

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

ACCELERATION BAY LLC,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 16-455 (RGA)
)	
TAKE-TWO INTERACTIVE SOFTWARE,)	REDACTED –
INC., ROCKSTAR GAMES, INC. and)	PUBLIC VERSION
2K SPORTS, INC.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

**DEFENDANTS’ OPENING BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF
THEIR MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS’ FEES AND COSTS**

OF COUNSEL:

David P. Enzminger
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

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@morrisonichols.com
cclark@morrisonichols.com

Attorneys for Defendants

Louis L. Campbell
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 520
Redwood City, CA 94065
(650) 858-6500

Dan K. Webb
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
35 West Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 558-5600

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

Original Filing Date: February 7, 2022
Redacted Filing Date: February 15, 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Nature and Stage of the Proceedings	1
II. Summary of the Argument.....	1
III. Statement of the Facts.....	2
A. All Asserted Claims Were Decided in Take-Two’s Favor at Summary Judgment.....	2
B. Acceleration Did Not Appeal the M-Regular Noninfringement Holding and Lost the Issues It Did Raise on Appeal	2
IV. This Was an Exceptional Case Warranting an Award of Attorneys’ Fees to Take-Two Under 35 U.S.C. § 285.....	3
A. Defendants Are the “Prevailing Parties”.....	3
B. Take-Two Should Be Awarded All of Its Attorneys’ Fees in Defending This Case.....	4
C. Acceleration’s Substantive Litigation Positions Were Exceptionally Weak.....	5
1. Acceleration’s infringement position for the “m-regular” limitation, which relied in part on falsified evidence, was exceptionally weak.....	5
2. Acceleration’s DOE arguments were exceptionally weak.....	9
3. Acceleration’s position that the CRM claims were not ineligible was exceptionally weak	9
4. Acceleration’s standing position as to Sony PlayStation games was exceptionally weak.....	10
5. Acceleration’s damages theories were exceptionally weak	11
D. Acceleration’s Litigation Conduct Was Exceptional	13
1. Acceleration’s counsel’s lack of candor.....	13
2. Acceleration forced relitigation of issues it had already lost.....	13
3. Conduct in other cases supports a fee award here to deter such conduct.....	14

V. It Is Necessary and Proper to Award Fees Against Acceleration Bay’s Principals,
Alter Egos, and Attorneys 16

VI. Alternatively, the Court Should Award Defendants Their Fees and Costs Under Its
Inherent Power 19

VII. Conclusion 20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Acceleration Bay LLC v. 2K Sports, Inc.</i> , 15 F.4th 1069 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	1, 3
<i>Acceleration Bay LLC v. Activision Blizzard, Inc.</i> , 324 F. Supp. 3d 470 (D. Del. 2018).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Acceleration Bay LLC v. Activision Blizzard, Inc.</i> , C.A. No. 16-453-RGA, 2017 WL 3668597 (D. Del. Aug. 24, 2017).....	1, 10, 11
<i>Acceleration Bay LLC v. Elec. Arts Inc.</i> , No. 16-454-RGA, 2019 WL 1376036 (D. Del. Mar. 27, 2019)	14
<i>Acceleration Bay LLC v. Take-Two Interactive Software, Inc.</i> , No. 16-455-RGA, 2020 WL 1333131 (D. Del. Mar. 23, 2020)	<i>passim</i>
<i>AdjustaCam, LLC v. Newegg, Inc.</i> , 861 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	8
<i>Anderson Mfg. Inc. v. Wyers Prods. Grp., Inc.</i> , 18-0235-WJM, 2019 WL 4007772 (D. Colo. Aug. 23, 2019).....	4, 5, 6, 13
<i>Aptix Corp. v. Quickturn Design Sys., Inc.</i> , 269 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	8
<i>Bayer Cropscience AG v. Dow Agrosciences LLC</i> , No. 12-256-RMB, 2015 WL 108415 (D. Del. Jan. 5, 2015)	11
<i>Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.</i> , 501 U.S. 32 (1991).....	19
<i>Commil USA, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 575 U.S. 632 (2015).....	16
<i>CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	10
<i>Dragon Intellectual Prop. LLC v. DISH Network LLC</i> , 13-2066-RGA, 2021 WL 5177680 (D. Del. Nov. 8, 2021)	17
<i>Eon-Net LP v. Flagstar Bancorp</i> , 653 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	8

Finjan, Inc. v. Juniper Networks, Inc.,
 No. 17-05659-WHA, 2021 WL 3140716 (N.D. Cal. July 26, 2021).....13, 15

Finjan, Inc. v. Juniper Networks, Inc.,
 No. 17-05659-WHA, 2021 WL 75735 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 9, 2021).....12, 13, 15

Freshub, Inc. v. Amazon.com Inc.,
 6:21-cv-00511-ADA, 2021 WL 5987106 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 17, 2021).....15

Inland Steel Co. v. LTV Steel Co.,
 364 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....4

Intamin Ltd. v. Magnetar Techs. Corp.,
 No. 04-0511-GAF, 2009 WL 10675581 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 8, 2009)8

Intex Recreation Corp. v. Team Worldwide Corp.,
 77 F. Supp. 3d 212 (D.D.C. 2015)14

Inventor Holdings, LLC v. Bed Bath & Beyond, Inc.,
 876 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....5

Iris Connex, LLC v. Dell, Inc.,
 235 F. Supp. 2d 826 (E.D. Tex. 2017)..... *passim*

Kindred Studio Illustration & Design, LLC v. Elec. Commc’n Tech., LLC,
 No. 18-07661-GJS, 2019 WL 2064112 (C.D. Cal. May 23, 2019).....9

Large Audience Display Sys., LLC v. Tennman Prods., LLC,
 745 F. App’x 153 (Fed. Cir. 2018)4

Machinery Corp. of America v. Gullfiber AB,
 774 F.2d 467 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....18

Midwest Athletic & Sports Alliance LLC v. Ricoh USA, Inc.,
 No. 19-514, 2019 WL 3387061 (E.D. Pa. July 25, 2019)11, 15

Midwest Athletic & Sports Alliance LLC v. Ricoh USA, Inc.,
 2021 WL 1907475 (E.D. Pa. May 12, 2021)15

Nelson v. Adams USA, Inc.,
 529 U.S. 460 (2000).....18

Octane Fitness, LLC v. ICON Health & Fitness, Inc.,
 572 U.S. 545 (2014).....3, 5, 8, 13

Ohio Cellular Products Corp. v. Adams USA, Inc.,
 175 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....18

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.