

**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.; AND ROCKSTAR GAMES, INC.  
Petitioners

v.

ACCELERATION BAY LLC  
Patent Owner

---

Case: IPR2016-00727

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF  
U.S. PATENT NO. 6,829,634**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
*Submitted Electronically via the Patent Review Processing System*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	TECHNOLOGY OVERVIEW.....	2
III.	MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER § 42.8 .....	4
IV.	PETITIONERS HAVE STANDING .....	6
	A.    Grounds for Standing Under § 42.104(a).....	6
	B.    Claims and Statutory Grounds Under §§42.22 and 42.104(b).....	6
V.	SUMMARY OF THE '634 PATENT .....	6
VI.	THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT PETITIONERS WILL PREVAIL WITH RESPECT TO AT LEAST ONE CLAIM .....	7
	A.    Claim Construction Under § 42.104(b)(3).....	8
	B.    Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art and State of the Art.....	8
	C.    Supporting Evidence Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(5) .....	9
VII.	DETAILED EXPLANATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B) .....	9
	A.    All References Relied Upon as Grounds for Trial Are Prior Art to the '634 Patent under § 102(b).....	9
	B.    Ground 1: Claims 19-24 Would Have Been Obvious Over Obraczka in View Shoubridge, or the Combination of Obraczka and the Obraczka Thesis in View of Shoubridge.....	11
	1.    Overview of Obraczka and the Obraczka Thesis.....	11
	2.    Overview of Shoubridge .....	16
	3.    Obvious Combinations of Obraczka and Shoubridge, as well as Obraczka, the Obraczka Thesis, and Shoubridge.....	19
	4.    Ground 1: Detailed Explanation of Obviousness of Claims 19-24 by Obraczka in View of Shoubridge, or Obraczka Combined with the Obraczka Thesis in View of Shoubridge.....	22
	C.    Ground 2: Claims 19-22 and 24 Would Have Been Obvious Over DirectPlay in View of Shoubridge .....	36
	1.    Overview of DirectPlay .....	36
	2.    Obvious Combination of DirectPlay and Shoubridge .....	39

3.	Ground 2: Detailed Explanation of Obviousness of Claims 19-22 and 24 by DirectPlay in View of Shoubridge. ....	43
D.	Ground 3: Claim 23 Would Have Been Obvious Over DirectPlay and Shoubridge in further view of Denes .....	58
1.	Claim 23: The computer-readable medium of claim 19 including: receiving a request to connect to another participant; disconnecting from a neighbor participant; and connecting to the other participant.....	58
2.	Obvious Combination of the Teachings of DirectPlay, Shoubridge, and Denes, and Reasons for the Same.....	59
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	60

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Challenged Claims	Claims 19-24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,829,634
Petitioners	Activision Blizzard, Inc., Electronic Arts Inc., Take-Two Interactive Software, Inc., 2K Sports, Inc., and Rockstar Games, Inc.
The '634 Patent	U.S. Patent No. 6,829,634 (Ex. 1201)
Karger	Declaration of David R. Karger, Ph.D., in support of the Petition for Inter Partes Review of Claims 19-24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,829,634 (Ex. 1219)
Obraczka	Katia Obraczka <i>et al.</i> , “A Tool for Massively Replicating Internet Archives: Design, Implementation, and Experience”, IEEE Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems, May 1996 (“Obraczka”) (Ex. 1224)
Obraczka Thesis	Katia Obraczka, “Massively Replicating Services In Wide Area Internetworks” (Ph.D. Thesis, University of Southern California, December 1994) (Ex. 1225)
DirectPlay	Bradley Barga and Peter Donnelly, <u>Inside DirectX</u> (Ex. 1203)
Shoubridge	Peter J. Shoubridge & Arek Dadej, “Hybrid Routing in Dynamic Networks,” IEEE International Conference on Communications, Montreal, 1997 (Ex. 1205)
Denes	Tamás Dénes, “‘Evolution’ by Vertex of Even-order Regular Graphs,” <u>MATEMATICKAI LAPOK</u> , 1979 (Exs. 1228 and 1229)
Shoubridge Thesis	Peter John Shoubridge, “Adaptive Strategies For Routing In Dynamic Networks,” Ph.D. thesis, University of South Australia, 1996 (Ex. 1206)

## PETITIONER'S EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit	Description
Ex. 1201	U.S. Patent No. 6,829,634 (“634 patent”)
Ex. 1202	U.S. Patent No. 6,829,634 File History
Ex. 1203	Bradley Bargaen and Peter Donnelly, <i>Inside DirectX</i> , Microsoft Press (1998) (“DirectPlay”)
Ex. 1204	Declaration of Scott Bennet, Ph.D
Ex. 1205	Peter J. Shoubridge & Arek Dadej, “Hybrid Routing in Dynamic Networks”, IEEE International Conference on Communications, Montreal, 1997 (“Shoubridge”)
Ex. 1206	Peter J. Shoubridge, “Adaptive Strategies for Routing in Dynamic Networks” (Ph.D. Thesis, University of South Australia, December 1996) (“Shoubridge Thesis”)
Ex. 1207	John M. McQuillan, <i>et al.</i> , “The New Routing Algorithm for the ARPANET,” IEEE TRANSACTIONS COMMS., Vol. 28, No. 5, 1980 (“McQuillan”)
Ex. 1208	Yogen Kantilal Dalal, “Broadcast Protocols in Packet Switched Computer Networks” (Ph.D. Thesis, Stanford University 1977) (“Dalal”)
Ex. 1209	Reserved
Ex. 1210	Declaration of Daniel R. Kegel
Ex. 1211	Donald M. Topkis, “Concurrent Broadcast for Information Dissemination,” IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON SOFTWARE ENGINEERING, Vol. SE-11, No. 10, October 1985 (“Topkis”)
Ex. 1212	Dimitri Bertsekas & Robert Gallager, <u>Data Networks</u> , Prentice Hall, 1992 (“Bertsekas”)
Ex. 1213	Kuo-Jui Raymond Lin, “Routing and Broadcasting in Two-dimensional Linear Congruential Graphs of Degree Four” (Master’s Thesis, Concordia University, June 1994) (“Kuo-Jui Lin”)
Ex. 1214	William S. Davis and David C. Yen, <u>The Information System Consultant’s Handbook: Systems Analysis and Design</u> , CRC Press, 1998 (“Davis”)
Ex. 1215	V.G. Cerf, D.D. Cown, and R.C. Mullin, <i>Topological Design Considerations in Computer Communication Networks</i> , <u>Computer Communication Networks</u> (Grimsdale, ed.), Noordhoff International Publishing, 1975 (“Cerf”)
Ex. 1216	U.S. Patent No. 6,122,277 (“Garmire”)

# 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.