

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Legal Principles of Claim Construction.....	1
III. Background.....	4
IV. Discussion of Disputed Terms	5
A. “determining, from the received positions, [a/the] set of the other users’ avatars that are to be displayed”	6
B. “position of less than all of the other users’ avatars”	12
C. “programmed to limit the number of remote user avatars shown on the graphic display”	15
D. “client process” / “server process”	18
E. “condition” / “participant condition”	20
F. “avatar”	23
G. “third user perspective”	24
H. “switch between a rendering in which all of a perspective view of a local user avatar of the local user is displayed and a rendering in which less than all of the perspective view is displayed”	26
I. “synchronously disseminating”	29
V. Conclusion	31

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Cases**

<i>Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Marchon Eyewear, Inc.</i> , 672 F.3d (quoting <i>Phillips</i> , 415 F.3d at 1315)	8
<i>Boston Scientific Corp. v. Micrus Corp.</i> , 556 F. Supp. 2d 1045, 1054 (N.D. Cal. 2012)	8
<i>Cybor Corp. v. FAS Techs., Inc.</i> , 138 F.3d 1448 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	1
<i>E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.</i> , 849 F.2d 1430, 1433 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	3, 11
<i>Edward Lifesciences LLC v. Cook Inc.</i> , 582 F.3d 1322, 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	6
<i>Energizer Holdings v. International Trade Com'n</i> , 435 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	21
<i>Exxon Research & Eng'g Co. v. United States</i> , 265 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	20, 21
<i>Finisar Corp. v. DirectTV Group, Inc.</i> , 523 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	2
<i>Honeywell Int'l, Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 341 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	21
<i>Innova/Pure Water, Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration Sys., Inc.</i> , 381 F.3d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	2
<i>Intervet Am., Inc. v. Kee-Vet Labs., Inc.</i> , 887 F.2d 1050 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	2
<i>Inverness Med. Switzerland GmbH v. Princeton Biomeditech Corp.</i> , 309 F.3d 1365, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	10
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995), <i>aff'd</i> , 517 U.S. 370 (1996)	1, 2, 21
<i>Omega Eng'g, Inc. v. Raytek Corp.</i> , 334 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	3, 23

<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	passim
<i>Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa' per Azioni</i> , 158 F.3d 1243 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	2
<i>Robotic Vision Sys., Inc. v. View Eng'g, Inc.</i> , 189 F.3d 1370, 1376 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	9
<i>SanDisk Corp. v. Memorex Prods., Inc.</i> , 415 F.3d 1278 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	3
<i>SciMed Life Sys., Inc. v. Advanced Cardiovascular Sys.</i> , 242 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	2
<i>Southwall Techs., Inc. v. Cardinal IG Co.</i> , 54 F.3d 1570, 1579 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	8
<i>Union Pac. Res. Co. v. Chesapeake Energy Corp.</i> , 236 F.3d 684 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	20
<i>Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.</i> , 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	2, 24

I. Introduction

Plaintiff Worlds, Inc. (“Worlds” or “Plaintiff”) asserts that Defendants Activision Blizzard, Inc.; Blizzard Entertainment, Inc.; and Activision Publishing, Inc. (collectively, “Defendants”) infringe certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,181,690 (the “690 Patent”); 7,493,558 (the “558 Patent”); 7,945,856 (the “856 Patent”); 8,082,501 (the “501 Patent”); and 8,145,998 (the “998 Patent”) (collectively, the “Worlds Patents”).¹

Defendants make, use, sell, and offer for sale several infringing video games in the highly successful *Call of Duty* and *World of Warcraft* franchises. In making their proposed claim constructions, Defendants attempt to avoid liability for their infringement by proposing constructions unsupported by the intrinsic evidence. Defendants have also proposed to improperly import limitations from the specification of the Worlds Patents into the asserted claims. As explained below, the Court should adopt Worlds’ proposed claim constructions and reject Defendants’.

II. Legal Principles of Claim Construction

A determination of patent infringement involves two steps. First, the patent claims are construed. Second, the claims are compared to the allegedly infringing device. *Cybor Corp. v. FAS Techs., Inc.*, 138 F.3d 1448, 1455 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (en banc). Claim construction is a legal question for the courts. *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 52 F.3d 967, 979 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (en banc), *aff’d*, 517 U.S. 370 (1996). The Federal Circuit reexamined the legal principles of claim construction in *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc), where it expressly reaffirmed the principles of claim construction set forth in *Markman*, *Vitronics Corp.*

¹ For the Court’s reference, the Worlds Patents are attached as Exhibits B through F. However, for the sake of clarity, in the body of this document the patents are cited according to their patent number rather than to their exhibit number.

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.