

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.)	
)	
Defendant.)	
<hr/>		
ACCELERATION BAY LLC,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 16-454 (RGA)
)	
ELECTRONIC ARTS INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
<hr/>		
ACCELERATION BAY LLC,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 16-455 (RGA)
)	
TAKE-TWO INTERACTIVE SOFTWARE,)	
INC., ROCKSTAR GAMES, INC. and)	
2K SPORTS, INC.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

**DEFENDANTS' REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION TO DISMISS,
STAY, OR TRANSFER VENUE TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

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 Defendants

OF COUNSEL:

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

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

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

August 4, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
I. Introduction.....	1
II. The California Actions Are First-Filed—The California Court Was The First Court To Acquire Subject Matter Jurisdiction.....	1
III. The Later Delaware Actions Do Not “Relate Back” To The Dismissed Actions	2
IV. Acceleration Bay Never Explains Why Or How The California Actions Fall Within The Anticipatory Filing Exception Of The First-Filed Rule	5
V. There Was No Forum Shopping—California Is Everyone’s “Home Turf”	6
VI. The Court Should Focus On The Forums’ <i>Current</i> Comparative Convenience	6
VII. The Northern District Of California Is The Most Convenient Forum	7
VIII. Judicial Economy Does Not Favor Keeping The Actions In Delaware	9
IX. Conclusion	10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
Cases	
<i>Adobe Sys. Inc. v. Bargain Software Shop, LLC</i> , No. 14-cv-3721-EMC, 2014 WL 6982515 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 8, 2014).....	4, 5
<i>Alps South, LLC v. Ohio Willow Wood Co.</i> , 787 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	3
<i>ASUSTeK Computer Inc. v. AFTG-TG LLC</i> , No. 5:CV 11-0192, 2011 WL 6845791 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 29, 2011)	4
<i>Audatex N. Am., Inc. v. Mitchell Int’l, Inc.</i> , No. 12-CV-139-GMS, 2013 WL 3293611 (D. Del. June 28, 2013).....	9
<i>Barnes & Noble, Inc.</i> , 823 F. Supp. 2d 980, 987 (N.D. Cal. 2011)	4
<i>Collectis S.A. v. Precision Biosciences, Inc.</i> , 881 F. Supp. 2d 609 (D. Del. 2012).....	6
<i>Diablo Techs., Inc. v. Netlist, Inc.</i> , No. 13-cv-3901, 2013 WL 5609321 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 11, 2013)	6
<i>E.E.O.C. v. Univ. of Penn.</i> , 850 F.2d 969 (3d Cir. 1988).....	1
<i>Electronics for Imaging, Inc. v. Coyle</i> , 394 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	6
<i>Enzo APA & Son, Inc. v. Geapag A.G.</i> , 134 F.3d 1090 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	3
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Sophos Inc.</i> , No. 14-cv-01197, 2014 WL 2854490 (N.D. Cal. June 20, 2014).....	7, 9
<i>Genentech, Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 998 F.2d 931 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	6
<i>Hilton v. Apple, Inc.</i> , No. C-13-2167, 2013 WL 5487317 (N.D. Cal. 2013)	4
<i>Linex Techs., Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , No. 11-400-GMS, 2013 WL 105323 (D. Del. Jan. 7, 2013)	7

Mentor H/S, Inc. v. Med. Device Alliance, Inc.,
240 F.3d 1016 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....2

Schering Corp. v. Amgen Inc.,
969 F. Supp. 258 (D. Del. 1997).....3, 4

Semcon Tech, LLC v. Intel Corp.,
No. 12-531-RGA, 2013 WL 126421 (D. Del. Jan. 8, 2013).....9

Signal Tech, LLC v. Analog Devices, Inc.,
No. 11-1073-RGA, 2012 WL 1134723 (D. Del. April 3, 2012).....8

Smith v. McIver,
22 U.S. 532 (1824).....1

Software Rights Archive, LLC v. Facebook, Inc.,
2013 WL 5225522 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 17, 2013)5

In re Telebrands Corp.,
No. 2016-106, 2016 WL 3033331 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 24, 2016)5

Vygon v. RyMed Techs., Inc.,
No. 08-172-GMS, 2009 WL 856469 (D. Del. March 31, 2009)6

Wacoh Co. v. Kionix Inc.,
845 F.Supp.2d 597 (D. Del. 2012).....8, 9

Wallerstein v. Dole Fresh Vegetables, Inc.,
967 F. Supp. 2d 1289 (N.D. Cal. 2013)1, 4

Other Authorities

F.R.C.P. 15(c)3

F.R.C.P. 213

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.