

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

ACCELERATION BAY LLC,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	C.A. No. 16-454 (RGA)
v.	)	
	)	<b>PUBLIC VERSION</b>
ELECTRONIC ARTS INC.,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**PLAINTIFF ACCELERATION BAY LLC’S OPENING BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF ITS  
MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND MOTION TO EXCLUDE  
EXPERT TESTIMONY OF CATHARINE M. LAWTON**

OF COUNSEL:

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

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

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

Dated: March 23, 2018  
Public version dated: April 4, 2018

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	1
ARGUMENT .....	2
I. EA Directly Infringes the Asserted Claims .....	3
A. EA is a Direct Infringer of the Asserted System Claims of the ‘497, ‘344, and ‘966 Patents .....	3
B. EA Directly Infringes the Asserted Method Claims in the ‘147 and ‘069 Patents .....	6
C. EA Directly Infringes the Computer Readable Medium Claims .....	10
II. The Accused Products Infringe the Claims 9 and 16 of the ‘497 Patent .....	10
A. The Accused Products Use [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and Permit Players to Connect to Online Multiplayer Gameplay Sessions .....	11
B. The Accused Products Include a “Component” (Element 9A).....	14
C. The Accused Products Include a Means for Identifying a Portal Computer Having a Dynamically Selected Call-In Port for Communicating with Other Computers (Elements 9B).....	17
D. The Accused Products Include a Means for Identifying the Call-In Port by Repeatedly Trying to Establish a Connection (Element 9C).....	19
E. The Accused Products Include a Means For Selecting the Call-In Port of the Identified Portal Computer Using a Port Ordering Algorithm (Element 9D).....	21
F. The Accused Products Include a Means for Re-Ordering the Communications Ports Selected By the Port Ordering Algorithm (Element 9E) .....	21
G. The Accused Products Use TCP/IP Connections and Infringe Claim 16 (Element 16).....	22
III. Ms. Lawton’s Damages Opinions Should be Excluded as Arbitrary, Unsupported by the Facts of this Case and Unreliable.....	23
A. Ms. Lawton’s Opinions Regarding Purported Non-Infringing Alternatives are Legally Flawed and Factually Unsupported .....	24

B. Ms. Lawton’s Opinion that the Uniloc Verdict is Not Comparable to the Hypothetical License is Unreasonable.....28

C. Ms. Lawton’s Reasonable Royalty Opinion Rests on Speculation.....30

D. Ms. Lawton Assumes Comparability of the [REDACTED] Without Any Analysis.....35

E. Ms. Lawton’s Opinion as to the Date For the Hypothetical Negotiation is Unsupported and Arbitrary .....40

CONCLUSION ..... 42

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Acceleration Bay LLC v. Activision Blizzard Inc.</i> (16-453-RGA).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Akamai Techs., Inc. v. Limelight Networks, Inc.</i> , 797 F.3d 1020 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (en banc).....	7, 9, 10, 16
<i>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.</i> , 477 U.S. 242 (1986).....	6, 10
<i>Applied Med. Res. Corp. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.</i> , 435 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	41
<i>Bowling v. Hasbro, Inc.</i> , C.A. No. 05-229S, 2008 WL 717741 (D.R.I. Mar. 17, 2008) .....	32, 34, 35
<i>Brandeis Univ. v. Keebler Co.</i> , No. 1:12-cv-1508, 2013 WL 5911233 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 18, 2013).....	28
<i>Centillion Data Systems, LLC v. Qwest Commc’ns Int’l, Inc.</i> , 631 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (en banc).....	3, 5
<i>CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	10
<i>DataQuill Ltd. v. High Tech Computer Corp.</i> , 887 F.Supp.2d 999 (S.D. Cal. 2011).....	35
<i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharms., Inc.</i> , 509 U.S. 579 (1993).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Elcock v. Kmart Corp.</i> , 233 F.3d 734 (3d Cir. 2000).....	28
<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Teva Parenteral Medicines, Inc.</i> , 845 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	7
<i>Exmark Mfg. Co. v. Briggs &amp; Stratton Power Prod. Grp., LLC</i> , No. 8:10CV187, 2016 WL 2772122 (D. Neb. May 11, 2016), <i>vacated in part</i> <i>on other grounds</i> , 879 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	24
<i>Fairchild Semiconductor Corp. v. Power Integrations, Inc.</i> , No. 12-540-LPS, 2015 WL 1303643 (D. Del. Mar. 20, 2015).....	31

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Secure Computing Corp.</i> , 626 F.3d 1197 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	10
<i>Fromson v. W. Litho Plate &amp; Supply Co.</i> , 853 F.2d 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	39
<i>Fujifilm Corp. v. Motorola Mobility LLC</i> , No. 12-cv-03587-WHO, 2015 WL 1265009 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 19, 2015) .....	41
<i>Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. United States Plywood Corp.</i> , 318 F.Supp. 1116 (S.D.N.Y. 1970) .....	24, 36, 37
<i>Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize-Prods. Co.</i> , 185 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	28
<i>Honeywell Int’l, Inc. v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp.</i> , 378 F. Supp. 2d 459 (D. Del. 2005).....	39
<i>Invitrogen Corp. v. Biocrest Mfg., L.P.</i> , 424 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	11
<i>LaserDynamics, Inc. v. Quanta Computer, Inc.</i> , No. 2:06-CV-348, 2011 WL 197869 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 20, 2011) .....	24, 28, 35
<i>Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.</i> , 580 F.3d 1301 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	36, 38
<i>M2M Sols. LLC v. Enfora, Inc.</i> , 167 F. Supp. 3d 665 (D. Del. 2016).....	35
<i>M2M Sols. LLC v. Motorola Sols., Inc.</i> , No. CV 12-33-RGA, 2016 WL 767900 (D. Del. Feb. 25, 2016) .....	35
<i>Mars, Inc. v. Coin Acceptors, Inc.</i> , 527 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	24
<i>Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.</i> , 475 U.S. 574 (1986).....	3
<i>NetAirus Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , No. LA CV 10-03257 JAK(Ex), 2013 WL 11237200 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 23, 2013).....	36
<i>NTP, Inc. v. Research in Motion, Ltd.</i> , 418 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	5

# 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.