

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ACTIVISION BLIZZARD, INC., ELECTRONIC ARTS INC.,
TAKE-TWO INTERACTIVE SOFTWARE, INC.,
2K SPORTS, INC., ROCKSTAR GAMES, INC., and
BUNGIE, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

ACCELERATION BAY, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Cases IPR2015-01951, IPR2015-01953 (Patent 6,714,966 B1)¹
Cases IPR2015-01964, IPR2015-01996 (Patent 6,829,634 B1)
Cases IPR2015-01970, IPR2015-01972 (Patent 6,701,344 B1)

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, LYNNE E. PETTIGREW and
WILLIAM M. FINK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

FINK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

¹ This Order applies to each of the listed cases. We exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be entered in each case. The parties, however, are not authorized to use this caption for any subsequent papers.

IPR2015-01951, IPR2015-01953 (Patent 6,714,966 B1)
IPR2015-01964, IPR2015-01996 (Patent 6,829,634 B1)
IPR2015-01970, IPR2015-01972 (Patent 6,701,344 B1)

ORDER
Conduct of the Proceeding
37 C.F.R. § 42.5

On October 21, 2016, Patent Owner contacted the Board by e-mail requesting a conference call to discuss Petitioner's Reply (*e.g.*, IPR2015-01951, Paper 54). Specifically, Patent Owner requests permission "to file a paper identifying portions of Petitioner's Reply that Patent Owner believes raises new issues or belatedly presents evidence. Patent Owner proposes a table format to identify the pages and lines that are outside the scope of the Reply, with a second column identifying the reason these portions are outside the scope of the Reply." In its email, Patent Owner does not indicate the number of such portions of the Reply it believes are objectionable.

A conference call is not necessary. Instead, for each proceeding, Patent Owner may file a short paper as stated below. Petitioner may file a short responsive paper as stated below. The Board will seek further information from the parties if necessary.

ORDER

It is:

ORDERED that Patent Owner is authorized to file by October 28, 2016, a paper containing an itemized listing of arguments in Petitioner's Reply, identified by page number and line, as well as evidence cited in each Reply (citing with particularity as applicable), that Patent Owner considers to be beyond the scope of a proper reply;

FURTHER ORDERED that, for each such paper filed by Patent Owner, Petitioner is authorized to file by November 4, 2016, a responsive

IPR2015-01951, IPR2015-01953 (Patent 6,714,966 B1)
IPR2015-01964, IPR2015-01996 (Patent 6,829,634 B1)
IPR2015-01970, IPR2015-01972 (Patent 6,701,344 B1)

paper of the same numbering and itemized manner of Patent Owner's paper, identifying what Petitioner regards as the material contained in the Patent Owner Response, by paper, page, and line number only that caused Petitioner to include such item in its Reply and, if applicable, where each such item appears in the Petition, by paper, page, and line number only;

FURTHER ORDERED that arguments, explanation, and other statements beyond the itemized listing are not authorized; and

FURTHER ORDERED that each such paper may not exceed two pages.

FOR PETITIONER:

J. Steven Baughman
Andrew Thomases
James L. Davis, Jr.
Daniel W. Richards
Matthew R. Shapiro
Joseph E. Van Tassel
ROPES & GRAY LLP
steven.baughman@ropesgray.com
andrew.thomases@ropesgray.com
james.l.davis@ropesgray.com
daniel.w.richards@ropesgray.com
matthew.shapiro@ropesgray.com
joseph.vantassel@ropesgray.com

Michael T. Rosato
Andrew S. Brown
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
mrosato@wsgr.com
asbrown@wsgr.com

IPR2015-01951, IPR2015-01953 (Patent 6,714,966 B1)
IPR2015-01964, IPR2015-01996 (Patent 6,829,634 B1)
IPR2015-01970, IPR2015-01972 (Patent 6,701,344 B1)

FOR PATENT OWNER:

James Hannah

Michael Lee

Shannon Hedvat

KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP

jhannah@kramerlevin.com

mhlee@kramerlevin.com

shedvat@kramerlevin.com