

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

ACCELERATION BAY, LLC, a	)	
Delaware Limited Liability Corporation,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	C.A. No. 22-904-RGA-SRF
	)	
v.	)	<b>PUBLIC VERSION</b>
	)	
AMAZON WEB SERVICES, INC., a	)	
Delaware Corporation,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**PLAINTIFF ACCELERATION BAY LLC’S ANSWERING BRIEF IN  
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT AMAZON WEB SERVICES, INC.’S  
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGEMENT AND TO EXCLUDE EXPERT OPINIONS**

OF COUNSEL:

Paul J. Andre  
 Lisa Kobialka  
 James Hannah  
 Kristopher Kastens  
 Michael Lee  
 Christina M. Finn  
 KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS  
 & FRANKEL LLP  
 333 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 700  
 Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
 (650) 752-1700

Philip A. Rovner (#3215)  
 POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP  
 Hercules Plaza  
 P.O. Box 951  
 Wilmington, DE 19899  
 (302) 984-6000  
 provner@potteranderson.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff  
 Acceleration Bay, LLC*

Aaron M. Frankel  
 Marcus A. Colucci  
 Cristina Martinez  
 Pooja P. Parekh  
 KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS  
 & FRANKEL LLP  
 1177 Avenue of the Americas  
 New York, NY 10036  
 (212) 715-9100

Date: June 18, 2024  
 Public version dated: June 26, 2024  
 11569541

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. ARGUMENT .....	1
A. AWS Does Not Have a License to the Asserted Patents .....	1
1. AWS Abandoned the Non-Assert Clause .....	2
2. The [REDACTED] is Unenforceable as a One-Sided Form Agreement Lacking Consideration .....	4
3. The Ambiguous [REDACTED] Should Be Narrowly Construed .....	6
4. AWS Should Be Precluded From Relying on the [REDACTED] Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(c)(1) Because it Selectively Withheld Relevant Amendments.....	9
5. AWS Does Not Have Admissible Evidence to Prove Boeing’s Use of VPC, EC2 and Cloudfront .....	11
B. AB Notified AWS it Was Infringing in 2019 .....	13
1. AB’s Notice Letter to AWS Identifies the Infringing Product Line and the Family of Asserted Patents.....	13
2. The Epic Games Notice Letter Confirms AWS Was on Notice .....	16
C. AWS’ Decision to Ignore AB’s Notice Letter Creates a Genuine Issue of Material Fact as to Willfulness .....	18
D. The Accused Products Use M-Regular Networks .....	20
1. The Accused Products Provide Scalable Cloud-Computing Services .....	21
2. VPC Peering Uses M-Regular Networks.....	22
3. VPC Infringes Through the Use of M-Regular [REDACTED] Products.....	25
4. Transit Gateway Uses Infringing M-Regular Networks.....	27
5. AB Disclosed Damages Theories for [REDACTED] and Hyperplane .....	30

E.	Dr. Cole Used a Reliable Methodology to Determine the Technical Value of the Infringing Functionality to the Accused Products .....	31
1.	Dr. Cole Relied on AWS Documents Identifying the Technical Features of the Accused Products .....	32
2.	Dr. Cole Consistently Applied his Methodology.....	34
F.	Mr. Gunderson’s Reasonable Royalty Opinion Reliably Captures the Full Scope of AWS’ Infringement .....	36
G.	Mr. Gunderson Properly Opined that the Parties to the Hypothetical Negotiation Would Be Aware of the <i>Activision</i> Verdict .....	38
III.	CONCLUSION.....	40

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Acceleration Bay, LLC v. Activision Blizzard, Inc.</i> , 324 F. Supp. 3d 470 (D. Del. 2018).....	39
<i>Acceleration Bay LLC v. Activision Blizzard, Inc.</i> , No. 16-453-RGA, 2017 WL 3738383 (D. Del. Aug. 29, 2017) .....	24, 38, 39, 40
<i>Acceleron, LLC v. Dell Inc.</i> , No. 1:12-cv-4123, 2022 WL 1087683 (N.D. Ga. Mar. 7, 2022), <i>aff'd</i> , No. 2022-1620, 2023 WL 4503189 (Fed. Cir. July 13, 2023).....	20
<i>Amsted Indus. Inc. v. Buckeye Steel Castings Co.</i> , 24 F.3d 178 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	15, 17
<i>Applied Med. Resources Corp. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.</i> , 435 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	40
<i>Bench Walk Lighting LLC v. LG Innotek Co.</i> , No. 20-51, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2727 (D. Del. Jan. 7, 2021), <i>adopted</i> 530 F. Supp. 3d 468, 478 (D. Del. 2021).....	19, 20
<i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i> , 477 U.S. 317 (1986).....	12
<i>Dali Wireless, Inc. v. CommScope Techs. LLC</i> , 2022 WL 19830016, (D. Del. Jan. 28, 2022).....	19
<i>Eastman Kodak Co. v. Agfa-Gevaert N.V.</i> , 560 F. Supp. 2d 227 (W.D.N.Y. 2008).....	15
<i>Eko Brands, LLC v. Adrian Rivera Maynez Enters., Inc.</i> , 946 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	18
<i>Epic Games, Inc. v. AB</i> , No. 4:19-cv-4133 (N.D. Cal.).....	16, 17
<i>Erfindergemeinschaft UroPep GbR v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> No. 2:15-cv-1202, 2017 WL 2190055 (E.D. Tex. May 18, 2017) .....	20
<i>Express Mobile, Inc. v. GoDaddy.com, LLC</i> , No. 19-cv-01937-MFK, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 243938 (D. Del. Aug. 8, 2022) .....	19

*Farmers Ins. Co. v. U.S.F. & G. Co.*,  
13 Wash.App. 836 (1975).....6

*Ferris v. Blumhardt*,  
48 Wash. 2d 395 (1956).....2, 4

*Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Sys., Inc.*,  
879 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....33

*Finjan, Inc. v. Cisco Sys. Inc.*,  
No. 17-CV-00072-BLF, 2020 WL 13180005 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 21, 2020) .....33, 34, 35

*Flatworld Interactives LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*,  
77 F. Supp. 3d 378 (D. Del. 2014).....15

*Gabl v. Alaska Loan & Inv. Co.*,  
6 Wn. App. 880 (1972) .....7

*Gart v. Logitech, Inc.*,  
254 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....16, 17

*Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Acceleron LLC*,  
587 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....16

*Interspiro USA, Inc. v. Figgie Int’l Inc.*,  
18 F.3d 927 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....2

*IOENGINE, LLC v. PayPal Holdings, Inc.*,  
607 F. Supp. 3d 464 (D. Del. 2022).....39, 40

*IP Power Holdings Ltd. v. Westfield Outdoor, Inc.*,  
No. 2:19-cv-01878, 2020 WL 2992415 (D. Nev. June 4, 2020) .....19, 20

*Kewazinga Corp. v. Microsoft Corp.*,  
558 F. Supp. 3d 90 (S.D.N.Y. 2021).....18

*King v. Rice*,  
146 Wash. App. 662 (2008).....7, 10

*Luna v. Gillingham*,  
57 Wash. App. 574 (1990).....6

*Marshall v. Thurston Cnty.*,  
165 Wash. App. 346 (2011).....9

*MasterObjects, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*,  
No. C 20-08103 WHA, 2021 WL 4685306 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 7, 2021) .....19

# 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.