in the Texas Litigation. *See* Ex.1019 at 3; Ex.1048. The Board has recognized that in certain circumstances more than one petition may be necessary. *See* Trial Practice Guide Update (July 2019), p.26. Petitioner has filed two petitions related to '218's claims and respectfully requests that the Board institutes both petitions. The Board should institute both petitions for three basic reasons. First, the claims cannot be addressed in one petition because of the number and length of the claims (which alone includes roughly 2,988 words) and because of the nature of the claims themselves. Second, each petition challenges different claims. Thus, the petitions are not duplicative and efficiently address the

patentability of the '218 claims. Third, the petitions cite essentially the same art against all claims, thus minimizing the burden on the Board from instituting both petitions.

The first petition challenges 15 claims including two independent claims. The second petition also challenges 15 claims including two independent claims. The Challenged Claims are directed to substantially overlapping subject matter and the multiple petitions are only needed due to the large number and length of the Challenged Claims. *See e.g., AliveCor, Inc. v. Apple Inc.*, IPR2023-00949, paper 8 (P.T.A.B., January 9, 2024) (acknowledging that "[j]ust reproducing the [almost 1000 word] claims and claim limitations alone, as a Petitioner generally must do for purposes of appropriate analysis, accounts for a significant portion of the required 14,000 word count").

2. RANKING OF THE PETITIONS

Petitioner requests that the Board consider the petitions in the following order, however, for the reasons explained above, the Board's analysis of the claims asserted in the Texas Litigation would not be complete without considering both petitions:

Rank	Petition	Challenged Claims	Prior Art Applied in Grounds
A	IPR2025-00273	1-15	1. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2014/0229992 to Ellis et al. ("Ellis").

			2. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2016/0036910 to Spivey ("Spivey"). 3. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2015/0163379 to Herzog ("Herzog").
B	IPR2025-00275	16-30	1. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2014/0229992 to Ellis et al. ("Ellis"). 2. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2016/0036910 to Spivey ("Spivey"). 3. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2015/0163379 to Herzog ("Herzog").

3. CONCLUSION

Petitioner is filing these two IPR petitions against claims 1-30 of the '218 as "copycat" petitions to the petitions previously filed by Genius in IPR2024-01310 & IPR2024-01311, and intends to seek joinder with those IPRs (and assume a "passive understudy role") in the event they are instituted by the Board.[1] Petitioner has not previously filed any IPR petitions against the '218. Petitioner is thus not abusing process; rather, Petitioner is merely providing the Board with sufficient context and

[1] In the event that Genius withdraws its IPR petitions prior to institution, Petitioner intends to rely on the instant petitions as grounds for seeking *inter partes* review of claims 1-30 of the '218.

analysis to fully understand the nature of the challenged to the claims and the asserted prior art. For these reasons, the Board should institute both petitions.[2]

Date: December 11, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott W. Cummings/
Scott W. Cummings
Reg. No. 41,567
BRYAN CAVE LEIGHTON PAISNER LLP
scott.cummings@bclplaw.com

Alexander Walden
Provisionally recognized PTAB attorney
(affidavit to follow)
BRYAN CAVE LEIGHTON PAISNER LLP
alexander.walden@bclplaw.com

Frank Fabiani
Reg. No. 75,934
BRYAN CAVE LEIGHTON PAISNER LLP
frank.fabiani@bclplaw.com

Attorneys For Petitioner Sportradar AG

[2] The Administrate Procedures Act and substantive and procedural due process weigh against denying the institution of either petition under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

In compliance with 37 C.F.R. §§42.105, 42.6(e), the undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing Petitioner's Showing of Good Cause for Parallel Petitions was served on the 11th day of December 2024, via Federal Express® directed to PO at the correspondence address of record:

149890 - Smith Baluch LLP
376 Boylston St,
Suite 401
Boston, MA 02116

A courtesy copy was also served by electronic mail on PO's counsel of record in the Texas litigation:

Britton F. Davis
KING & SPALDING LLP
1401 Lawrence Street
Suite 1900
Denver, CO 80202
(720) 535-2300
bfdavis@kslaw.com

Christopher C. Campbell
KING & SPALDING LLP
1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 200
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 626-5578
ccampbell@kslaw.com

Ryan A. Schmid
KING & SPALDING LLP
1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 200
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 626-5578
rschmid@kslaw.com

Matthew D. Wood
KING & SPALDING LLP
500 West 2nd Street
Suite 1800
Austin, TX 78701
(512) 457-2000
mwood@kslaw.com

/Teresa C. Rodriguez/