

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BUNGIE, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

WORLDS INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-01264 (Patent 7,945,856 B2)

Case IPR2015-01319 (Patent 8,082,501 B2)

Case IPR2015-01321 (Patent 8,145,998 B2)

**PATENT OWNER WORLDS INC.'S
RESPONSE ON REMAND FROM CAFC**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	ISSUE PRECLUSION DOES NOT BAR WORLDS’ ARGUMENTS ON REAL PARTY IN INTEREST.....	2
A.	The Identification of All RPIs to Each Petition is Not an Identical Issue Among the Appealed and Non-Appealed IPRs	2
1.	Federal Circuit Cases Applying Issue Preclusion to Board Decisions are Not On Point to the Differing Issues Here	6
2.	Identity of Issue Does Not Exist Where the Burden of Proof is Different Between a First Action and a Second Action.....	7
3.	Bungie’s Argument for Issue Preclusion on the RPI Issue Would Lead to Absurd Results	8
B.	Bungie Fails to Meaningfully Address <i>B&B Hardware</i> ’s Concern for Quality, Extensiveness, and Fairness of Procedures Followed.....	9
C.	The Policy Behind <i>Cygnus</i> ’s Exemplary Exception Applies Here.....	11
D.	The Solicitor’s Office Agrees That Common Law-Based Issue Preclusion Does Not Apply at the PTAB.....	12
III.	BUNGIE FAILS TO CARRY ITS BURDEN OF ESTABLISHING THAT ACTIVSION IS NOT AN RPI TO BUNGIE’S PETITIONS	14
A.	Bungie Has No Relevant Evidence to Carry Its Burden.....	15
1.	The Agreement Executed in 2010 Cannot Prove That Activision is Not an RPI in 2015.....	16
2.	The Timing of Bungie’s Petitions Does Not Establish That Activision is Not an RPI	18
3.	The Board Should Ignore Bungie’s Attorney Argument Regarding a Self-Serving Settlement Attempt	19

B. Bungie Ignores the Federal Circuit’s Specific Instructions and Fails to Apply the Legal Test for RPI Set Forth in *AIT*20

C. Bungie Attempts to Avoid the Proper RPI Conclusion By Invoking Due Process Without Any Evidence24

D. Activision is also a Privy of Bungie in These IPR Petitions.....26

E. Bungie’s Refusal to Submit Evidence Should Not Create an Equitable Escape from the Statutory Requirement to Name all RPIs28

IV. CONCLUSION.....30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>A.B. Dick Co. v. Burroughs Corp.</i> , 713 F.2d 700 (Fed. Cir. 1983), <i>cert. denied</i> , 464 U.S. 1042 (1984)	3, 9
<i>Applications in Internet Time, LLC v. RPX Corp.</i> , 897 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	passim
<i>Aruze Gaming Macau, Ltd. v. MGT Gaming, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01288, Paper 13 (PTAB Feb. 20, 2015)	5
<i>Astoria Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass’n v. Solimino</i> , 501 U.S. 104 (1991).....	13
<i>Atlanta Gas Light Co. v. Bennett Regulator Guards, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00453, Paper 88 (PTAB Jan. 6, 2015)	29
<i>B&B Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Indus., Inc.</i> , 135 S.Ct. 1293 (2015).....	9, 10
<i>Clark v. Bear Stearns & Co.</i> , 966 F.2d 1318 (9th Cir. 1992)	7
<i>Cobb v. Pozzi</i> , 363 F.3d 89 (2d Cir. 2004)	7
<i>Commil USA, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 135 S. Ct. 1920 (2015).....	16
<i>FCC v. Schreiber</i> , 381 U.S. 279 (1965).....	13
<i>Guenther v. Holmgreen</i> , 738 F.2d 879 (7th Cir. 1984)	7
<i>In re Cygnus Telecom. Tech., LLC Patent Litig.</i> , 536 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	9, 11, 12
<i>Intel Corp. v. U.S. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 946 F.2d 821 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	28

<i>Johnson v. Whitehead</i> , 647 F.3d 120 (4 th Cir. 2011)	13
<i>Killep v. Office of Personnel Mgmt.</i> , 991 F.2d 1564 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	13
<i>Littlejohn v. United States</i> , 321 F.3d 915 (9th Cir. 2003)	7
<i>MaxLinear, Inc. v. CF Crespe LLC</i> , 880 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	6
<i>Nestle USA Inc. v. Steuben Food, Inc.</i> , 884 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	6, 7
<i>Unified Patents v. Realtime Adaptive Streaming, LLC</i> , IPR2018-00883, Paper 29 (PTAB Oct. 11, 2018).....	25
<i>VirnetX Inc. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 909 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	2, 4
<i>WesternGeco LLC v. ION Geophysical Corp.</i> , 889 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	20, 26, 27
<i>WiFi One LLC v. Broadcom Corp.</i> , 887 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	10
<i>Worlds Inc. v. Bungie, Inc.</i> , 903 F.3d 1237 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	passim
<i>XY, LLC v. Trans Ova Genetics, L.C.</i> , 890 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	6

Statutes

15 U.S.C. § 1069	14
35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2).....	3, 5
35 U.S.C. § 315(b)	passim
35 U.S.C. § 315(d)	13
35 U.S.C. § 315(e)	13, 14, 30

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.