

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LIGHT & WONDER, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

EVOLUTION MALTA LIMITED,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2025-01073

U.S. Patent No. 10,629,024

**PETITIONER REPLY TO
PATENT OWNER RESPONSE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	2
A. The Board Correctly Construed “Payout”	2
B. “A Spin Of The Roulette Wheel”	5
C. Alleged Sequence Of Elements	5
III. CLAIMS 1, 3-5, 7-8, 10-12, 14-15, 17-18, AND 20 ARE OBVIOUS OVER GROUND 1	8
A. Kido Discloses “Determine A First Payout For First Position And A Second Payout For The Second Position For The Spin Of The Roulette Wheel, Wherein The First Payout Is Higher Than The Second Payout”	8
B. Kido Teaches Claims 7, 14, And 20	10
1. Dr. Casey Applies An Improper Standard For A POSITA	10
2. Kido Renders Obvious Randomly Selecting A Second Position	11
3. It Would Be Obvious To Make The Payouts Different	12
IV. CLAIMS 2, 9, And 16 ARE OBVIOUS OVER GROUND 2	13
V. CLAIMS 1, 3-5, 7-8, 10-12, 14-15, 17-18, AND 20 ARE OBVIOUS OVER GROUND 3	14
A. Baron Discloses The “For A Spin Of The Roulette Wheel” Claim Elements	14
B. Baron Teaches Claims 7, 14, And 20	16
VI. EVOLUTION’S ALLEGED SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS CANNOT SAVE THE CLAIMS	18
VII. CONCLUSION	22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Page****CASES**

<i>Altiris, Inc. v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 318 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	5
<i>Ancora Techs., Inc. v. Roku, Inc.</i> , 140 F.4th 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2025)	21
<i>Fox Factory, Inc. v. SRAM, LLC</i> , 944 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	18, 19, 21
<i>In re Cree, Inc.</i> , 818 F.3d 694 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	21
<i>In re GPAC Inc.</i> , 57 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	19
<i>In re Harza</i> , 274 F.2d 669 (CCPA 1960)	12
<i>In re Huai-Hung Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	19, 20
<i>Interactive Gift Exp., Inc. v. CompuServe Inc.</i> , 256 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	5
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	22
<i>Leapfrog Enters., Inc. v. Fisher-Price, Inc.</i> , 485 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	22
<i>Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	7

<i>Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.</i> , 463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	20
<i>Profectus Tech. LLC v. Huawei Techs. Co.</i> , 823 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	2
<i>Seabed Geosolutions (US) Inc. v. Magseis FF LLC</i> , 8 F.4th 1285 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	2
<i>W.L. Gore & Assocs., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.</i> , 721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	18
<i>Wyers v. Master Lock Co.</i> , 616 F.3d 1231 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	21, 22

UPDATED LIST OF PETITIONER EXHIBITS

EX1001	U.S. Patent No. 11,011,014 (the “‘014 Patent”)
EX1002	File History for U.S. Patent No. 11,011,014
EX1003	Declaration of Stacy Friedman
EX1004	Curriculum Vitae of Stacy Friedman
EX1005	U.S. Patent No. 10,629,024 (the “‘024 Patent”)
EX1006	File History of U.S. Patent No. 10,629,024
EX1007	U.S. Pre-Grant Pub’l. No. 2008/0248853 (published Oct. 9, 2008) to Kido (“Kido”)
EX1008	U.S. Pre-Grant Pub’l. No. 2016/0155296 (published June 2, 2016) to Baron (“Baron”)
EX1009	U.S. Patent No. 9,600,974 to Yee (“Yee”)
EX1010	Evolution’s Response to Invalidity and Unenforceability Contentions
EX1011	U.S. Patent No. 11,756,371 (the “‘371 Patent”)
EX1012	Partial File History of U.S. Patent No. 11,756,371
EX1013	<i>Determine</i> , The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 5th Ed.
EX1014	Wikipedia, <i>Roulette</i> , https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roulette
EX1015	Complaint, <i>Evolution Malta Ltd. v. Light & Wonder, Inc.</i> , No. 2:24-cv-00993 (D. Nev. May 8, 2024)
EX1016	U.S. Patent No. 7,674,172 to Miltenberger (“Miltenberger”)
EX1017	U.S. Patent No. 9,646,459 to Hsu (“Hsu”)
EX1018	U.S. Pre-Grant Pub’l. No. 2002/0167126 (published Nov. 14, 2002) to Raedt (“Raedt”)

- EX1019 U.S. Patent No. 5,540,442 to Orselli (“Orselli”)
- EX1020 Chart Comparing Independent Claims 1, 9, and 17 of the ‘014 Patent
- EX1021 Chart Comparing Dependent Claims of the ‘014 Patent
- EX1022 Order Granting Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss
- EX1023 First Amended Complaint
- EX1024 Chart Comparing Independent Claims 1, 8, and 15 of the ‘024 Patent
- EX1025 Chart Comparing Dependent Claims of the ‘024 Patent
- EX1026 U.S. Pre-Grant Pub’l. No. 2011/0006477 (published Jan. 13, 2011) to Miller (“Miller”)
- EX1027 WO 2015/139088 A1 to Witty (“Witty”)
- EX1028 U.S. Pre-Grant Pub’l. No. 2008/0242393 (published Oct. 2, 2008) to Kido (“Kido 393”)
- EX1029 U.S. Pre-Grant Pub’l. No. 2007/0060262 (published Mar. 15, 2007) to Kosaka (“Kosaka”)
- EX1030 Chart Comparing Independent Claims 1, 11, and 21 of the ‘371 Patent
- EX1031 Chart Comparing Dependent Claims of the ‘371 Patent
- EX1032 JOHN SCARNE, SCARNE’S NEW COMPLETE GUIDE TO Gambling (1st Fireside ed. 1986)
- EX1033 *Roulette*, CAESARS (1996),
https://web.archive.org/web/19961031041803fw_/http://www.caesars.com/GamingGuide/Roulette.Content.html
- EX1034 *Roulette*, MICROGAMING SYSTEMS (1999),
<https://web.archive.org/web/19990503024445/http://www.microgaming.com:80/html/roulette.html>
- EX1035 Richard Marosi, *Casino Boss Can’t Cash In On Game He Developed*, L.A. TIMES (Nov. 3, 2002)

- EX1036 Andrew W. Scott, *Baccarat Without the Juice*, GAMING (Jan./Feb. 2013)
- EX1037 Rakesh Wadhwa, NO-COMMISSION BACCARAT (2d ed. 2006)
- EX1038 U.S. Patent No. 4,836,553 to Suttle (“Suttle”)
- EX1039 U.S. Patent No. 5,288,081 to Breeding (“Breeding”)
- EX1040 U.S. Patent No. 5,685,774 to Webb (“Webb”)
- EX1041 Letter from Keith Cooper, State of Nevada Gaming Control Board to John Piccoli, D.P. Stud, Incorporated, approving the operation of “E Z Baccarat” (Dec. 24, 2003)
- EX1042 U.S. Patent No. 7,435,172 to Hall (“Hall”)
- EX1043 Ultimate Texas Hold ‘Em, U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 77/726,392 (filed May 24, 2010)
- EX1044 Benjamin Spillman, *Global Gaming Expo 2006: Take my game, please*, LAS VEGAS REV. J. (Nov. 20, 2006)
- EX1045 Richard N. Velotta, *Seeking A Place At The Gaming Table*, LAS VEGAS SUN (May 12, 2009)
- EX1046 *Roulette*, WIZARD OF ODDS (2016)
<https://web.archive.org/web/20161119154345/http://lwizardofodds.com:80/games/roulette/basics/> (describes Roulette win probabilities)
- EX1047 *Top Hat™ Twenty-One*, ROBERTWINTER.COM (May 29, 2006)
https://web.archive.org/web/20060529010957/https://www.robertwinter.com/slot/odyssey/images/flyers/th_f.jpg
- EX1048 *Rapid Roulette*, SHUFFLE MASTER INC. (May 7, 2005)
- EX1049 *Winning Games*, WAGERWORKS (Mar. 10, 2007)
- EX1050 *Putting It All On The Table*, DIGIDEAL (n.d.)

- EX1051 *This Month in Physics History, July 1654: Pascal’s Letters to Fermat on the ‘Problem of Points,’* APS125 (July 2009),
aps.org/archives/publications/apsnews/200907/physicshistory.cfm
- EX1052 *Wheel Poker*, WIZARD OF ODDS (Apr. 21, 2010),
<https://web.archive.org/web/20120201095611/https://wizardofodds.com/games/video-poker/tables/wheel-poker/>
- EX1053 *Bonus Spin*, AGS (2016),
<https://web.archive.org/web/20170227055308/http://www.playags.com/portfolio/bonus-spin>
- EX1054 U.S. Patent No. 7,901,285 to Tran (“Tran”)
- EX1055 U.S. Patent No. 6,659,866 to Frost (“Frost”)
- EX1056 U.S. Pre-Grant Pub’l. No. 2014/0094244 (published Apr. 3, 2014) to Baron (“Baron and Haushalter”)
- EX1057 U.S. Patent No. 6,457,715 to Friedman (“Friedman ‘715”)
- EX1058 U.S. Patent No. 7,651,096 to Friedman (“Friedman ‘096”)
- EX1059 U.S. Patent No. 8,074,992 to Friedman (“Friedman ‘992”)
- EX1060 *Sic Bo*, WIZARD OF ODDS (Jan. 21, 2005),
<https://web.archive.org/web/20111007213531/http://wizardofodds.com/sicbo/rules.html>
- EX1061 *Spectacular*, The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 5th Ed.
- EX1062 Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss Original Complaint
- EX1063 Evolution’s Motion for Leave to File Second Amended Complaint
- EX1064 Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss First Amended Complaint
- EX1065 Joint Stipulation to Extend Fact Discovery Cut Off Deadline Only (July 25, 2025, Dkt. 150)

- EX1066 U.S. District Courts, Federal Court Management Statistics (June 30, 2025)
- EX1067 Defendants' Motion to Compel Arbitration
- EX1068 Order Granting Motion to Compel Arbitration
- EX1069 Parties' Joint Status Report (D. Nev. No. 2:24-cv-00993, Apr. 30, 2026, Dkt. 179)
- EX1070 Minute Order [Staying case pending arbitration] (D. Nev. No. 2:24-cv-00993, May 5, 2026, Dkt. 180)
- EX1071 Declaration of Stacy Friedman in Support of Petitioner Reply
- EX1072 U.S. Patent No. 7,618,319 to Casey
- EX1073 U.S. Patent No. 5,934,999 to Valdez
- EX1074 *Frank Floor Talk: Slots 101 – Persistence slot machines*, CDC GAMING (May 26, 2026), <https://cdcgaming.com/commentary/frank-floor-talk-slots-101-persistence-slot-machines/>
- EX1075 *Monthly Revenue Report*, NEVADA GAMING CONTROL BOARD (April 2026), <https://www.gaming.nv.gov/siteassets/content/about/gaming-revenue/monthly-revenue-report---april-2026.pdf>
- EX1076 LinkedIn profile of Todd Haushalter, <https://www.linkedin.com/in/toddhaushalter/>
- EX1077 *Let It Ride Progressive and Three Card Poker Progressive rules of play*, SHUFFLE MASTER (Oct. 9, 2009), https://www.gaming.nv.gov/siteassets/content/divisions/enforcement/rules-of-play/Let_It_Ride_Progressive_-_Three_Card_Poker_Progressive.pdf
- EX1078 U.S. Patent No. 7,780,511 to Casey
- EX1079 U.S. Patent No. 6,059,659 to Busch
- EX1080 U.S. Patent No. 7,892,083 to Okada

I. INTRODUCTION

The Board correctly found that L&W demonstrated a reasonable likelihood of prevailing in showing the unpatentability of the independent claims of the '024 patent and instituted IPR against all challenged claims accordingly. DI, 18. Evolution's POR rehashes arguments the Board already rejected in granting institution—chief among them the untenable claim-construction position that game prizes expressly described in Kido and Baron as “*payouts*” are somehow not “*payouts*” within the meaning of the claims. The Board rejected Evolution's construction, finding that “the current record does not support limiting the term ‘payout’ to just the amount a player will win in relation to the amount wagered.” *Id.*, 13. As shown below, the record has not meaningfully changed.

The POR also repeats Evolution's meritless “spin of the wheel” argument, insisting Baron requires “multiple spins of [multiple] wheels.” But the Petition relies on Baron's Figure 6 embodiment, which uses a *single roulette wheel 406* and a random number generator—not additional wheels (physical, virtual, or otherwise)—to produce multiple outcomes within a single round of play. The few new arguments of the POR, principally an unsupported sequence-of-elements theory and motivation-to-combine arguments that fail to apply a proper POSITA viewpoint, do not save any of Evolution's claims.

Challenged claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-18, and 20 should be held unpatentable.

II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

A. The Board Correctly Construed “Payout”

Evolution reasserts the same narrow construction of “payout” that the Board rejected at institution, arguing that “payout” means “the amount a player will win in relation to the amount wagered.” POR, 3-4, 14-21; DI, 7-9. The Board found this unpersuasive, noting that while the specification provides examples in odds format, it “also states that ‘[a]ny suitable payouts can be used in some embodiments,’” which “suggests a broader interpretation of ‘payout’ beyond just payout odds[.]” DI, 8. Nothing in the POR undermines this correct finding. The intrinsic evidence thus supports L&W’s plain and ordinary meaning construction of “payout,” and Evolution’s extrinsic evidence cannot narrow the term contrary to the intrinsic record. *Profectus Tech. LLC v. Huawei Techs. Co.*, 823 F.3d 1375, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (“Extrinsic evidence may not be used to contradict claim meaning that is unambiguous in light of the intrinsic evidence.”) (internal citations omitted); *Seabed Geosolutions (US) Inc. v. Magseis FF LLC*, 8 F.4th 1285, 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2021) (“[T]o the extent the Board relied on extrinsic evidence to alter the meaning of [a claim term] that is clear from the intrinsic evidence, that was error.”).

The term “payout” should be interpreted according to its plain and ordinary meaning: an amount that is paid to someone. As L&W explained in its Reply to

the POPR (at 2-3), there is no evidence of disclaimer or lexicography in the intrinsic record that would warrant departure from that meaning. The '024 patent's examples of odds-formatted payouts are not limiting (“[a]ny suitable payouts can be used,” EX1005, 5:14-15), and multiple references cited during prosecution use “payout” to describe amounts unrelated to the wager. Paper 12 (Reply to POPR), 3 (citing Valdez, Busch, Okada, filed herewith as EX1073, EX1079, EX1080, respectively). The IPR art confirms that the term “payout” is not limited to odds-formatted payouts: Kido describes its jackpot as “a special payout” (EX1007, ¶[0129]) and states that the privilege unit “awards, as a payout, the game value stored in the accumulated game value memory” (*id.*, ¶¶[0117], [0119]). Baron likewise describes a “payout” as “an entire amount of the progressive pot.” EX1008, ¶[0045].

Evolution's position is also self-contradictory. In the parallel district court proceeding, Evolution insists the '024 patent represents an unconventional technological improvement over standard roulette, yet here demands that “payout” be confined to its alleged meaning in “conventional” roulette, the fixed 35:1 odds format. *See, e.g.*, EX1023, 017, 024, 025 (“[T]he patents claim a new game of roulette and technological improvements[.]”). Moreover, as a practical matter, any amount can be expressed in relation to what is wagered: a \$75,000 jackpot won on

a \$10 bet is a 7,500:1 payout. EX1071, ¶¶50-57¹. What matters in the '024 patent's claims is that the first payout is higher than the second, not the format in which it is expressed.

Mr. Friedman's deposition statement that "a traditional game of roulette does not include a progressive jackpot" (EX2045, 40:4-6) is beside the point because the '024 patent does not claim traditional roulette, as Evolution has repeatedly confirmed. *See, e.g.*, POR, 8 (contrasting the '024 patent and Lightning Roulette with "traditional roulette"). Mr. Friedman's general statement that "table games almost always specify payouts as N-to-1" (EX2045, 46:16-18) is irrelevant for the same reason; if anything, the qualifier "almost always" confirms that payouts are not categorically limited to those in an N-to-1 format. And Dr. Casey makes the same errors as Evolution in seeking to impose an odds-based requirement onto the term "payout" (EX2042, ¶¶78-95), and his own patents use the term "payout" to describe roulette games with absolute-amount payouts. *See, e.g.*, EX1072, 4:19-26, 11:31-37 ("standard payout of 100 credits").

Evolution's construction of "payout" should be rejected.

¹ L&W cites portions of Mr. Friedman's declaration (EX1071) that reference Evolution's related U.S. Patent No. 11,011,014 because the same analysis is equally applicable to the '024 patent. The patents share substantially similar claim limitations, and Evolution's arguments overlap accordingly. EX1071, ¶66.

B. “A Spin Of The Roulette Wheel”

Evolution asserts that “a spin of the roulette wheel” means one spin of one wheel and argues this defeats the Petition’s Baron grounds. POR, 21-23, 50-56. L&W agrees that the claims require a number of steps performed for a particular spin of the claimed “roulette wheel,” but disagrees that this defeats the Petition’s Baron grounds. As explained in Section V.A below, Baron discloses table 400 with wheel 406 and teaches each claim step relative to a single spin of that single wheel.

C. Alleged Sequence Of Elements

Evolution argues that the final five limitations of independent claims 1, 8, and 15 must be performed in the order listed. POR, 23-26. But “unless the steps ... actually recite an order,” claim steps are not limited to the order written. *Interactive Gift Exp., Inc. v. CompuServe Inc.*, 256 F.3d 1323, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2001). In this regard, the Federal Circuit has articulated a two-part test: (1) whether claim language “as a matter of logic or grammar” requires the order; or (2) whether the specification “directly or implicitly requires such a narrow construction.” *Altiris, Inc. v. Symantec Corp.*, 318 F.3d 1363, 1369-70 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (quotation omitted). Evolution’s argument fails both parts.

First, neither the logic nor the grammar of the claim language requires that the first and second payouts be determined before the ball lands. EX1071, ¶¶43-

47. The “randomly select” step expressly requires that the random selection occur “prior to the ball falling into a position on the roulette wheel,” but the “determine a first payout ... and a second payout” step lacks any such restriction:

randomly select a first selected position on the roulette wheel for the spin of the roulette wheel prior to the ball falling into a position on the roulette wheel, wherein the first selected position is the same as the first position;
determine a first payout for first position and a second payout for the second position for the spin of the roulette wheel, wherein the first payout is higher than the second payout;

EX1005, Cl. 1 (highlighting added).

In fact, during prosecution, Evolution amended the “randomly select” step to add “prior to the ball falling,” demonstrating knowledge of how to limit certain steps temporally. EX1006, 072. Evolution did not similarly limit the “determine [the first and second payouts]” step:

randomly select a first selected position on the roulette wheel for the spin of the roulette wheel prior to the ball falling into a position on the roulette wheel, wherein the first selected position is the same as the first position;
determine a first payout for first position and a second payout for the second position for the spin of the roulette wheel, wherein the first payout is higher than the second payout;

Id.

The express inclusion of a requirement in one element, coupled with its omission from another, evidences an intentional choice to leave the latter unrestricted. *See Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.*, 358 F.3d 898, 910 (Fed. Cir. 2004). The “determine [the first and second payouts]” limitation is accordingly not restricted to occurring “prior to the ball falling.”

Evolution argues that payouts must “logically” be determined before the ball falls because “it would be highly suspicious” otherwise, and Dr. Casey states that “determining the payouts while the ball is spinning allows the excitement to build.” POR, 24 (citing EX2042, ¶ 103). But there are no claim limitations relating to player wariness or building excitement. EX1071, ¶¶43-47. Evolution’s and Dr. Casey’s arguments fail since they are based on elements that do not exist in the claims.

Second, the specification does not require payouts to be determined before the ball lands. The ’024 patent expressly states that “at least some of the ... blocks of the process of FIG. 2 can be executed or performed in any order or sequence not limited to the order and sequence shown in and described in the figure.” EX1005, 7:16-24. Evolution ignores this critical disclosure and instead argues that “Step 212 must occur before Step 214” because determining new payouts before the ball lands “builds excitement.” POR, 26. But again, there are no limitations relating to excitement. While the first payout must be determined prior to the final claim step

(“indicat[e] that the first player is to be paid at the first payout”), nothing in the intrinsic evidence requires payout determination before the ball lands. Rather, the specification teaches it can happen “in any order.”

III. CLAIMS 1, 3-5, 7-8, 10-12, 14-15, 17-18, AND 20 ARE OBVIOUS OVER GROUND 1

A. Kido Discloses “Determine A First Payout For First Position And A Second Payout For The Second Position For The Spin Of The Roulette Wheel, Wherein The First Payout Is Higher Than The Second Payout”

Evolution raises several arguments against Kido’s disclosure of this element, most of which the Board already rejected. None have merit.

First, the POR’s argument (at 29-32) that Kido’s progressive payout is not a “payout” was already rejected by the Board. DI, 14 (finding Kido “even describes its bonus routines and jackpots as payouts”). Nothing warrants a departure from this finding. *See* Section II.A, *supra*. Likewise, Evolution’s argument that Kido’s payout determination occurs after the ball falls (POR, 36) depends on Evolution’s erroneous sequence-of-steps claim-construction position refuted above in Section II.C.

Second, Evolution contends Kido’s standard 35:1 payout is the same for every position, so Kido cannot disclose a “first payout” that “is higher than the second payout.” POR, 32-35; EX2042, ¶128 (asserting “Kido does not provide a mechanism for varying roulette payouts among different numbers on the wheel”).

But the Petition explained that a player in Kido wins $A11 + A12$ (*i.e.*, the accumulated Prog bonus together with the standard base-odds payout for a non-star-mark position) when the player's bet matches the ball outcome and the same position is the star mark, whereas a player receives $A12$ only (*i.e.*, the standard base-odds payout) when the player wins on a number that is not the star mark. Pet., 33-36; EX1003, ¶¶159-167. In view of these disclosures, the Board correctly found that “a first payout that receives Kido's accumulated Prog bonus payout is necessarily higher than a second payout that does not receive the Prog bonus.” DI, 14.

Third, Evolution argues that Kido determines a payout for “only one position on the roulette wheel: the position the ball fell into.” POR, 32-36 (emphasis omitted). The Board squarely rejected this at institution, finding that “[t]he portions of Kido cited by Petitioner disclose that bet win determining unit 111 determines payouts based on the payout rate relative to the bet type for all positions bet.” DI, 15-16. Evolution now points to Kido's paragraph [0114] to argue that payout calculating unit 114 operates only “when it is yes.” POR, 35-36. But the claims require *determining* the first and second payouts for the respective first and second positions; they do not require *calculations* of any payouts. In Kido, when one player wins on the star mark position and another player places a losing bet on a different position (receiving \$0), Kido has necessarily determined

two payouts for the two respective positions. EX1003, ¶163. Further, this is another example of Kido disclosing a first (greater-than-zero) payout that is greater than a second payout of zero. *Id.*

B. Kido Teaches Claims 7, 14, And 20

Claims 7, 14, and 20 each require the processor to “randomly select a second selected position on the roulette wheel” and “determine a payout for the second selected position that is different than the payout for the first position.”

Evolution’s arguments rest on flawed premises about the skill of a POSITA and an erroneous insistence that game features must be perfectly balanced as disclosed. EX1071, ¶¶9-25.

1. Dr. Casey Applies An Improper Standard For A POSITA

Dr. Casey’s arguments for claims 7, 14, and 20 interpret the prior art from the viewpoint of someone ignorant of casino game design principles. EX1071, ¶¶9-12. He argues that Kido at most discloses one star-triggered privilege that a game designer would reject as exploitable and that the selection of a second star mark would further undermine Kido’s commercial viability. EX2042, ¶¶129-58. But a POSITA “familiar with gaming mathematics would already understand” how to set payouts “for numbers not selected ... to account for the increased payouts of the selected numbers” and “would have been capable of using probability theory to carry out the calculations necessary to implement the mathematics described in the

challenged patents.” EX1003, ¶¶95-96. A proper POSITA would know how to adjust game aspects of Kido and re-evaluate if a feature appears to pay back too much. EX1071, ¶¶18-20.

Further, Dr. Casey’s reasoning, if accepted, would apply equally against Evolution’s own claims. *Id.*, ¶¶14-16. His “exploit” involves a player wagering on every roulette position, guaranteeing that the player has wagered on a star-mark position. EX2042, ¶¶135-136. But the same logic applies to the ’024 patent: a player could wager on every position, guaranteeing a win with the increased payout. EX1071, ¶¶14-16. Dr. Casey himself opines that Evolution’s Lightning Roulette is an embodiment of the claims (EX2042, ¶194), yet it too would be “exploitable” under his reasoning. EX1071, ¶¶14-16. As Mr. Friedman explains (*id.*), a proper POSITA understands that such increased payouts cannot feasibly be awarded on every spin in a game with only 38 equal possibilities where the player may bet on all of them, and this understanding applies equally to the ’024 patent, Lightning Roulette, and Kido.

2. Kido Renders Obvious Randomly Selecting A Second Position

Evolution argues that the Petition did not provide a reason for using a second star mark in Kido. POR, 38-39. In fact, the Petition showed that “[a] POSA would have understood that, after a first selected position is randomly selected, it would have been obvious to randomly select a second,” citing Mr. Friedman’s testimony

that Kido discloses multiple privilege routines, each of which can randomly select a position of a star mark, and that Kido discloses combining its privileges. Pet., 46-48; EX1003, ¶¶189-190. When combining privileges, there are only two possibilities: either the same star mark triggers both, or two different star marks each trigger one. EX1003, ¶190; EX1071, ¶31. A POSITA would have understood that combining privileges triggered by the same star mark would lead to higher mathematical variance than implementing two privileges with different star positions, and would have chosen either approach based on mathematical design goals. EX1003, ¶190; EX1071, ¶¶29-31. It would therefore have been at least obvious to combine two privilege routines by randomly selecting a different star mark for each, thus disclosing the claimed “randomly select a second selected position on the roulette wheel.” EX1003, ¶190; EX1071, ¶¶26-33.

The Petition further explained that simply reciting two or more of something does not, by itself, qualify as a nonobvious difference. *See In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 671-672 (CCPA 1960). The POR (at 39 n.10) attempts to distinguish *Harza* by noting the claims’ different-payout requirement, but making the payouts different is itself obvious, as explained below.

3. It Would Be Obvious To Make The Payouts Different

Evolution argues L&W has not provided any reason why the payouts for each star mark would be different in an implementation of Kido using two different

star marks. POR, 44-45. But once the two different star marks are selected, the payouts could only be the same or different, and making them different is at least obvious. Pet. 47-48; EX1003, ¶¶191-192. Doing so would satisfy Kido's stated "object of the invention [which] is to provide a roulette gaming device that awards a new game value to several numbers." EX1003, ¶191 (quoting EX1007, ¶[0008]). Kido also describes an objective of avoiding "monotonous" play and "increasing a player's game desire" (EX1007, ¶¶[0006]-[0008]), and a POSITA would have recognized that different payouts for different selected positions would add excitement, motivating this design choice. Pet. 47-48; EX1003, ¶¶191-192. Further, many other games provided different awards for different winning outcomes, and it would have been obvious to do so in Kido. Pet., 48; EX1003, ¶192. Dr. Casey's exploitability arguments (EX2042, ¶¶132-162) do not respond to these showings.

IV. CLAIMS 2, 9, AND 16 ARE OBVIOUS OVER GROUND 2

Evolution does not separately contest the unpatentability of dependent claims 2, 9, and 16 under Ground 2, relying instead on its arguments against Kido for the independent claims in Ground 1. POR, 48. Because those arguments are fully addressed above, dependent claims 2, 9, and 16 are unpatentable for at least the same reasons as the claims from which they depend.

V. CLAIMS 1, 3-5, 7-8, 10-12, 14-15, 17-18, AND 20 ARE OBVIOUS OVER GROUND 3

A. Baron Discloses The “For A Spin Of The Roulette Wheel” Claim Elements

Evolution’s arguments that Baron does not disclose certain “for a spin of the roulette wheel” claim elements rest on the incorrect premise that the Petition relies on a three-wheel embodiment of Baron. POR, 50-55. Evolution points to Baron’s Figure 4, depicting a table with three roulette wheels, and argues that “Baron’s game requires spinning three different roulette wheels.” POR, 5, 49. But the Petition never cites Figure 4 for this purpose. It relies on Baron’s Figure 6, which depicts a table 400 containing a single roulette wheel 406. Pet., 53-70.




FIG. 6

The Petition (at 54, 61-66) showed that in a given round, “[a] plurality of roulette outcomes” are generated: a “primary roulette outcome” is produced by the physical wheel and ball, and “ancillary outcomes” are “generated utilizing a random number generator [RNG] (e.g., operated by a control circuit).” EX1008,

¶¶[0039]-[0041]. The Petition mapped these disclosures to the challenged claims, explaining that Baron’s ancillary outcomes are generated by the RNG during a single round in which the single roulette wheel 406 is spun once. Pet., 62-66. Evolution’s arguments related to the three wheels of Baron’s Figure 4 do not respond to the Petition’s unpatentability showing, and Evolution’s other arguments lack merit for the reasons below.

First, the POR (at 53) argues that because Baron’s roulette wheels generate outcomes by a ball falling into a position, none can select a position “prior to” a ball falling. EX2042, ¶174. That argument fails because the Petition does not map ancillary outcomes to balls falling into positions and instead cites Baron’s ancillary outcomes generated via a RNG. Pet., 62-63; EX1003, ¶¶251-257; EX1008, ¶[0041]. Baron further discloses that ancillary outcomes can be generated “at the close of wagering or at the beginning of a new round of play,” *i.e.*, before the ball falls into its outcome position on the single physical wheel. EX1008, ¶[0088]; Pet., 63-64.

Second, Dr. Casey contends Baron does not disclose bet information “corresponding to only a single [first | second] position on the roulette wheel” because Baron’s progressive wagering involves a separate side bet. EX2042, ¶175. But the claims do not require a traditional straight-up wager or exclude side bets. EX1071, ¶¶58-61. Baron’s progressive wager is made on a single number, just as

the claims require, and the player's predicted outcome corresponds to a single position on the roulette wheel. EX1008, Abstract, Fig. 1 at 102.

Third, the POR (at 54-55) argues that Baron's payouts are the same for any one spin of one roulette wheel, and higher payouts require results from two spins of two wheels. But again, L&W is not relying on an embodiment of Baron using multiple wheels, and the actual relied-upon embodiment from Baron discloses higher payouts resulting from one spin of one roulette wheel in conjunction with a randomly-generated number. Pet., 55-70.

Finally, Baron does not use "multiple spins of multiple roulette wheels" to any greater extent than the '024 patent itself. POR, 52; EX1071, ¶¶48-49. Like Baron, the '024 patent uses a random number generator to select positions for increased payouts (EX1005, 4:56-65), and Evolution's Lightning Roulette "combines Live Casino with a high-payout RNG (Random Number Generator) element." EX2027, 2.

B. Baron Teaches Claims 7, 14, And 20

Evolution argues L&W "completely fails to identify [the] 'second selected position' [required by claims 7, 14, and 20] in Baron." POR, 56-57. That is wrong. The Petition identified Baron's randomly generated roulette outcomes as the claimed "selected position[s]" and explained that Baron's random number generator may generate "one or more of the plurality of roulette outcomes."

EX1008, ¶¶[0039]-[0041]; Pet., 75. The Petition further identified Baron’s Figure 3 as disclosing three randomly generated roulette outcomes, including two ancillary outcomes (also referred to as “progressive outcomes”) and one primary outcome, and Baron explains that each such outcome may be any number from zero to thirty-six. EX1008, Fig. 3, ¶[0041]; Pet., 75. The two ancillary outcomes are the first and second “selected position[s]” required by the claims. Pet., 75; EX1003, ¶¶292-295.

Evolution does not dispute that Baron’s random number generator can select multiple roulette positions for a single round. POR, 55-57. Instead, Evolution argues that these positions cannot be “selected positions” because they are supposedly determined by “wheels” and therefore are “outcome positions.” *Id.* But as explained in Section V.A above, the Petition relied on Baron’s Figure 6 embodiment using a single wheel, and the ancillary-outcome positions are determined by a RNG, not wheels.

Dr. Casey contends that Mr. Friedman “does not explain why generating multiple ‘roulette outcomes’ requires selecting both a first and second position for increased payouts.” EX2042, ¶182. But this rests on the flawed premise that both positions must receive “increased” payouts. EX1071, ¶¶26-33. The claims require only that they be different. Mr. Friedman’s example (EX1003, ¶¶292-293) directly refutes Dr. Casey: there is only one ball, landing on 24; the RNG generates

outcomes of 24 and 10; and the different match counts yield different payouts (100:1 vs. 7:1).

VI. EVOLUTION’S ALLEGED SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS CANNOT SAVE THE CLAIMS

Evolution argues that secondary considerations save the challenged claims (POR, 57-71), but they do not.

First, Evolution’s alleged secondary considerations are “irrelevant to the issue of anticipation.” *W.L. Gore & Assocs., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1562 n.10 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (Davis, J., concurring in part). The Petition showed that the majority of the challenged claims are anticipated by Kido and Baron, and the Board agreed that L&W has shown a reasonable likelihood that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 are anticipated by Kido. DI, 17. Evolution’s alleged secondary considerations are irrelevant to L&W’s anticipation showings.

Second, there is no presumption of nexus because Lightning Roulette is not coextensive with the claims. Evolution invokes a presumption of nexus, but that presumption attaches only where the product is “coextensive” with the claims, *i.e.*, where the product is “essentially the claimed invention.” *Fox Factory, Inc. v. SRAM, LLC*, 944 F.3d 1366, 1373-74 (Fed. Cir. 2019). The POR’s element-by-element chart (at 62-70) proves, at most, that Lightning Roulette falls within the claims, but the POR nowhere shows that Lightning Roulette is coextensive with the claims, and it is not. The claims recite a wagering system including a roulette

wheel, ball, and hardware processor configured to perform steps. Lightning Roulette, by contrast, includes numerous additional features: an “online” format in which “players can see a live video feed from a studio,” where “a [live dealer] host presents the game,” among others. POR, 1, 6, 9, 58, 62. None of these features is claimed. Because Lightning Roulette is not coextensive with the claims, no presumption arises. *Fox Factory*, 944 F.3d at 1375.

Third, without the presumption of nexus, none of Evolution’s four categories supplies the required nexus. Objective indicia merit weight only if the patentee proves a nexus between the evidence and “the merits of the claimed invention.” *In re GPAC Inc.*, 57 F.3d 1573, 1580 (Fed. Cir. 1995). The nexus must run to what is both claimed and novel: “[w]here the offered secondary consideration actually results from something other than what is both claimed and novel in the claim, there is no nexus.” *In re Huai-Hung Kao*, 639 F.3d 1057, 1068 (Fed. Cir. 2011).

The only feature Evolution identifies as allegedly being new is the random selection of roulette positions for increased payouts. *See, e.g.*, EX1015, 024. But the Petition demonstrated that this feature was disclosed years before the ’024 patent: Along with the asserted prior art, the Petition also cited Orselli, which discloses paying “odds of 1000 to 1” for a coincidence between a roulette outcome and a random number generator output (EX1019, 3:8-12); de Raedt, which

discloses “randomly selecting a plurality of numbers as bonus game numbers” with multipliers such as “five times the normal payoff” (EX1018, [0047]-[0051]); and Hsu (2013), which discloses a “dynamic raised odds calculation element” that “randomly selects a specific number of the game results and generates dynamic raised odds” for roulette (EX1017, Abstract).

Thus, even if Evolution could tie its evidence to the claimed random selection of roulette positions for increased payouts, that would still not establish nexus to any inventive feature because this alleged point of novelty was already well known in the prior art. EX1071, ¶¶62-65. Evidence attributable to prior-art features cannot supply the required nexus to the challenged claims. *Kao*, 639 F.3d at 1068; *Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.*, 463 F.3d 1299, 1311-12 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

Fourth, Evolution’s own evidence confirms that its asserted secondary considerations are driven by unclaimed features. The awards and press materials praise the overall Lightning Roulette experience, including its online, live-dealer format, and studio presentation. POR, 57-59. Those features are not claimed, and Evolution does not show that any award, praise, commercial success, alleged long-felt need, or asserted skepticism was caused by the random selection of roulette positions for increased payouts, specifically. *See id.* At most, Evolution’s evidence shows that a branded, online live-dealer game succeeded in the

marketplace; it does not show that the claimed invention was nonobvious. *Fox Factory*, 944 F.3d at 1375.

Fifth, L&W's license does not prove secondary considerations. The March 2021 agreement was a forward-looking business deal for L&W to develop a land-based version of the branded Lightning Roulette product, not a license reflecting the inventive value of the claimed random-selection mechanism. EX2014; POR, 59. Licenses are often taken for business reasons unrelated to the merits of a patent. *In re Cree, Inc.*, 818 F.3d 694, 703 (Fed. Cir. 2016). Nor does *Ancora* help Evolution. There, the Federal Circuit credited litigation-settlement licenses taken late in litigation and supported by royalties that "far exceeded the cost of litigation," reflecting a reluctance to risk larger infringement exposure and the market value of the patented technology. *Ancora Techs., Inc. v. Roku, Inc.*, 140 F.4th 1351, 1362-63 (Fed. Cir. 2025). The L&W agreement is not commensurate with this: Evolution offers no comparable settlement, royalty-magnitude, or patent-valuation evidence.

Sixth, Evolution's copying theory likewise fails. Copying requires "evidence of efforts to replicate a specific product"; a pending infringement allegation is not evidence of copying. *Wyers v. Master Lock Co.*, 616 F.3d 1231, 1246 (Fed. Cir. 2010). Evolution's bare assertions about the parallel infringement case are not evidence of copying. POR, 60-61.

Finally, even if any of Evolution’s evidence were credited, such weak objective indicia “cannot overcome a strong prima facie case of obviousness.” *Wyers*, 616 F.3d at 1246; *Leapfrog Enters., Inc. v. Fisher-Price, Inc.*, 485 F.3d 1157, 1162 (Fed. Cir. 2007). The Petition establishes that the prior art discloses every element of the challenged claims—including randomly selecting payout positions for increased payouts—and that their combination yields no more than the predictable result of applying a known technique to a known game. *See KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 416 (2007). The Board should accord Evolution’s objective evidence no weight.

VII. CONCLUSION

The Board should cancel claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-18, and 20 of the ’024 patent.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 19, 2026

/Joshua R. Nightingale/

Joshua R. Nightingale
Reg. No. 67,865
JONES DAY
500 Grant Street, Suite 4500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
(412) 394-7950
jrnightingale@jonesday.com

Jennifer D. Bennett
Reg. No. 56,629
JONES DAY
555 California Street, 26th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94104
(415) 626-3939
jenniferbennett@jonesday.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies the foregoing document, PETITIONER REPLY TO PATENT OWNER RESPONSE, and corresponding exhibits were served via electronic mail on the date below, upon the following:

Lauren Katzeff
lkatzeff@sidley.com

Ching-Lee Fukuda
clfukuda@sidley.com

Sharon Lee
sharon.lee@sidley.com

SidleyEvolution@sidley.com

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 19, 2026

/Joshua R. Nightingale/

Joshua R. Nightingale
Reg. No. 67,865
JONES DAY
500 Grant Street, Suite 4500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
(412) 394-7950
jrnightingale@jonesday.com

CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(A)

I, the undersigned, do hereby certify that the attached brief contains 4,654 words, as measured by the Word Count function of Microsoft Word 2016. This is less than the limit of 5,600 words as specified by 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(c)(i).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 19, 2026

/Joshua R. Nightingale/

Joshua R. Nightingale