IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

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

DEFENDANT ACTIVISION BLIZZARD INC.'S OPENING BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO STRIKE PLAINTIFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL EXPERT DAMAGES REPORT

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

Attorneys for Defendant

OF COUNSEL:

B. Trent Webb Aaron E. Hankel Jordan T. Bergsten Maxwell C. McGraw SHOOK HARDY & BACON LLP 2555 Grand Boulevard Kansas City, MO 64108 (816) 474-6550

Tanya Chaney SHOOK HARDY & BACON LLP 600 Travis Street, Suite 3400 Houston, TX 77002 (713) 227-8008

Original Filing Date: March 15, 2019 Redacted Filing Date: March 28, 2019



TABLE OF CONTENTS

			Page
I.	NA	TURE AND STAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS	1
II.	SUI	MMARY OF ARGUMENT	1
III.	STA	ATEMENT OF FACTS	2
IV.	AR	GUMENT	3
A.		Parr's Report Violates the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Third Circuit	3
	i.	Acceleration Has Already Fully Disclosed Its Damages Case And Now Seeks To Present An Entirely New and Undisclosed Damages Case	
	ii.	Mr. Parr's Report Does Not Supplement Dr. Meyer's Report; Rather It Offers New, Previously Undisclosed Damages Opinions.	6
	iii.	Acceleration Never Disclosed Any Damages Opinion Based On The Boeing-Panthesis License.	8
	iv.	Mr. Parr's Departures From Acceleration's Damages Disclosures Significantly Prejudice Activision And Warrant Exclusion Under Pennypack.	9
В.		Boeing-Panthesis License Is Inadmissible Under the Federal Rules of dence	11
	i.	Acceleration Does Not Meet Its Burden To Make A Threshold Showing That An Exception to the Best Evidence Rule Applies.	11
	ii.	Mr. Parr's Royalty Rate Is Based On Inadmissible Hearsay	12
V.	CO	NCLUSION	14



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
Bridgestone Sports Co. Ltd. v. Acushnet Co., No. 05-132 JJF, 2007 WL 5218944 (D. Del. Feb. 15, 2007)	9, 10
Goodman v. Lukens Steel Co., 777 F.2d 113 (3d Cir. 1985)	9
Inline Connection Corp. v. AOL Time Warner Inc., 470 F. Supp. 2d 435 (D. Del. 2007)	13
Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. AT&T Mobility LLC, No. 12-193-LPS, 2017 WL 478565, at *1 (D. Del. Jan. 31, 2017)	3, 4
Meyers v. Pennypack Woods Home Ownership Ass'n, 559 F.2d 894 (3d Cir. 1977)	9
Remington Arms Co. v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co., 810 F. Supp. 1420 (D. Del. 1992)	12
Robocast, Inc. v. Apple Inc., No. 11-235-RGA, 2014 WL 334199 (D. Del. Jan. 28, 2014)	6, 8, 9
Uniloc USA, Inc. v. EA, No. 6:13-cv-00259-RWA (E.D. Tex. Dec. 15, 2014)	2, 5, 6
Rules	
FED. R. CIV. P. 37(c)(1)	4
Fed. R. Evid. 1002	15
FED. R. EVID. 1004(a)	15
Fed. R. Evid. 1008	15
FED R EVID 801(c)	17

I. NATURE AND STAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS

Activision moves to strike Acceleration's "supplemental" damages report submitted by Russell Parr. Mr. Parr's report introduces new, contradictory, and undisclosed damages theories resulting in far increased damages numbers. His report is based on facts withheld during discovery (despite multiple orders compelling disclosure) and his theories squarely contradict Acceleration's original damages expert, Dr. Meyer. The Court gave Acceleration a chance to supplement, not supplant. Acceleration's last-minute facts, opinions, and theories should be stricken and excluded.

II. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Acceleration has been given multiple chances to make its case. It has failed to do so at every turn, which is the only consistency Acceleration has provided thus far. Seizing on this Court's latitude for one "final opportunity" to "supplement" its case, Acceleration abused this Court's leave by hiring a new expert to render new and contradictory opinions predicated on withheld and undisclosed facts. Mr. Parr's opinions do not simply deviate from Acceleration's earlier theories, they are flatly contrary to the entire record developed during fact and expert discovery. These new theories are do not "supplement" any fairly and timely disclosed position. Instead, they assault the record, attack the discovery process, and ambush Activision at the eleventh hour. Exclusion is warranted,

Mr. Parr's report relies on facts withheld during discovery, despite Activision's extensive efforts to learn about Acceleration's theories. Mr. Parr's expert report opines on a single royalty rate of that is based entirely on a purported Boeing-Panthesis license agreement. The Special Master compelled full disclosure of Acceleration's damages case, but Acceleration never even identified this agreement as relevant to its damages case, let alone a basis for its requested



compensation. Nor was the final, executed version of the agreement ever produced. As a result, Activision never had a chance to explore—let alone test—the veracity of Mr. Parr's assumptions or his off-the-record sources, such as an inventor's recollection of an almost two-decade old agreement.

The Court should not excuse Acceleration's irresponsible advocacy and should hold Acceleration accountable for its own its strategic decisions in developing its damages case in this matter. This is particularly true where, as here, Acceleration's approach to damages deprived Activision of any meaningful opportunity to vet its newly-proffered trial theories during fact and expert discovery.

At the end of the day, discovery and the Federal Rules serve a vital role in every litigation. So do deadlines. For these reasons, as detailed below, Activision respectfully request the Court to strike and exclude the new opinions and theories stated in Mr. Parr's "supplemental" report pursuant to Rules 26 and 37, as well as this Court's inherent discretion in its application of the Third Circuit's *Pennypack* factors.

III. STATEMENT OF FACTS

Two months prior to the start of trial, this Court struck Acceleration's expert damages opinion offered by Dr. Meyer for improperly relying upon the *Uniloc* jury verdict. D.I. 578 at 27–28.

Following this ruling, Activision sought clarification from Acceleration as to what damages evidence it intended to present at trial. In response, Acceleration pivoted and said it would then rely upon a royalty rate of which it derived from a random website. On September 28, 2018, one month before trial, Activision filed a Motion to Preclude Acceleration's "revised" damages case. *See* D.I. 581. This Court granted Activision's motion in-part and



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.

