

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

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

**REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT’S MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT AND TO EXCLUDE EXPERT OPINIONS UNDER FRE 702**

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

OF COUNSEL:

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

Attorneys for Defendant

Louis L. Campbell
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

Krista M. Enns
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
101 California Street, 35th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
(415) 591-1000

Michael M. Murray
Anup K. Misra
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
200 Park Avenue,
New York, NY 10166
(212) 294-6700

Andrew R. Sommer
Thomas M. Dunham
Michael Woods
Paul N. Harold
Joseph C. Masullo
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
1700 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 282-5000

Original Filing Date: April 27, 2018
Redacted Filing Date: May 8, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities..... iii

Table of Exhibits and Abbreviations v

I. EA Does Not Infringe the Asserted Claims..... 1

 A. The Accused Networks Are Not M-Regular and Incomplete and They Do Not Meet the Broadcast/Rebroadcast Requirements..... 1

 1. The Accused Networks Are Not M-Regular And Not Incomplete. 1

 2. The Accused Networks Do Not Broadcast and Re-broadcast Data as Required By all claims of the '344 And '966 Patents and Claim 22 of the '634 Patent.....5

 3. EA did not ignore Doctrine of Equivalents6

 B. EA Does Not Make, Use, or Sell the “Network” “System” or “Information Delivery Service” of the '344 and '966 Patent Claims.....7

 C. EA Does Not Make, Use, or Sell the Hardware “Component” of the '497 Patent.....8

 D. The Actions Alleged to Infringe the Steps of the Method Claims of the '147 and '069 Patents Do Not All Occur in the United States.9

 E. Users Do Not Join The Accused Games As Recited by the Asserted Claims of the '069 and '634 Patents. 10

 1. There Is No “Fully Connected Portal Computer” or “Located Portal Computer” Required By the Asserted Claims of the '069 And '634 Patents. 10

 2. The Accused Games Do Not “Identify[] a Pair of Participants of the Network That Are Connected” or “Disconnect[] the Participants of the Identified Pair From Each Other” so There Can Be No Infringement of the '069 Patent..... 11

 3. The '069 Patent Is Not Infringed Because There Is No “Edge Connection Request” Sent to “Randomly Selected Neighboring Participants.” 12

 F. Users Do Not Leave The Accused Games As Recited by The Asserted Claims of the '147 Patent. 13

 G. The Accused Games Do Not Contact a Portal Computer as Required by the Asserted Claims of the '497 Patent. 13

 1. The [REDACTED] Server Does Not Have A Dynamically Selected Call-in Port and the Accused Games Do Not Repeatedly Try to Establish a Connection to any Port. 13

 2. The Accused Games Do Not Use a “Port Ordering Algorithm.” 14

 H. Head-to-Head Modes Cannot Infringe the '344, '966, '634,

'147, and '069 patents15

I. EA Does Not Infringe Any Claim Under the Doctrine of
Equivalents.15

J. Accused Acts Outside The United States Do Not Infringe Any
Patent.16

II. Acceleration Cannot Show Willful Infringement.....16

III. Dr. Medvidović And Dr. Mitzenmacher’s Opinions Regarding
“Logics Rules” Should Be Excluded As Unsupported By Their
Expert Reports.17

IV. Drs. Meyer, Bims, and Valerdi Offer Unreliable Opinions Related
To Damages Issues, Which Should Be Excluded.....17

A. Dr. Meyer Should Not Be Allowed To Offer An Alternative
Analysis Regarding the Hypothetical Negotiation Date.17

B. Dr. Meyer’s Opinions Regarding the [REDACTED] Should Be
Excluded.18

C. The *Uniloc v. EA* Jury Verdict Is Not Comparable To the
Asserted Patents, and All Opinions Regarding *Uniloc v. EA*
Should Be Excluded.18

D. Dr. Bims’s Opinions Regarding the Relative Value of the
Asserted Patents and the Uniloc Patent Are Unreliable and
Should Be Excluded.19

E. Dr. Meyer Did Not Properly Apportion the Royalty Base, and It
Is Improper To Claim Damages For Future Products.20

F. Dr. Meyer’s Royalty Rate For Individual Patents Is Not
Supported, Not Reliable, and Should be Excluded.22

G. Dr. Valerdi’s Analysis Is Unreliable and Should Be Excluded.23

Conclusion.....24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Allergan Sales, LLC v. UCB, Inc.</i> 2016 WL 8222619 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 7, 2016).....	22
<i>Arthur A. Collins v. Northern Telecom Ltd.</i> , 216 F.3d 1042 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	15
<i>Centillion Data Systems, LLC v. Qwest Communications Int’l, Inc.</i> , 631 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	7, 8, 9
<i>Centrak, Inc. v. Sonitor Techs, Inc.</i> , No. CV 14-183-RGA, 2017 WL 3730617 (D. Del. Aug. 30, 2017)	7
<i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals</i> , 509 U.S. 579 (1993)	23
<i>Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Sys., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	18
<i>Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd.</i> , 535 U.S. 722 (2002)	7, 11
<i>Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd. (Festo II)</i> , 344 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	7, 16
<i>Flexuspine, Inc. v. Globus Med., Inc.</i> , 2016 WL 9282314 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 5, 2016).....	19
<i>Graves v. Mazda Motor Corp.</i> , 405 F. App’x 296 (10th Cir. 2010).....	20
<i>Grecia v. McDonald’s Corp.</i> , 2018 WL 1172580 (Fed. Cir. Mar. 6, 2018)	7
<i>Jang v. Boston Scientific Corp.</i> , 872 F. 3d 1275 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	6
<i>LaserDynamics, Inc. v. Quanta Computer, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 51 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	18, 20
<i>Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.</i> , 580 F.3d 1301 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	21
<i>NTP, Inc. v. Research in Motion, Ltd.</i> , 418 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	8, 10

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.