

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 No. IPR2016-00727
Patent 6,829,634

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE '634 PATENT	3
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	10
IV. SPECIFIC REASONS WHY THE CITED REFERENCES DO NOT INVALIDATE THE CLAIMS, AND WHY <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED.....	10
A. Ground 1: Claims 19-24 are Patentable Over Obraczka in view of Obraczka Thesis and Shoubridge (or alternatively Obraczka in view of Shoubridge).....	11
1. The Petition Fails to Provide Adequate Motivation to Modify Obraczka with Obraczka Thesis and Shoubridge References	15
2. Obraczka in view of Obraczka Thesis and/or Shoubridge Fails to Disclose “non-routing table” (claim 19)	20
3. Obraczka in view of Obraczka Thesis and/or Shoubridge Fails to Disclose “requesting the located portal computer to provide an indication of neighbor participants to which the participant can be connected” and “receiving the indications of the neighbor participants” (Claim 19).....	25
4. Obraczka in view of Obraczka Thesis and/or Shoubridge Failure to Disclose Independent Claim 19 Confirms the Patentability of Claims 20-24	26
B. Ground 2: Claims 19-22 and 24 are Patentable Over DirectPlay in view of Shoubridge	27
1. The Petition Fails to Provide Adequate Motivation to Modify DirectPlay with Shoubridge Reference	29
2. DirectPlay in view of Shoubridge Fails to Disclose “non-routing table” (claim 19).....	33

3.	DirectPlay in view of Shoubridge Fails to Disclose “wherein the network is m-regular and m-connected, where m is the number of neighbor participants of each participant, and further wherein the number of participants is at least two greater than m thus resulting in a non-complete graph” (claim 19)	37
4.	DirectPlay in view of Shoubridge Fails to Disclose Independent Claim 19 Confirms the Patentability of Claims 20-22 and 24	40
C.	Ground 3: Claim 23 is Patentable Over DirectPlay in view of Shoubridge and Denes.....	41
V.	PETITIONERS’ OBVIOUSNESS ARGUMENTS FAIL AS A MATTER OF LAW BECAUSE IT DID NOT CONDUCT A COMPLETE OBVIOUSNESS ANALYSIS.....	41
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	43

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Activision Blizzard, Inc. v. Acceleration Bay, LLC</i> , IPR2015-01953, Paper No. 8 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 24, 2016)	14, 30
<i>Activision Blizzard, Inc. v. Acceleration Bay, LLC</i> , IPR2015-01972, Paper No. 8 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 24, 2016)	14, 30
<i>Activision Blizzard, Inc. v. Acceleration Bay, LLC</i> , IPR2016-00931, Paper No. 13 (P.T.A.B. June 23, 2016)	30
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F. 3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012).	16
<i>Apple Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	42
<i>Crocs, Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	43
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	42
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	41
<i>In re Gurley</i> , 27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	40
<i>Ex parte Ian Hector Frazer</i> , Appeal No. 2012-002760, Decision on Appeal (P.T.A.B. Jan. 9, 2014)	32
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	16, 19
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	42, 43

<i>Medichem, S.A. v. Rolabo, S.L.</i> , 437 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	40
<i>OpenTV, Inc. v. Cisco Tech., Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2013-00328, Paper No. 13 (2013)	16, 19
<i>Plantronics, Inc. v. Aliph, Inc.</i> , 724 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	42
<i>Rambus Inc. v. Teresa Stanek Rea</i> , 731 F.3d 1248 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	43
<i>In re Ratti</i> , 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959).....	18, 24
<i>Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.</i> , 234 F.3d 654 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	42
<i>Ex Parte Taro Fujii</i> , No. 2009-011862, 2012 WL 370584 (B.P.A.I. Jan. 31, 2012).....	40
<i>Travelocity.com L.P. v. Conos Technologies, LLC</i> , CBM2014-00082, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 16, 2014)	2
<i>In re Wertheim</i> , 541 F.2d 257 (CCPA 1976)	20

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	11
--------------------------	----

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(ii).....	44
37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e).....	45
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)	2
37 C.F.R. § 42.107	45
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c).....	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c).....	1

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.