

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

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

**PLAINTIFF ACCELERATION BAY LLC’S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT
ELECTRONIC ARTS, INC.’S MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
AND TO EXCLUDE EXPERT OPINIONS UNDER F.R.E. 702**

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

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: April 13, 2018
Public version dated: April 24, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	1
ARGUMENT	2
I. EA Infringes the Asserted Claims.....	2
A. The Accused Networks are M-Regular and Incomplete and Meet the Broadcast/Rebroadcast Requirements	2
(1) The Accused Networks are M-Regular and Incomplete.....	2
(2) The Accused Networks Broadcast and Re-broadcast Data as Required By the ‘344, ‘966 and ‘634 Patents	7
(3) The Accused Networks Infringe at least Under the Doctrine of Equivalents.....	8
B. EA Makes, Uses, Sells or Puts Into Use the “Network,” “System” or “Information Delivery Service” of the ‘344 and ‘966 Patent Claims.....	9
C. EA Makes, Uses, Sells or Puts Into Use the ‘497 Patent Hardware “Component”	11
D. The Actions That Infringe the Method Claims Occur in the U.S.	14
E. The Accused Products Connect as Required by the’069 and ‘634 Patents	15
(1) The Accused Product Use “Fully Connected” and “Located” Portal Computers	15
(2) The Accused Products Infringe the Asserted Claims of the ‘069 Patent.....	17
(3) An “Edge Connection Request” is Sent to “Randomly Selected Neighboring Participants” as Required by the Asserted Claims of the ‘069 Patent	18
F. Players Disconnect from the Accused Products as Required by the’147 Claims	20
G. The Accused Products Contact a Portal Computer.....	22
(1) The Accused Products Repeatedly Try to Establish a Connection to a Port of the Portal Computer that has a Dynamically Selected Call-in Port.....	22

(2) The Accused Products Use a “Port Ordering Algorithm”	24
H. Head-to-Head Modes	24
I. At the Very Least, EA Infringes the Claims Under DOE.....	24
J. EA Foreign Sales and Use of its Systems Infringe.....	27
II. EA is and has been Willfully Infringing the Asserted Patents.....	28
III. Dr. Medvidović and Dr. Mitzenmacher Disclose in Their Expert Reports the Bases For Their Opinions that the Accused Products “Use Various Rules And Constants” To Converge on M-Regular And Create A Broadcast Channel.....	31
IV. The Opinions of Drs. Meyer, Bims and Valerdi Are Reliable.....	33
A. Overview of the Damages Opinions at Issue	33
B. Dr. Meyer’s Hypothetical Negotiation Date Opinions are Reliable	37
C. Dr. Meyer’s Opinions Regarding the [REDACTED] are Reliable.....	37
D. The Opinions of Drs. Meyer and Bims Regarding Uniloc are Reliable	38
E. Dr. Bims’ Opinion that the Relative Value of the Asserted Patents is 6-15 Times the Value of the Uniloc Patent is Reliable.....	41
F. Dr. Meyer Properly Apportioned the Royalty Base and Accounted for Future Infringement of the Patented Technology Through Patent Expiry	43
G. Dr. Meyer’s Royalty Rate for Individual Patents is Reliable	45
H. Dr. Valerdi’s Cost Opinion is Reliable.....	46
CONCLUSION.....	49

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>Ansell Healthcare Prods. LLC v. Reckitt Benckiser LLC</i> , No. 15-CV-915-RGA, 2018 WL 620968 (D. Del. Jan. 30, 2018).....	31
<i>Cadence Pharms. Inc. v. Exela PharmSci Inc.</i> , 780 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	26
<i>Card-Monroe Corp. v. Tuftco Corp.</i> , 270 F. Supp. 3d 967 (E.D. Tenn. 2017).....	27, 28
<i>Centillion Data Sys., LLC v. Qwest Commc'ns Int'l, Inc.</i> , 631 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	10
<i>CNET Networks, Inc. v. Etilize, Inc.</i> , 528 F. Supp. 2d 985 (N.D. Cal. 2007)	10
<i>Exmark Mfg. Co. v. Briggs & Stratton Power Prods. Grp., LLC</i> , 879 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	43, 45
<i>Georgia-Pac. Corp. v. U.S. Plywood Corp.</i> , 318 F. Supp. 1116 (S.D.N.Y. 1970).....	49
<i>Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.</i> , 769 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (O'Malley, J., concurring)	30, 31
<i>NTP, Inc. v. Research in Motion, Ltd.</i> , 418 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	9
<i>Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.</i> , 609 F. Supp. 2d 1057 (C.D. Cal. 2009)	28
<i>Trading Techs. Int'l, Inc. v. eSpeed, Inc.</i> , 595 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	26
<i>Transcenic, Inc. v. Google, Inc.</i> , No. CV 11-582-LPS, 2014 WL 7275835 (D. Del. Dec. 22, 2014).....	14
<i>Travel Sentry, Inc. v. Tropp</i> , 877 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	12
<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. v. EA</i> , No. 6:13-cv-00259-RWS (E.D. Tex.) (Dec. 5, 2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.</i> , 829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	30
Federal Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 271(a)	9, 10, 12, 27

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

	ABBREVIATION
The Parties	
Acceleration Bay, LLC	AB
Acceleration Bay's Opening Summary Judgment and <i>Daubert</i> Brief (D.I. 437)	AB Br.
Electronic Arts, Inc.	EA
EA's Brief in Support of Motions for Summary Judgment and Exclude Expert Opinions Under FRE 702 (D.I. 426)	Def. Br.
Declaration of Kathleen Barry in Support of Electronic Arts, Inc.'s Motions for Summary Judgment and to Exclude Expert Opinions (D.I.428-494)	Barry Decl.
EA Blizzard	EA
The "Asserted Patents"	
U.S. Patent No. 6,701,344 (Ex. 102)	'344 Patent
U.S. Patent No. 6,714,966 (Ex. 103)	'966 Patent
U.S. Patent No. 6,829,634 (Ex. 105)	'634 Patent
U.S. Patent No. 6,910,069 (Ex. 107)	'069 Patent
U.S. Patent No. 6,732,147 (Ex. 106)	'147 Patent
U.S. Patent No. 6,920,497 (Ex. 104)	'497 Patent
The "Accused Products"	
FIFA 15 and FIFA 16	FIFA
NHL 15 and NHL 16	NHL
Plants vs. Zombies: Garden Warfare 1 and Plants vs. Zombies Garden Warfare 2	PvZ

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.