

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

BUNGIE, INC.,  
Petitioner

v.

WORLDS INC.,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2015-01268  
Patent 7,181,690

---

**PATENT OWNER WORLDS INC.'S  
RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Background.....	3
	a. About U.S. Patent No. 7,181,690 (the “‘690 patent” or “Leahy”).....	3
	b. The Petition Challenges Claims 1-20 of the ‘690 Patent .....	5
	c. Petitioner Failed to Conduct a Proper Claim Construction Analysis and Applied Unreasonably Broad Interpretations of the Claim Terms .....	7
III.	Argument .....	23
	a. The Petition’s Obviousness-Based Challenges Fail Due to Shortcomings of the Secondary References.....	23
	b. Petitioner’s Theory of Anticipation Fails to Identify Each Recited Feature of the Claims .....	36
	c. Funkhouser Fails to Disclose all Features of Claim 1.....	37
	d. Durward Also Fails to Disclose all Features of Claim 1 .....	42
	e. The Petition Fails to Name All Real Parties in Interest .....	47
	f. An Invalidity Ruling in This Case Constitutes an Impermissible Taking of a Private Right Without Article III Oversight.....	52
	g. Claims 9, 18, and 20 of the ‘690 Patent are Not Indefinite.....	54
	h. Under Bungie’s Interpretation of “determining”, Funkhouser ’95 is Not Prior Art .....	55
IV.	Conclusion .....	59

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Cammeyer v. Newton</i> , 94 U.S. 225 (1876) .....	54
<i>Garmin Int'l, Inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Techs LLC</i> , IPR2012-00001 (PTAB March 5, 2013) .....	51
<i>IGT v. Bally Gaming Int'l, Inc.</i> , 659 F.3d 1109 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	15
<i>In re Guan Inter Partes</i> Reexamination Proceeding, Control No. 95/001,045, Decision Vacating Filings Date (Aug. 25, 2008) .....	50
<i>In re Rambus, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 42 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	8
<i>James v. Campbell</i> , 104 U.S. 356 (1881) .....	54
<i>K.J. Pretech Co., Ltd. v. Innovative Display Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2015-01866-68 (PTAB Nov. 20, 2015).....	52
<i>Loral Space &amp; Comms., Inc. v. Viasat, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00236 (PTAB Apr. 21, 2014) .....	53
<i>McCormick Harvesting Mach. Co. v. Aultman</i> , 169 U.S. 606 (1898).....	54, 55
<i>Michigan Land and Lumber Co. v. Rust</i> , 168 U.S. 589 (1897).....	55
<i>Omron Oilfield &amp; Marine, Inc. v. MD/TOTCO, a Division of Varco, L.P.</i> , IPR2014-00265 (PTAB Oct. 31, 2013) .....	8
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	8, 11
<i>RPX Corp. v. Virnetx Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00171 (PTAB June 5, 2014) .....	48, 53
<i>Seymour v. Osborne</i> , 11 Wall. 516 (1870) .....	54
<i>St. Jude Med., Cardiology Div., Inc. v. Volcano Corp.</i> , IPR2013-00258 (PTAB Oct. 16, 2013) .....	53
<i>Taylor v. Sturgell</i> , 553 U.S. 880 (2008).....	50
<i>United States v. Am. Bell Telephone Co.</i> , 128 U.S. 315 (1888) .....	54, 55
<i>United States v. Schurz</i> , 102 U.S. 378 (1880).....	54
<i>Universal Remote Control, Inc. v. Universal Elecs., Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00168 (PTAB Aug. 26, 2013) .....	53

### Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102 .....	55
-----------------------	----

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) .....	35
35 U.S.C. § 154(a)(2).....	9
35 U.S.C. § 154(a)(3).....	9
35 U.S.C. § 315(b) .....	48, 50, 52, 53
5 U.S.C. § 554(d) .....	32

**Other Authorities**

Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012).....	8, 50
---	-------

**Rules**

37 C.F.R. § 1.131(b) .....	58
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1).....	53
37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).....	15, 35, 45
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....	8
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(c).....	10

## LIST OF PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBITS

<u>Exhibit</u>	<u>Description</u>
2001	Transcript of Conference Call of July 23, 2015
2002	“Exhibit 1” to Exhibit 2001 (Software Publishing and Development Agreement, dated April 16, 2010)
2003	Proof of Service in <i>Worlds Inc. v. Activision Blizzard, Inc., et al.</i> , Case No. 1:12-cv-10576 (D. Mass.)
2004	Letter dated November 13, 2014, from Worlds’ litigation counsel to Activision’s litigation counsel
2005	Patent Owner’s First [Proposed] Set of Requests for Production of Documents and Things to Petitioner (Nos. 1-6)
2006	Claim Construction Order dated June 26, 2015 in <i>Worlds Inc. v. Activision Blizzard, Inc., et al.</i> , Case No. 1:12-cv-10576 (D. Mass.)
2007	Complaint in <i>Worlds Inc. v. Activision Blizzard, Inc., et al.</i> , Case No. 1:12-cv-10576 (D. Mass.)
2008	Copilevitz, Todd, “Here’s a chat room worth talking about,” The Dallas Morning News, June 11, 1995
2009	Smith, Gina, “Whole new Worlds on-line,” San Francisco Examiner, May 14, 1995
2010	Image File Wrapper from USPTO’s Patent Application Information Retrieval website for U.S. Patent No. 7,181,690
2011	Petition to Accept Unintentionally Delayed Payment of Maintenance Fee In an Expired Patent (37 CFR 1.378(b)) for U.S. Patent No. 7,181,690
2012	Electronic Patent Application Fee Transmittal for U.S. Patent

# 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.