```
Case 1:16-cv-00453-RGA Document 625 Filed 11/15/18 Page 1 of 23 PageID #: 49939
                      IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
    1
    2
                         FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE
    3
         ACCELERATION BAY, LLC
    4
    5
                           Plaintiff,
    6
                                           ) Civil Action No. 16-453-RGA
         V.
    7
         ACTIVISION BLIZZARD, INC.,
    8
                           Defendant.
    9
   10
                                           J. Caleb Boggs Courthouse
                                           844 King Street
   11
                                           Wilmington, Delaware
   12
                                           Thursday, October 25, 2018
                                           9:35 a.m.
                                           Teleconference in Chambers
   13
   14
         BEFORE: THE HONORABLE RICHARD G. ANDREWS, U.S.D.C.J.
   15
   16
         APPEARANCES:
   17
                      PHILIP A. ROVNER, ESQUIRE
                      POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON, LLP
   18
                         1313 N. Market Street, 6th Floor
                         Hercules Building
   19
                         Wilmington, Delaware 19899
   20
                                 -and-
   21
                      PAUL ANDRE, ESQUIRE
                      LISA KOBIALKA, ESQUIRE
   22
                      AARON M. FRANKEL, ESQUIRE
                      KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL, LLP
   2.3
                         990 Marsh Road
                         Menlo Park, California 94025
   24
                         For the Plaintiff
   25
                                                Heather M. Triozzi
```





3

09:35:47 1 THE COURT: Good morning, this is Judge Andrews 09:35:50 2 in Acceleration Bay versus Activision Blizzard. Number 09:35:55 3 16 - 453. Who's on the line for plaintiff, please? 09:35:57 4 09:35:58 5 MR. ROVNER: Good morning, Your Honor. Phil Rovner of Potter Anderson. And with me from Kramer 09:36:03 6 09:36:05 7 Levin is Paul Andre, Lisa Kobialka, and Aaron Frankel. THE COURT: All right. Good morning to you all. 09:36:09 8 09:36:11 9 And for Activision? 09:36:14 10 MR. BLUMENFELD: Good morning, Your Honor. It's 09:36:16 11 Jack Blumenfeld from Morris Nichols. I'm with David Enzminger, Kathleen Barry, Mike Tomasulo from Winston & 09:36:20 12 Strawn, and Trent Webb from Shook Hardy & Bacon. 09:36:25 13 09:36:28 14 THE COURT: Okay. So good morning to you all, 09:36:30 15 too. 09:36:31 16 So there were two things, after I got your 09:36:33 17 letters yesterday, that I was interested in hearing about. 09:36:39 18 The first one is really for the plaintiff. 09:36:44 19 Mr. Andre, in terms of your proof on 09:36:49 20 willfulness, what exactly do you have? 09:36:53 21 MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, Paul Andre here. have the fact that we provided the defendants notice of the 09:36:55 22 09:37:01 23 patent in March 2015. They had the explicit, you know, 09:37:07 24 infringement reason, et cetera. 09:37:09 25 And we had a meeting with them to try to



4

09:37:12 1 09:37:16 2 09:37:20 3 09:37:24 4 09:37:28 5 09:37:30 6 09:37:33 7 09:37:41 8 09:37:44 9 09:37:49 10 09:37:50 11 09:37:53 12 09:37:57 13 09:38:05 14 09:38:11 15 09:38:20 16 09:38:26 17 09:38:31 18 09:38:34 19 09:38:3620 09:38:39 21 09:38:43 22

negotiate a license with them. They basically told us to go pound sand, and they continued their conduct, even ramping up the conduct, releasing new products, and increasing their infringing activity in spite of the fact that they had knowledge of the patent and the ongoing lawsuit.

THE COURT: So is any part of that relating to dollars and cents, or I mean, based on what you have -- I guess, does any part of your willfulness case depend upon you presenting financial numbers of one kind or another?

MR. ANDRE: Not at all, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

All right. So Mr. Enzminger or Mr. Webb, or whoever is speaking for the defendant here, you know, your letter said, and I'm paraphrasing here, great prejudice, unfair prejudice to respond to the case that we thought we were responding to, but without the damages component. And you know, what I saw and part of the reason we're on the phone is because I know I only gave you an extremely brief time to think about what you want to do and to submit something.

I'm interested in what the specifics are that you're talking about because it's not apparent to me that there's really that much overlap between -- I mean, it's not apparent to me that it really isn't just a case of subtraction from what you were planning on both responding

09:38:52 23

09:39:01 24

09:39:05 25

09:39:09 1 09:39:15 2 09:39:20 3 09:39:22 4 09:39:24 5 09:39:33 6 09:39:35 7 09:39:36 8 09:39:37 9 09:39:42 10 09:39:46 11 09:39:47 12 09:39:49 13 09:39:53 14 09:39:56 15 09:40:00 16 09:40:02 17 09:40:04 18 09:40:08 19 09:40:11 20 09:40:12 21 09:40:16 22 09:40:1923

to and doing. But so what do you have to say about that?

And can you also tell me who's talking?

MR. WEBB: This is Trent Webb, and I'm speaking on behalf of the -
THE COURT: Hold on, Mr. Webb. I'm sorry.

Mr. Webb. Mr. Webb, I'm sorry, something happened to the

Could you start over again?

phone at your end.

MR. WEBB: Sure, Your Honor. Again, Trent Webb on behalf of the defendant. Will I be given a chance to respond to Mr. Andre's position on willfulness?

THE COURT: If you think it's worthwhile, but first let's hear -- well, why don't we just take care of that. What is your response to that?

MR. WEBB: To the willfulness issue, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. WEBB: Yeah. I believe the products that are released after the 2015 date are not accused of infringement in this case. I have to confirm that, but that's my belief.

But the other position with respect to Your

Honor's question about how this impacts our case, we have

built our case plan and strategy around the assumption that

damages and liability would be tried together. That

includes witness preparation, deposition designations,

09:40:23 24

09:40:26 25

# DOCKET

# 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.

