

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 OPPOSITION TO  
PLAINTIFF’S SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND DAUBERT MOTIONS**

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  
Joseph C. Masullo  
Paul N. Harold  
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP  
1700 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 282-5000

Original Filing Date: February 23, 2018  
Redacted Filing Date: March 8, 2018

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. Plaintiff’s Summary Judgment Motion for all Accused Games Fails For Several Fundamental Reasons. ....	1
A. Destiny Does Not Infringe Claims 12 of the ’344 Patent. ....	2
1. Destiny is Not “Configured to Maintain” an “M-Regular” State. ....	2
2. Destiny Does Not Meet the Broadcast/Re-Broadcast Limitations of Claim 12 of the ’344 Patent. ....	4
3. Destiny Does Not Have a “Broadcast Channel.” ....	6
B. Call of Duty Does Not Infringe Claims 12 of the ’344 Patent.....	7
1. Plaintiff Has Failed to Show “Each Participant Having Connections to At Least Three Neighbor Participants” for Call of Duty.....	7
2. Call of Duty is Not “Configured to Maintain” an “M-Regular” and “Incomplete” State. ....	8
3. Call of Duty Does Not Meet the Broadcast/Re-Broadcast Limitations of Claim 12 of the ’344 Patent. ....	11
4. Call of Duty Does Not Have a “Broadcast Channel.” ....	14
C. World of Warcraft Does Not Infringe Claims 12 of the ’344 Patent.....	14
1. WoW is Not “Configured to Maintain” an “M-Regular” State. ....	15
2. WoW Does Not Meet the Broadcast/Re-Broadcast Limitations of Claim 12 of the ’344 Patent. ....	17
3. WoW Does Not Have a “Broadcast Channel.” ....	18
II. Plaintiff’s Summary Judgment Of Validity should be denied. ....	18
A. Plaintiff Is Not Entitled To Summary Judgment of Validity.....	18
B. Plaintiff’s Estoppel Arguments Lack Merit.....	19
1. There is No Estoppel based on Age of Empires. ....	19
2. There is No Estoppel on DirectPlay.....	20
3. There is No Estoppel On Alagar.....	21

C.	Defendants May Present Invalidity Grounds That Were Not Addressed In A Final Written Decision.....	23
1.	Shoubridge And Claim 12 Of The '344 And '966 Patents.....	24
2.	The PTAB's Preliminary Determination Regarding Shoubridge, Dénes, and Rufino Does Not Warrant Summary Judgment of Validity. ....	25
3.	The PTAB's Preliminary Determination Regarding the DirectPlay Book Does Not Warrant Summary Judgment. ....	25
4.	Summary Judgment of Validity of the '069 Patent Over the Obraczka Thesis, Shoubridge, and Dénes is Improper.....	26
D.	Alagar Alone or In Combination With Other References Renders Obvious an M-Regular, Incomplete Network. ....	27
1.	Plaintiff Does Not Address Each of Defendants' Alagar-Based Invalidity Proofs.....	28
2.	Plaintiff Incorrectly Applies The Law of Obviousness And Takes Far Too Narrow A View of The Record Related to Alagar.....	28
3.	Plaintiff's Arguments About AoE (or DirectPlay) In View of Alagar Are Inadequate To Support Summary Judgment.....	30
E.	Kegel And ActiveNet Were Both Publicly Accessible Before The Filing Date.....	30
1.	Kegel was publicly accessible by 1999 and was actively being discussed showing it was disseminated and accessible to those skilled in the art.....	31
2.	ActiveNet Was In Public Use and On Sale More Than a Year Before the '497 Patent Was Filed and Is Prior Art. ....	32
III.	Ms. Lawton's Opinions Should Not Be Excluded.....	33

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b><u>Page(s)</u></b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>01 Communique Lab., Inc. v. Citrix Sys., Inc.</i> , 151 F.Supp.3d 778 (N.D. Ohio 2015).....	19
<i>Applied Med. Res. Corp. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.</i> , 435 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	36, 37
<i>AstraZeneca AB v. Apotex Corp.</i> , 782 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	36
<i>Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	32
<i>Carnegie Mellon Univ. v. Marvell Tech. Grp., Ltd.</i> , 807 F.3d 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	50
<i>Carnegie Mellon University v Marvell Technology Grp., Ltd.</i> , 2012 WL 6562221 (W.D. Pa. Dec. 15, 2012).....	49, 50
<i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i> , 477 U.S. 317 (1986).....	19
<i>Comcast IP Holdings I, LLC v. Sprint Communications Co. L.P.</i> , 2015 WL 4730899 (D. Del. Aug. 10, 2015).....	34
<i>Demaco Corp. v. F. Von Langsdorff Licensing Ltd.</i> , 851 F.2d 1387 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	48, 50
<i>Depomed, Inc. v. Purdue Pharma L.P.</i> , 2016 WL 8677317 (D.N.J. Nov. 4, 2016) .....	19, 20, 34
<i>Digital Control, Inc. v. Charles Mach. Works</i> , 437 F.3d 1309 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	27
<i>Douglas Dynamics, LLC v. Meyer Prods. LLC</i> , 2017 WL 2116714 (W.D. Wis. May 15, 2017) .....	22, 24
<i>EMC Corp. v. Pure Storage, Inc.</i> , 154 F. Supp. 3d 81 (D. Del. 2016).....	47
<i>Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Sys., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	42
<i>Exmark Mfg. Co. Inc. v. Briggs &amp; Stratton Power Prods. Grp., LLC</i> , 879 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	24, 25
<i>FMC Techs., Inc. v. Edwards</i> , 2007 WL 1725098 (W.D. Wash. June 12, 2007).....	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.