

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

ACCELERATION BAY LLC, ) C.A. No. 16-453 (RGA)  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
) **PUBLIC VERSION**  
v. )  
)  
ACTIVISION BLIZZARD, INC., )  
)  
Defendant. )  
)  

---

ACCELERATION BAY LLC, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
) C.A. No. 16-454 (RGA)  
v. )  
)  
ELECTRONIC ARTS INC., )  
)  
Defendant. )  
)  

---

ACCELERATION BAY LLC, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
) C.A. No. 16-455 (RGA)  
v. )  
)  
TAKE-TWO INTERACTIVE SOFTWARE, )  
INC., ROCKSTAR GAMES, INC., and 2K )  
SPORTS, INC., )  
)  
Defendants. )  

---

**PLAINTIFF ACCELERATION BAY LLC'S  
OPENING SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND DAUBERT BRIEF**

OF COUNSEL:

Paul J. Andre  
Lisa Kobialka  
KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS  
& FRANKEL LLP  
990 Marsh Road  
Menlo Park, CA 94025  
(650) 752-1700  
pandre@kramerlevin.com  
lkobialka@kramerlevin.com

Aaron M. Frankel  
KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS  
& FRANKEL LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036  
(212) 715-9100  
afrankel@kramerlevin.com

Dated: February 2, 2018

Public version dated: February 9, 2018

Philip A. Rovner (#3215)  
Jonathan A. Choa (#5319)  
POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP  
Hercules Plaza  
P.O. Box 951  
Wilmington, DE 19899  
(302) 984-6000  
provner@potteranderson.com  
jchoa@potteranderson.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
ACCELERATION BAY LLC

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	1
ARGUMENT .....	2
I. The Asserted Claims Are Valid Over Defendants’ Asserted Prior Art .....	2
A. IPR Estoppel Bars Various of Defendants’ Invalidation Challenges to the Asserted Claims of the ‘344 and ‘966 Patents .....	4
1. Defendants are estopped from asserting DirectPlay against Claim 12 of the ‘344 and ‘966 Patents.....	4
B. The PTAB Already Rejected Several of Defendants’ Invalidation Arguments .....	7
1. The PTAB Already Found That Obraczka Thesis, Shoubridge and Denes Do Not Render Obvious Claims 1 and 11 of the ‘069 Patent.....	7
2. The PTAB Already Found That Shoubridge Does Not Render Obvious Claim 12 of the ‘344 and ‘966 Patents.....	9
3. The PTAB Already Found That Shoubridge in View of Denes and Rufino Does Not Render Obvious Claims 1, 11, 15 and 16 of the ‘147 Patent.....	10
4. The PTAB Already Found That Neither DirectPlay in View of Shoubridge Nor Obraczka in View of Shoubridge and Obraczka Thesis Renders Obvious Claims 19 and 22 of the ‘634 Patent .....	10
C. Defendants’ Prior Art Fails to Disclose an Incomplete, M-regular Network .....	11
1. Alagar does not teach an incomplete, m-regular network .....	11
2. AoE in View of Alagar Does Not Teach a Non-Complete, M-Regular Network.....	13
3. DirectPlay in View of Alagar Does Not Teach a Non-Complete, M- Regular Network.....	13
D. Kegel and ActiveNet Do Not Invalidate the Asserted Claims of the ‘497 Patent.....	14
1. Kegel Was Not Available Until After the Filing Date of the ‘497 Patent .....	14
2. ActiveNet Was Not Publicly Available Until After the Filing Date of the ‘497 Patent .....	16

- II. The Accused Products infringe Claim 12 of the ‘344 Patent.....17
  - A. Destiny Infringes Claim 12 of the ‘344 Patent .....18
    - 1. Destiny Provides “A computer network for providing a game environment for a plurality of participants” .....19
    - 2. In Destiny, “each participant ha[s] connections to at least three neighbor participants” .....19
    - 3. In Destiny, “an originating participant sends data to the other participants by sending the data through each of its connections to its neighbor participants and ... participant sends data that it receives from a neighbor participant to its other neighbor participants,” .....20
    - 4. The Destiny Network “is m-regular, where m is the exact number of neighbor participants of each participant” and “the number of participants is at least two greater than m thus resulting in a non-complete graph” .....22
    - 5. In Destiny, “the interconnections of participants form a broadcast channel for a game of interest.” .....24
  - B. Call of Duty Infringes Claim 12 of the ‘344 Patent.....24
    - 1. CoD provides “A computer network for providing a game environment for a plurality of participants” .....24
    - 2. In CoD, “each participant ha[s] connections to at least three neighbor participants” .....25
    - 3. In CoD, “an originating participant sends data to the other participants by sending the data through each of its connections to its neighbor participants and ... participant sends data that it receives from a neighbor participant to its other neighbor participants,” .....26
    - 4. The CoD “network is m-regular, where m is the exact number of neighbor participants of each participant” .....27
    - 5. For CoD, “the number of participants is at least two greater than m thus resulting in a non-complete graph” .....27
    - 6. In CoD, “the interconnections of participants form a broadcast channel for a game of interest.” .....28
  - C. World of Warcraft Infringes Claim 12 of the ‘344 Patent .....28

1.	WoW provides “A computer network for providing a game environment for a plurality of participants” .....	29
2.	In WoW, “each participant ha[s] connections to at least three neighbor participants” .....	29
3.	In WoW, “an originating participant sends data to the other participants by sending the data through each of its connections to its neighbor participants and ... participant sends data that it receives from a neighbor participant to its other neighbor participants,” .....	30
4.	The WoW “network is m-regular, where m is the exact number of neighbor participants of each participant” and “the number of participants is at least two greater than m thus resulting in a non-complete graph” .....	30
5.	In WoW, “the interconnections of participants form a broadcast channel for a game of interest.” .....	32
III.	Ms. Lawton’s Opinions Should Be Excluded.....	32
A.	Ms. Lawton’s Damages Opinions Should be Excluded as Arbitrary, Unsupported by the Facts of this Case and Unreliable .....	32
1.	Ms. Lawton’s Reasonable Royalty Opinion Necessarily Rests on Speculation.....	32
2.	Ms. Lawton’s Damages Opinion Relies Upon the [REDACTED] License, For Which She Assumes Comparability Without Any Analysis.....	38
3.	Ms. Lawton’s Opinion as to the Date For the Hypothetical Negotiation is Unsupported and Arbitrary .....	43
B.	Ms. Lawton is Not Qualified to Offer Technical Opinions Regarding Non-Infringing Alternatives.....	46
C.	Ms. Lawton’s Separate Opinion Responding to Acceleration Bay’s Technical Validity Expert Is Unreliable .....	48
	CONCLUSION.....	50

# 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.