

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

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

**DEFENDANT ACTIVISION BLIZZARD, INC'S BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF ITS
MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND
EXCLUDE EXPERT OPINIONS UNDER FRE 702**

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP
Jack B. Blumenfeld (#1014)
Stephen J. Kraftschik (#5623)
1201 North Market Street
P.O. Box 1347
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 658-9200
jblumenfeld@mnat.com
skraftschik@mnat.com

OF COUNSEL:

Michael A. Tomasulo
Gino Cheng
David K. Lin
Joe S. Netikosol
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
333 South Grand Avenue, 38th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 615-1700

Attorneys for Defendant

David P. Enzminger
Louis L. Campbell
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
275 Middlefield Road, Suite 205
Menlo Park, CA 94025
(650) 858-6500

Dan K. Webb
Kathleen B. Barry
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
35 West Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 558-5600

Krista M. Enns
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
101 California Street, 35th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
(415) 591-1000

Michael M. Murray
Anup K. Misra
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
200 Park Avenue,
New York, NY 10166
(212) 294-6700

Andrew R. Sommer
Thomas M. Dunham
Michael Woods
Paul N. Harold
Joseph C. Masullo
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
1700 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 282-5000

Original Filing Date: February 2, 2018
Redacted Filing Date: February 13, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
NATURE AND STAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS.....	1
STATEMENT OF FACTS	1
ARGUMENT.....	3
I. Activision Does Not Infringe The ‘344 And ‘966 Patents Because Activision Does Not Make, Use Or Sell The Accused Networks (CoD, Destiny).....	3
A. Activision Does Not Make, Use, Or Sell The Accused “Destiny” Networks.....	4
B. Activision Does Not Make, Use, Or Sell The Accused “CoD” Networks.....	4
II. Activision Does Not Infringe The ‘497 Patent Because It Does Not Make, Use Or Sell The Accused Hardware Component (CoD, Destiny).....	6
III. Activision Does Not Directly Infringe The Method Claims Because It Does Not Perform Any Of The Steps Alleged To Cause Infringement (CoD, Destiny).....	7
IV. Plaintiff Has No Evidence That Activision Infringed Any Patent Through Testing (CoD, Destiny).....	9
V. Activision Does Not Infringe Any Of The Five “Topology Patents” Because The Accused Networks Are Not M-Regular And Non-Complete, They Are Not Broadcast Channels And They Do Not Meet The Broadcast/Rebroadcast Requirements.	10
A. The Accused WoW Network Does Not Infringe Any Topology Patent.....	10
B. The Accused CoD Networks Do Not Infringe Any Of The Topology Patents.	14
C. The Accused Destiny Networks Do Not Infringe Any Topology Patent.....	19
VI. The Accused Products Do Not Infringe The ‘069 And ‘634 Patents (CoD, Destiny, WoW (‘634 only)).	22
A. CoD Does Not “Identify[] A Pair Of Participants Of The Network That Are Connected” Or “Disconnect[] The Participants Of The Identified Pair From Each Other.”	22
B. CoD Does Not Infringe The Asserted Claims Of The ‘069 And ‘634 Patents Because CoD Does Not Include The “Fully	

Connected Portal Computer” And “Located Portal Computer”
Required By The Asserted Claims..... 23

C. There Is No “Edge Connection Request” Sent To “Randomly
Selected Neighboring Participants” In CoD. 24

D. Destiny does not “identify[] a pair of participants of the network
that are connected” or “disconnect[] the participants of the
identified pair from each other.” 24

E. There is no “edge connection request” sent to “randomly selected
neighboring participants” in Destiny. 25

VII. The Accused Products Do Not Infringe The ’147 Patent (CoD
andDestiny). 25

VIII. The Accused Products Do Not Infringe The ’497 Patent (CoD, Destiny,
WoW). 26

A. The Accused Products Do Not Repeatedly Try To Establish A
Connection. 26

B. The Accused Games Do Not Use A “Port Ordering Algorithm.” 28

IX. Activision Does Not Infringe Any Claim Under The Doctrine Of
Equivalents. 29

X. Accused Acts Outside The United States Do Not Infringe Any Patent. 31

XI. Acceleration Bay Cannot Show Willful Infringement. 32

XII. The Asserted Claims Of The ’634 Patent Are Indefinite And Therefore
Invalid. 32

XIII. The ’344, ’966, ’634, ’147, And ’069 Patents Are Invalid For Lack Of
Written Description. 33

A. The Patents Do Not Contain A Written Description Supporting An
M That Changes For Any Established Broadcast Channel 33

B. The Patents Do Not Describe The “Non-Routing Table Based”
Limitations. 35

XIV. The ’344, ’966 And ’497 Patents Are Invalid If They Cover Pure
Software. 36

XV. The “Computer Readable Media” Claims (’634 Claims 19 And 22/’147
Claims 11, 15, 16) Are Invalid As Including Non-Statutory Subject
Matter. 37

XVI. Dr. Medvidovic And Dr. Mitzenmacher’s Opinions That The Accused
Products “Use Various Rules And Constants” To Converge On M-Regular
And Create A Broadcast Channel Should Be Excluded As Unsupported
By Their Expert Reports. 38

XVII. The Opinions Of Dr. Meyer, Dr. Bims, And Dr. Valerdi Should Be
Excluded. 40

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.