

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

ACCELERATION BAY LLC,)	C.A. No. 16-453 (RGA)
)	
Plaintiff,)	PUBLIC VERSION
)	
v.)	
)	
ACTIVISION BLIZZARD, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	
<hr style="border: 0.5px solid black;"/>		
ACCELERATION BAY LLC,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	C.A. No. 16-454 (RGA)
v.)	
)	
ELECTRONIC ARTS INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	
<hr style="border: 0.5px solid black;"/>		
ACCELERATION BAY LLC,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	C.A. No. 16-455 (RGA)
v.)	
)	
TAKE-TWO INTERACTIVE SOFTWARE, INC., ROCKSTAR GAMES, INC., and 2K SPORTS, INC.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

**PLAINTIFF ACCELERATION BAY LLC'S REPLY BRIEF IN
IN SUPPORT OF ITS SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND DAUBERT MOTIONS**

OF COUNSEL:

Paul J. Andre
Lisa Kobialka
KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS
& FRANKEL LLP
990 Marsh Road
Menlo Park, CA 94025
(650) 752-1700
pandre@kramerlevin.com
lkobialka@kramerlevin.com

Aaron M. Frankel
KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS
& FRANKEL LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
(212) 715-9100
afrankel@kramerlevin.com

Dated: March 9, 2018
Public version dated: March 16, 2018

Philip A. Rovner (#3215)
Jonathan A. Choa (#5319)
POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP
Hercules Plaza
P.O. Box 951
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 984-6000
provner@potteranderson.com
jchoa@potteranderson.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ACCELERATION BAY LLC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ARGUMENT	1
I. The Asserted Claims Are Valid Over Defendants’ Prior Art	1
A. IPR Estoppel Bars Various of Defendants’ Invalidity Challenges	1
1. Defendants are Estopped from Asserting DirectPlay and AoE	1
2. Defendants Are Barred From Asserting Alagar Alone or With AoE	2
B. Defendants Cannot Prove Invalidity By Clear and Convincing Evidence	4
1. Obraczka Thesis, Shoubridge and Dénes Do Not Render Obvious ‘069 Claims 1 and 11	5
2. Shoubridge Does Not Render Obvious Claim 12 of the ‘344 and ‘966 Patents..	5
3. Shoubridge, Dénes and Rufino Do Not Render Obvious ‘147 Claims 1, 11, 15 and 16.....	6
4. Neither DirectPlay in View of Shoubridge Nor Obraczka in View of Shoubridge and Obraczka Thesis Renders Obvious Claims 19 and 22 of the ‘634 Patent.....	6
C. Defendants’ Prior Art Does Not Disclose an Incomplete, M-regular Network.....	7
1. Alagar Fails to Disclose the M-Regular Claims	7
2. AoE, DirectPlay and Alagar Do Not Teach a Non-Complete, M-Regular Network.....	7
D. Kegel and ActiveNet Do Not Invalidate the Asserted Claims of the ‘497 Patent	8
1. Kegel Was Not Available Until After the Filing Date of the ‘497 Patent	8
2. ActiveNet Was Not Publicly Available Until After the Filing Date of the ‘497 Patent.....	9
II. The Accused Products infringe Claim 12 of the ‘344 Patent.....	10
A. Destiny Infringes Claim 12 of the ‘344 Patent	10
1. The Destiny Network is m-regular	10
2. Destiny Broadcasts and Rebroadcasts Messages	11
3. Destiny Forms Broadcast Channels	12
B. Call of Duty Infringes Claim 12 of the ‘344 Patent.....	13
1. In CoD, Each Participant Has At Least Three Connections	13
2. The CoD Network is M-regular and Incomplete	13
3. CoD Satisfies the Broadcast Limitations	15
4. CoD Forms Broadcast Channels For a Game of Interest.....	15
C. World of Warcraft Infringes Claim 12 of the ‘344 Patent.....	16
1. WoW Satisfies the Broadcast Limitations	16

2. WoW Uses Non-Complete, M-Regular Networks 16

3. WoW Forms Broadcast Channels For Games of Interest 17

III. MS. LAWTON’S OPINIONS SHOULD BE EXCLUDED 18

A. Ms. Lawton’s Reasonable Royalty Opinion is Unsupported and Unreliable 18

B. Ms. Lawton Failed to Demonstrate Comparability of the Sony/Boeing License 19

C. Ms. Lawton’s Hypothetical Negotiation Date Opinion is Unsupported..... 21

D. Ms. Lawton’s Opinions Regarding Non-Infringing Alternatives are Unsupported ... 23

E. Ms. Lawton’s Invalidity Opinions are Unreliable 25

CONCLUSION..... 25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>01 Communique Lab., Inc. v. Citrix Sys., Inc.</i> , 151 F. Supp. 3d 778 (N.D. Ohio 2015).....	2
<i>Applied Med. Resources Corp. v. U.S. Surgical</i> , 435 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	22
<i>Astrazeneca AB v. Apotex Corp.</i> , 782 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	22
<i>Biscotti Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , No. 13-cv-01015-JRG-RSP, 2017 WL 2526231 (E.D. Tex. May 11, 2017).....	2
<i>Carnegie Mellon Univ. v. Marvell Tech. Group Ltd.</i> , No. 09-290, 2012 WL 6562221 (W.D. Pa. Dec. 15, 2012)	25
<i>Clearlamp, LLC v. LKQ Corp.</i> , No. 12 C 2533, 2016 WL 4734389 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 18, 2016)	2, 4
<i>Comcast IP Holdings I, LLC v. Sprint Commc'nc Co.</i> , No. 12-0205-RGA, 2015 WL 4730899 (D. Del. Aug. 10, 2015)	21
<i>Depomed, Inc. v. Purdue Pharma L.P.</i> , No. 13-571 (MLC), 2016 WL 8677317, (D.N.J. Nov. 4, 2016).....	2
<i>Fujifilm Corp. v. Motorola Mobility LLC</i> , No. 12-cv-03587-WHO, 2015 WL 1265009 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 19, 2015)	22
<i>In re Hall</i> , 781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	8
<i>Inline Connection Corp. v. AOL Time Warner Inc.</i> , 470 F. Supp. 2d 435 (D. Del. 2007).....	24
<i>Insight Tech., Inc. v. SureFire, LLC</i> , No. 04-cv-74-JD, 2007 WL 3244092 (D.N.H. Nov. 1, 2007).....	8
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Toshiba Corp.</i> No. 13-453-SLR, 2017 WL 107980 (D. Del. Jan. 11, 2017).....	3
<i>LaserDynamics, Inc. v. Quanta Computer, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 51 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	22

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.