

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 REGARDING U.S. PATENT NOS. 6,701,344, 6,714,966, AND 6,829,634**

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSH & 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:

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

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

Michael M. Murray
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166
(212) 294-3510

October 31, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. THE MOTIONS TO DISMISS ARE PROCEDURALLY PROPER.....	3
III. THE BROADCAST CLAIMS ARE NOT PATENT-ELIGIBLE UNDER <i>ALICE</i>	3
A. Plaintiff's Interpretation Of The Claims Should Be Rejected.....	3
B. <i>Alice</i> Step 1: Even Under Plaintiff's Construction, The Broadcast Claims Are Directed To An Abstract Idea.....	4
C. <i>Alice</i> Step 2: The Broadcast Claims Contain No "Inventive Concept"	7
1. The Broadcast Claims Do Not Recite Concrete Limitations Providing Tangible Benefits.	7
2. The Broadcast Claims Purport To Preempt The Field.	8
3. Novelty Is Not Relevant To A Section 101 Analysis.....	9
IV. AS DEFINED BY PLAINTIFF, THE BROADCAST CLAIMS ARE NOT PHYSICAL OR TANGIBLE STRUCTURES AND THUS NOT PATENT-ELIGIBLE SUBJECT MATTER.....	9
V. CONCLUSION	10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. v. CLS Bank Int'l,</i> 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Allvoice Developments US, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.,</i> 612 F. App'x 1009 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	10
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics, Inc. v. Sequenom, Inc.,</i> 788 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	8
<i>ART+COM Innovationpool GmbH v. Google Inc.,</i> 2016 WL 1718221 (D. Del. Apr. 28, 2016).....	8
<i>Bilski v. Kappos,</i> 561 U.S. 593 (2010)	2
<i>DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.,</i> 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	5, 6
<i>Dealertrack, Inc. v. Huber,</i> 674 F.3d (Fed. Cir. 2012)	8
<i>Diamond v. Diehr,</i> 450 U.S. 175 (1981)	9
<i>Digitech Image Techs., LLC v. Elecs. for Imaging, Inc.,</i> 758 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Enfish, LLC. v. Microsoft Corp.,</i> 822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	5, 6
<i>GoDaddy.com LLC v. RPost Commc'n's Ltd.,</i> 2016 WL 3165536 (D. Ariz. June 7, 2016)	10
<i>Kenexa BrassRing, Inc. v. HireAbility.com, LLC,</i> 2015 WL 1943826 (D. Mass. Apr. 28, 2015).....	3
<i>MAZ Encryption Technologies LLC v. BlackBerry Corp.,</i> 2016 WL 5661981 (D. Del. Sept. 29, 2016).....	6
<i>McRO, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games Am. Inc.,</i> 2016 WL 4896481 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 13, 2016)	8
<i>Network Congestion Sols., LLC v. United States Cellular Corp.,</i> 170 F. Supp. 3d 695 (D. Del. 2016)	6

<i>Nice Sys. Ltd. v. Clickfox, Inc.,</i> 2016 WL 4941984 (D. Del. Sept. 15, 2016).....	6
<i>In re Nuijten,</i> 500 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	10
<i>Personalized Media Commc'ns, LLC v. Amazon.com,</i> 2015 WL 4730906 (D. Del. Aug. 10, 2015).....	8
<i>Pragmatus Telecom, LLC v. Genesys Telecomm.,</i> 2015 WL 4128963 (D. Del. July 9, 2015).....	6
<i>Priceplay.com, Inc. v. AOL Advert., Inc.,</i> 83 F. Supp. 3d 577 (D. Del. 2015).....	9
<i>Smartflash LLC v. Apple, Inc.,</i> 2015 WL661174 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 13, 2015).....	8
<i>SRI Int'l, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.,</i> 2016 WL 1437655 (D. Del. Apr. 11, 2016).....	6
<i>Treehouse Avatar LLC v. Valve Corp.,</i> 170 F. Supp. 3d 706 (D. Del. 2016)	6
<i>Two-Way Media Ltd. v. Comcast Cable Commc'n, LLC,</i> 2016 WL 4373698 (D. Del. August 15, 2016)	3
<i>Visual Memory LLC v. NVIDIA Corp.,</i> 2016 WL 3041847 (D. Del. May 27, 2016)	3, 6

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 101.....	<i>passim</i>
----------------------	---------------

Other Authorities

Fed. R. Civ. P. 56.....	3
-------------------------	---

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.