

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

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

---

**PLAINTIFF ACCELERATION BAY LLC’S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT  
ACTIVISION BLIZZARD, INC.’S MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT  
AND TO EXCLUDE EXPERT OPINIONS UNDER F.R.E. 702**

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

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

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 23, 2018  
Public version dated: March 7, 2018

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	1
ARGUMENT .....	1
<b>I.</b> Activision Infringes the ‘344, ‘966 and ‘497 Patents .....	1
<b>A.</b> Activision Infringes the ‘344 and ‘966 Patents By Making, Using and Selling the Accused Destiny and CoD Network Systems .....	1
<b>B.</b> Activision Infringes the ‘497 Patent.....	5
<b>C.</b> Activision is Deemed to Perform All Steps of the Method Claims .....	6
<b>D.</b> Activision Directly Infringes Through Testing and Use of the Accused Products .....	7
<b>II.</b> Activision Infringes the ‘344, ‘966, ‘634, ‘147 and ‘069 Patents.....	8
<b>III.</b> The Accused Products Infringe the ‘069 and ‘634 Patents.....	14
<b>A.</b> CoD “identifies a pair of participants of the network that are connected” and “disconnects the participants of the identified pair from each other” .....	15
<b>B.</b> CoD Uses “fully connected” and “located portal computers” .....	15
<b>C.</b> CoD sends an “edge connection request” to “randomly selected neighboring participants” .....	15
<b>D.</b> Destiny “identif[ies] a pair of participants of the network that are connected” and “disconnect[s] the participants of the identified pair from each other” .....	16
<b>E.</b> Destiny sends an “edge connection request” to “randomly selected neighboring participants” .....	16
<b>F.</b> CoD and Destiny Also Infringe Under the DoE .....	16
<b>IV.</b> CoD and Destiny Infringe the ‘147 Patent.....	17
<b>V.</b> CoD, Destiny and WoW Infringe the ‘497 Patent .....	18
<b>A.</b> The Accused Products Repeatedly Try to Connect to a Portal Computer .....	18
<b>B.</b> CoD, Destiny and WoW use a “port ordering algorithm” .....	20
<b>VI.</b> Activision Infringes Under the Doctrine of Equivalents .....	21
<b>VII.</b> Activision’s Foreign Sales Give Rise to Infringement .....	23
<b>VIII.</b> Acceleration Bay Can Prevail On Its Willful Infringement Claims .....	26
<b>IX.</b> Acceleration Bay Moved to Correct the Asserted Claims of the ‘634 Patent .....	26
<b>X.</b> The ‘344, ‘966, ‘634, ‘147 and ‘069 Patents Are Valid under 35 U.S.C. § 112.....	27

A.	The Specifications Explain That “M” Can Change.....	27
B.	The Asserted Patents Describe “Non-Routing Table Based” Systems & Methods.....	29
<b>XI.</b>	The ‘344, ‘966 and ‘497 Patents Are Valid Even if They Include Software.....	31
<b>XII.</b>	The “Computer Readable Medium” Claims Cover Statutory Subject Matter.....	31
<b>XIII.</b>	Drs. Medvidović and Mitzenmacher Explained Their Infringement Opinions.....	33
<b>XIV.</b>	The Opinions of Drs. Meyer, Bims and Valerdi Are Reliable.....	35
A.	Overview of the Damages Opinions at Issue.....	35
B.	Dr. Meyer’s Opinions Regarding the Hypothetical Negotiation Date are Reliable.....	38
C.	The Opinions of Drs. Meyer and Bims Regarding <i>Uniloc</i> are Reliable.....	41
D.	Dr. Bims’ Opinion that the Relative Value of the Asserted Patents is 6-15 Times the Value of the Uniloc Patent is Reliable.....	43
E.	Dr. Meyer Properly Apportioned the Royalty Base and Accounted for Future Infringement of the Patented Technology Through Patent Expiry.....	45
F.	Dr. Valerdi’s Cost Opinion is Reliable.....	48
	CONCLUSION.....	50

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b><u>Page(s)</u></b>
<b>Federal Cases</b>	
<i>3M Innovative Properties Co. v. Louis M. Gerson Co.</i> , No. 08-cv-4960, slip op. (D. Minn. Mar. 31, 2011).....	43
<i>Ansell Healthcare Prods. LLC v. Reckitt Benckiser LLC</i> , No. 15-CV-915-RGA, 2018 WL 620968 (D. Del. Jan. 30, 2018).....	26
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	28
<i>In re Beauregard</i> , 53 F.3d 1583 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	32, 33
<i>Cadence Pharms. Inc. v. Exela PharmSci Inc.</i> , 780 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	22
<i>Card-Monroe Corp. v. Tuftco Corp.</i> , 270 F. Supp. 3d 967 (E.D. Tenn. 2017).....	23, 25
<i>Caserto v. Metro-N. R.R. Co.</i> , No. 14-CV-7936 (JMF), 2016 WL 406390 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 2, 2016).....	8
<i>Cassidian Commc'ns, Inc. v. microDATA GIS, Inc.</i> , No. 2:12-CV-00162-JRG, 2013 WL 12148459 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 10, 2013).....	39
<i>Centillion Data Sys., LLC v. Qwest Commc'ns Int'l, Inc.</i> , 631 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	2, 3
<i>CNET Networks, Inc. v. Etilize, Inc.</i> , 528 F. Supp. 2d 985 (N.D. Cal. 2007) .....	3
<i>CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	32
<i>Decca Ltd. v. U.S.</i> , 210 Ct. Cl. 546 (Ct. Cl. 1976).....	24
<i>Digitech Image Techs. LLC v. Elecs. For Imaging, Inc.</i> , 758 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	31
<i>Exmark Mfg. Co. v. Briggs &amp; Stratton Power Prods. Grp., LLC</i> , 879 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	45, 46
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Sys., Inc.</i> , 879 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	31
<i>Flatworld Interactives LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 77 F. Supp. 3d 378 (D. Del. 2014).....	29
<i>Fujifilm Corp. v. Motorola Mobility LLC</i> , No. 12-cv-03587-WHO, 2015 WL 1265009 (N.D. Cal. March 19, 2015).....	40, 41

<i>Georgia-Pac. Corp. v. U.S. Plywood Corp.</i> , 318 F. Supp. 1116 (S.D.N.Y. 1970).....	50
<i>Goulds' Mfg. Co. v. Cowing</i> , 105 U.S. 253 (1881).....	23
<i>H.K. Porter Co. v. Gates Rubber Co.</i> , No. C-3138, 1975 WL 21117 (D. Colo. Sept. 11, 1975).....	28
<i>Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.</i> , 769 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (O'Malley, J., concurring).....	26
<i>Int'l Bus. Machines Corp. v. Priceline Grp. Inc.</i> , 271 F. Supp. 3d 667 (D. Del. 2017).....	39
<i>Integra Lifesciences I, Ltd. v. Merck KGaA</i> , 331 F.3d 860 (Fed. Cir. 2003), <i>vacated</i> 545 U.S. 193 (2005) .....	41
<i>Lampi Corp. v. Am. Power Prods., Inc.</i> , 228 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	28
<i>LaserDynamics, Inc. v. Quanta Computer, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 51 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	41
<i>McRO, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games Am. Inc.</i> , 837 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	32
<i>Mentor Graphics Corp. v. EVE-USA, Inc.</i> , 851 F.3d 1275 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	33
<i>MiiCs &amp; Partners, Inc. v. Funai Elec. Co.</i> , No. CV 14-804-RGA, 2017 WL 6268072 (D. Del. Dec. 7, 2017).....	39
<i>NTP, Inc. v. Research in Motion, Ltd.</i> , 418 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	2, 24
<i>In re Nujiten</i> , 500 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	33
<i>Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.</i> , 609 F. Supp. 2d 1057 (C.D. Cal. 2009) .....	25
<i>Prism Techs. LLC v. AT&amp;T Mobility, LLC</i> , No. 8:12CV122, 2014 WL 4843874 (D. Neb. Sept. 29, 2014) .....	43
<i>Prism Techs. LLC v. Sprint Spectrum L.P.</i> , 849 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2017), <i>cert. denied</i> , 138 S. Ct. 429, 199 L. Ed. 2d 313 (2017).....	43
<i>Segan LLC v. Zynga Inc.</i> , No. CV 11-670-GMS, 2013 WL 12156529 (D. Del. May 2, 2013).....	7
<i>Sonix Tech. Co. v. Publications Int'l</i> , No. 13 C 2082, 2017 WL 5171192 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 8, 2017).....	39
<i>Trading Techs. Int'l, Inc. v. eSpeed, Inc.</i> , 595 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	22

# 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.