

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.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

**DEFENDANT’S REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT
BY COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL**

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP
Jack B. Blumenfeld (#1014)
Cameron P. Clark (#6647)
1201 North Market Street
P.O. Box 1347
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 658-9200
jblumenfeld@morrisnichols.com
cclark@morrisnichols.com

OF COUNSEL:

David P. Enzminger
Michael A. Tomasulo
Gino Cheng
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
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 520
Redwood City, CA 94065
(650) 858-6500

Joseph C. Masullo
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
1700 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 282-5000

January 7, 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. EA Has Demonstrated That Summary Judgment of Collateral Estoppel of Non-Infringement Based on <i>Take-Two</i> Is Warranted	1
A. EA Satisfies the Collateral Estoppel Standard.....	1
B. Acceleration’s Supposed “Application Layer Overlay” Network Does Not Infringe.....	4
C. Any Distinctions Between EA’s Voice Squelching and Sub-Channels Features and the Take Two Games Are Immaterial.....	5
1. Voice Squelching Feature Is an Immaterial Distinction	5
2. PvZ Voice Sub-Channel Feature Is an Immaterial Distinction	7
II. In Addition to Summary Judgment of Collateral Estoppel, the Court May Also Grant Summary Judgment of Non-Infringement in the First Instance	9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Acceleration Bay LLC v. Take-Two Interactive Software, Inc.,
No. 16-455-RGA, 2020 WL 1333131 (D. Del. Mar. 23, 2020) *passim*

Medtronic, Inc. v. Mirowski Fam. Ventures, LLC,
571 U.S. 191 (2014).....9

I. EA Has Demonstrated That Summary Judgment of Collateral Estoppel of Non-Infringement Based on *Take-Two* Is Warranted

Acceleration's opposition never addresses the central issue raised in EA's motion: collateral estoppel of non-infringement is required because, both in *Take-Two* and here, Acceleration does not dispute that the accused network is a client-server network. Instead, Acceleration offers the same theories for why Acceleration's supposed "application layer overlay network" is an m-regular and incomplete network.¹ Those theories failed in *Take-Two*, and they also fail here for the same reasons. Acceleration now offers three main counterarguments for why those theories are not barred by collateral estoppel: 1) proving collateral estoppel is a heavy burden, 2) EA focuses on the wrong layer, 3) EA's games are different. These arguments all fail.

A. EA Satisfies the Collateral-Estoppel Standard

It does not matter that collateral estoppel imposes a high bar because EA has cleared it. The accused *Take-Two* NBA 2K game and all accused EA games use a client-server network, and for each, Acceleration contends that there is an "application layer overlay" network overlaid on the client-server network that is purportedly m-regular and incomplete. It is not true that there is an overlay network in either case, but that is beside the point. The "application overlay network" Acceleration conjures up did not meet the claim limitations in *Take Two*, and it does not here for indistinguishable reasons. In *Take-Two*, Acceleration's expert said the relay server was a participant in the accused network. *Acceleration Bay LLC v. Take-Two Interactive Software, Inc.*, No. 16-455-RGA, 2020 WL 1333131 (D. Del. Mar. 23, 2020) ("*Take-Two*") at *9 ("Dr. Mitzenmacher, Plaintiff's own expert, wrote that the relay servers 'are participants'"). Here

¹ Despite its quibbling at the last status conference over whether the Court had granted summary judgment on the '497 patent, Acceleration confirms it is not moving forward with that patent. D.I. 582 at 2, n1. Either way, the '497 patent is out of this case. All that remains are Acceleration's theories that EA infringed the '344 and '966 patents by internal testing of the NHL and PvZ games and that the accused games infringe the '147 patent under the doctrine of equivalents.

too, Acceleration's expert has said that the server is a participant in the accused network for the FIFA, NHL and PvZ games:

• Participants: The participants are FIFA software application programs, running on player consoles (PC and Xbox), and EA's DirtyCast server. Poon Tr. 12:18-20, 15:9-11; EA0032813. See my discussion of Elements 344:12(a), 344:12(b), 344:12(e), 147:1(a).

• Participants: The participants are NHL software application programs, running on player consoles (PC and Xbox), and EA's DirtyCast server. O'Neill Tr. 105:11-106:11, 111:6-18, 127:7-19; Poon Tr. 12:18-20, 15:9-11; EA0032813. See my discussion of Elements 344:12(a), 344:12(b), 344:12(e), 147:1(a).

• Participants: The participants are PvZ software application programs, running on player consoles (PC and Xbox), and EA's DirtyCast server. O'Neill Tr. 105:11-106:11, 111:6-18, 127:7-19; Lo Tr. 19:18-21:3, 21:23-22:15, 23:12-20, 24:15-21; EA0032813. See my discussion of Elements 344:12(a), 344:12(b), 344:12(e), 147:1(a).

D.I. 428, Ex. A-1 (Medvidović opening report) ¶ 2 (highlighting added).

79. The participants in the FIFA game environments include FIFA software application programs running on players' consoles (PC or Xbox) and EA's DirtyCast server,

D.I. 428, Ex. A-1 (Medvidović opening report) ¶ 79 (highlighting added).

86. The participants in the NHL game environments include NHL software application programs running on players' consoles (XBox) and EA's DirtyCast server, which

D.I. 428, Ex. A-1 (Medvidović opening report) ¶ 86 (highlighting added).

93. The participants in the PvZ game environments include PvZ software application programs running on players' consoles (PC or Xbox) and EA's DirtyCast server, which includes

D.I. 428, Ex. A-1 (Medvidović opening report) ¶ 93 (highlighting added).

Q. So I'd like to go to Paragraph 79.

A. Of which exhibit?

Q. Of your opening report. Sorry.

A. Thank you.

Q. So we've looked at most of this already, but in the sixth line of that paragraph—actually, I'll start at the fifth line so it's a

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.