

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

ACCELERATION BAY LLC, : CA NO. 16-453-RGA,
 : 16-454-RGA, 16-455-RGA
Plaintiff, :
 :
v. : February 17, 2017
 :
ACTIVISION BLIZZARD INC., et :
al., :
 :
Defendants, : 11:06 o'clock a.m.
.....:

TRANSCRIPT OF SCHEDULING CONFERENCE
BEFORE THE HONORABLE RICHARD G. ANDREWS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff: POTTER, ANDERSON & CORROON
BY: PHILLIP A. ROVNER, ESQ

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

-and-

KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL

BY: PAUL J. ANDRE, ESQ

BY: AARON M. FRANKEL, ESQ

For Defendants: MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL

BY: JACK B. BLUMENFELD, ESQ

-and-

WINSTON & STRAWN

BY: DAVID P. ENZMINGER, ESQ

BY: MICHAEL A. TOMASULO, ESQ

Court Reporter: LEONARD A. DIBBS
Official Court Reporter

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2
3 (The proceedings occurred at 11:06 o'clock a.m. as
4 follows:)

:06:51 5 THE COURT: All right.

6 Good morning. Please be seated.

7 So this is Acceleration Bay v. Activision, Civil Action
8 No. 16-453, and also Electronics Arts, No. 15-454, and also
9 Take-Two Interactive Software, No. 16-455.

:07:13 10 Mr. Rovner, good morning.

11 MR. ROVNER: Good morning, your Honor.

12 With me for plaintiff is Paul Andre and Aaron Frankel
13 from Kramer Levin.

14 MR. ANDRE: Good morning, your Honor.

:07:22 15 THE COURT: Good morning to you all.

16 Mr. Blumenfeld?

17 MR. BLUMENFELD: Good morning, your Honor.

18 Jack Blumenfeld for all defendants along with David
19 Enzminger and Mike Tomasulo from Winston & Strawn.

:07:32 20 THE COURT: All right.

21 So, you know, Mr. Blumenfeld and Mr. Rovner have heard
22 me many times start off by thanking counsel for their efforts to
23 reach agreement and how much I appreciate it. I'm not going to
24 say that today.

:07:48 25 But before we got to the Scheduling Order, I was just

1 wondering why, notwithstanding the fact that I referred
2 everything to the Special Master here, I couldn't actually just
3 resolve this, because it didn't seem like it was very difficult,
4 so it might fall within my area of competence.

:08:09

5 What plaintiff proposed, as I understand it, is that
6 simply because somebody worked on the IPR, which now it is
7 represented you cannot change the claims on, does not in any way
8 impede them from working on a going forward basis, is that
9 right?

:08:36

10 MR. FRANKEL: Your Honor, the issue is that the -- we
11 think the people who have been working on the IPRs should now be
12 able to access source code because --

13 THE COURT: Right, I get that, but, I mean, it's
14 because the IPR is over.

:08:48

15 MR. ANDRE: It's not over, your Honor, but the point
16 where you can amend is over.

17 THE COURT: Right.

18 MR. ANDRE: Yes.

:08:58

19 THE COURT: So is there something wrong with the theory
20 that what you -- why you sometimes restrict people, because they
21 have decision-making capabilities that could somehow, you know,
22 impact the case, aren't we past that point?

23 MR. ENZMINGER: We're not past that point. That's the
24 problem, your Honor.

:09:14

25 The Motions to Amend the claims are still pending, so

1 there's no certainty as to how the Patent Office is going as to
2 handle it.

3 THE COURT: Are the Motions to Amend still pending?

4 MR. ANDRE: We filed the motions. All the oral
:09:27 5 argument is done. We can't do anything else. There's nothing
6 else we can affect the decision. The amendment have already
7 been made. The proposed amendments have been made to the claims
8 and we can't change those.

9 THE COURT: So is there a timetable for when somebody
:09:46 10 in the PTO, or I guess in the PTAB, or somewhere is going to
11 rule on these?

12 MR. ANDRE: March 2nd, I believe. Less than two weeks.

13 The PTAB is statutorily required to come up with a
14 decision on the IPRs by, I think, March 2nd or 3rd. You guys
:10:05 15 correct me if I'm wrong, but I think it's those dates.

16 MR. TOMASULO: Mid-March. There are two sets of
17 decisions.

18 THE COURT: And, so, when the PTAB actually rules, what
19 would your position be then?

:10:17 20 MR. ENZMINGER: It depends on how the PTAB rules.

21 THE COURT: Let's say they -- why does their ruling
22 make a difference?

23 MR. ENZMINGER: Suppose they ask for additional
24 briefing or something?

:10:30 25 MR. TOMASULO: Or they appeal?

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.