

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 IPR2016-00747  
Patent 6,732,147

---

Mailed: March 28, 2016

Before Alexander C. Levy, *Trial Paralegal*

NOTICE OF FILING DATE ACCORDED TO PETITION  
AND  
TIME FOR FILING PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

The petition for “*inter partes* review,” filed in the above proceeding  
has been accorded the filing date of March 12, 2016.

A review of the petition identified the following defects:

The exhibit filed under the title, Exhibit 1002v3, is actually Exhibit 1002v2. (The exhibit filed under the title, Exhibit 1002v2, is also actually Exhibit 1002v2.) *See* 35 U.S.C. § 312(a). Correction is required. Petitioner may submit a written request to [trials@uspto.gov](mailto:trials@uspto.gov) to have these exhibits expunged specifically identifying the exhibit to be expunged (e.g., by the name given to the exhibit in the Patent Review Processing System (PRPS) and/or by the date the exhibit was filed).

Petitioner improperly used claim charts by including statements of Petitioners' conclusions or arguments in the bold portions commencing each section (except for the cross-references to other sections of the claim charts). *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(2)(iii). Correction is required.

Petitioner must correct these defects within FIVE BUSINESS DAYS from this notice. Failure to correct the defect may result in an order to show cause as to why the Board should institute the trial. No substantive changes (e.g., new grounds) may be made to the petition.

Patent Owner may file a preliminary response to the petition no later than three months from the date of this notice. The preliminary response is limited to setting forth the reasons why the requested review should not be instituted. Patent Owner may also file an election to waive the preliminary response to expedite the proceeding. For more information, please consult the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012), which is available on the Board Web site at <http://www.uspto.gov/PTAB>.

Patent Owner is advised of the requirement to submit mandatory notice information under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(2) within 21 days of service of the petition.

The parties are encouraged to use the heading on the first page of this Notice for all future filings in the proceeding.

The parties are advised that under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), recognition of counsel *pro hac vice* requires a showing of good cause. The parties are authorized to file motions for *pro hac vice* admission under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c). Such motions shall be filed in accordance with the “Order -- Authorizing Motion *for Pro Hac Vice* Admission” in Case IPR2013-00639, Paper 7, a copy of which is available on the Board Web site under “Representative Orders, Decisions, and Notices.”

The parties are reminded that unless otherwise permitted by 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(b)(2), all filings in this proceeding must be made electronically in the Patent Review Processing System (PRPS), accessible from the Board Web site at <http://www.uspto.gov/PTAB>. To file documents, users must first obtain a user ID and password by registering with PRPS. Information regarding how to register with and use PRPS is available at the Board Web site.

If there are any questions pertaining to this notice, please contact Alexander C. Levy at 571-272-0382 or the Patent Trial and Appeal Board at 571-272-7822.

Case IPR2016-00747

Patent 6,732,147

PETITIONER:

Michael M. Murray

Andrew R. Sommer

Michael A. Tomasulo

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP

mmurray@winston.com

asommer@winston.com

mtomasulo@winston.com

PATENT OWNER:

Perkins Coie LLP – Boeing

PO Box 1247

Patent – SEA

Seattle, WA 98111-1247

Paul J. Andre

Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP

990 Marsh Road

Menlo Park, CA 94025

**NOTICE CONCERNING ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION  
(ADR)**

The Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB) strongly encourages parties who are considering settlement to consider alternative dispute resolution as a means of settling the issues that may be raised in an AIA trial proceeding. Many AIA trials are settled prior to a Final Written Decision. Those considering settlement may wish to consider alternative dispute resolution techniques early in a proceeding to produce a quicker, mutually agreeable resolution of a dispute or to at least narrow the scope of matters in dispute. Alternative dispute resolution has the potential to save parties time and money.

Many non-profit organizations, both inside and outside the intellectual property field, offer alternative dispute resolution services. Listed below are the names and addresses of several such organizations. The listings are provided for the convenience of parties involved in cases before the PTAB; the PTAB does not sponsor or endorse any particular organization's alternative dispute resolution services. In addition, consideration may be given to utilizing independent alternative dispute resolution firms. Such firms may be located through a standard keyword Internet search.

<b>CPR INSTITUTE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION</b>	<b>AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW ASSOCIATION (AIPLA)</b>	<b>AMERICAN ARBITRATION ASSOCIATION (AAA)</b>	<b>WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (WIPO)</b>	<b>AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION (ABA)</b>
Telephone: (212) 949-6490	Telephone: (703) 415-0780	Telephone: (212) 484-3266	Telephone: 41 22 338 9111	Telephone : (202) 662-1000
Fax: (212) 949-8859	Fax: (703) 415-0786	Fax: (212) 307-4387	Fax: 41 22 733 5428	N/A
575 Lexington Ave	241 18th Street, South, Suite 700	140 West 51st Street	34, chemin des Colombettes	1050 Connecticut Ave, NW
New York, NY 10022	Arlington, VA 22202	New York, NY 10020	CH-1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	Washington D.C. 20036
<a href="http://www.cpradr.org">www.cpradr.org</a>	<a href="http://www.aipla.org">www.aipla.org</a>	<a href="http://www.adr.org">www.adr.org</a>	<a href="http://www.wipo.int">www.wipo.int</a>	<a href="http://www.americanbar.org">www.americanbar.org</a>

If parties to an AIA trial proceeding consider using alternative dispute resolution, the PTAB would like to know whether the parties ultimately decided to engage in alternative dispute resolution and the reasons why or why not. If the parties actually engage in alternative dispute resolution, the PTAB would be interested to learn what mechanism (e.g., arbitration, mediation, etc.) was used and the general result. Such a statement from the parties is not

Case IPR2016-00747

Patent 6,732,147

required but would be helpful to the PTAB in assessing the value of alternative dispute resolution to parties involved in AIA trial proceedings. To report an experience with ADR, please forward a summary of the particulars to the following email address: [PTAB\\_ADR\\_Comments@uspto.gov](mailto:PTAB_ADR_Comments@uspto.gov).