

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BUNGIE, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

ACCELERATION BAY, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-01600
Patent 6,910,069

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

REDACTED VERSION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
PATENT OWNER’S EXHIBIT LIST	i
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Facts	3
A. SWAN Development.....	3
B. The ‘069 Patent	5
III. Claim Construction.....	11
A. “wherein a seeking computer contacts a fully connected portal computer” (all challenged claims)	11
IV. Francis Is Not Prior Art	15
V. The Board Should Deny the Petition Under 35 U.S.C. § 315(B)	26
A. Activision is a Real Party in Interest.....	27
B. Petitioner is in Privity with Activision Blizzard, Inc.....	30
C. The 315(b) Clock Runs From the Service of the 2015 Complaint.....	31
VI. The Board Should Deny the Petition Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	34
VII. Francis in View of Gilbert Does Not Render Claims 1–5, 7, 8, and 11– 13 Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	37
A. Francis in View of Gilbert Fails to Disclose “A computer- based, non-routing table based, non-switch based method for adding a participant to a network of participants, each participant being connected to three or more other participants” (all challenged claims)	41
1. Francis’ System is Routing Table Based	42

2.	Gilbert’s System is Switch Based and Routing Table Based.....	44
B.	Francis in View of Gilbert Fails to Disclose “wherein a seeking participant contacts a fully connected portal computer” (all challenged claims).....	52
C.	Francis in View of Gilbert Fails to Disclose “a fully connected portal computer, which in turn sends an edge connection request to a number of randomly selected neighboring participants to which the seeking participant is to connect” (all challenged claims).....	56
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Acceleration Bay LLC v. Activision Blizzard, Inc.</i> , Case No. 15-cv-00228 (D. Del. March 11, 2015)	33
<i>Activision Blizzard, Inc. v. Acceleration Bay LLC</i> , Case No. 16-cv-03375-RS, 2016 WL 454985 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 1, 2016.)	32
<i>Activision Blizzard, Inc. v. Acceleration Bay LLC</i> , Case IPR2016-00726, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 9, 2016.).....	27, 30
<i>Amazon.com, Inc. v. Appisty, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2015-00480, Paper 18 (P.T.A.B. July 13, 2015)	28
<i>ams AG v. 511 Innovations, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2016-01792, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 16, 2017)	11
<i>Apple Inc. v. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute</i> , Case IPR2014-00319, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. June 12, 2014)	33
<i>Atlanta Gas Light Co. v. Bennett Regulator Guards, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2013-00453, Paper 88 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 6, 2015)	28
<i>Cooper v. Goldfarb</i> , 154 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	16, 17
<i>Fleming v. Escort, Inc.</i> , 774 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	16
<i>Kinetic Techs., Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2014-00529, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 23, 2014).....	43
<i>LG Display Co. v. Delaware Display Group LLC</i> , Case IPR2014-01359, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 2, 2015)	11
<i>Loral Fairchild Corp. v. Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co.</i> , 266 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	17
<i>Loral Space & Communications, Inc. v. ViaSat, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2014-00236, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 21, 2014).....	33

Medtronic, Inc., v. Nuvasive, Inc.,
Case IPR2014-00487, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 11, 2014).....37

Metalcraft of Mayville, Inc. v. The Toro Co.,
848 F. 3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2017)47

Oracle Corp. v. Click-to-Call Techs. LP,
Case IPR2013-00312, Paper 40 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 18, 2013)32

Taylor v. Sturgell,
553 U.S. 880 (2008).....28, 29

Travelocity.com L.P. v. Cronos Techs., LLC,
Case CBM2014-00082, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 16, 2014)3

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103(A)37

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2).....28

35 U.S.C. § 315(b)*passim*

35 U.S.C. § 325(d)2, 34, 36, 37

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)*passim*

37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(2).....48

37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).....42

77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,759 (Aug. 14, 2012)27, 31, 42

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.