MARTIN R. GLICK H. JOSEPH ESCHER III MARLA J. MILLER HOWARD, RICE, NEMEROVSKI, CANADY, ROBERTSON & FALK A Professional Corporation Three Embarcadero Center, 7th Floor San Francisco, California 94111 Telephone: 415/434-1600 ALDO J. TEST THOMAS O. HERBERT 7 EDWARD S. WRIGHT SCOTT HOVER-SMOOT FLEHR, HOHBACH, TEST, ALBRITTON & HERBERT Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 3400 San Francisco, California 94111 Telephone: 415/781-1989 Attorneys for Defendant and HOWARD Counterclaimant Activision, Inc. 12 RICE **NEMEROVSKI** CANADY 13 ROBERTSON & FALK 14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT A Professional Corpo 15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 16 17 THE MAGNAVOX COMPANY, a corpora-No. C 82 5270 CAL tion, and SANDERS ASSOCIATES, 18 INC., a corporation, PRETRIAL STATEMENT OF 19 Plaintiffs, ACTIVISION, INC. REGARDING DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES 20 (Local Rule 235-7(e)) VS. ACTIVISION, INC., a corporation, Pretrial Conference: 22 Defendant. December 13, 1984 23 AND RELATED CROSS-ACTION. 24 25

Defendant and Counterclaimant Activision, Inc. ("Acti-2 vision") submits the following plain and concise statement of disputed factual issues pursuant to Local Rule 235-7(e).

. 23

HOWARD

ROBERTSON & FALK

RICE **NEMEROVSKI** CANADY

> -2-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

In 1954, a video pool game was developed at the University of Michigan ("Michigan pool game"). The Michigan pool game could be played by two persons using a cathode ray tube The view on the screen was that of a pool table, seen from the top down: there was a circular figure representing a cue ball at one end of the display, and 15 "balls" in a triangular "rack" at the other. When the ball hit the "pocket," the ball disappeared. When the cue ball hit the object ball, the object ball would move in a direction and with a velocity proportional to the speed and velocity of the cue ball. The same movement would occur when two object balls hit each other or hit a pool table rail. The Michigan pool game generated a hitting symbol (the player controlled cue stick), and a hit symbol (the cue ball). In addition, it ascertained coincidence between the hitting symbol and the hit symbol, and imparted a distinct motion to the hit symbol upon coincidence. The Michigan pool game provided horizontal and vertical control signals for varying the horizontal and vertical positions of the hitting symbol. The Michigan pool game is prior art with respect to the '507 patent. 11

-3-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

HOWARD RICE 12 NEMEROVSKI CANADY 13 ROBERTSON & FALK 14

15

16

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

2. In 1957, Dr. William A. Higinbotham developed a video tennis game for "open house" day at the Brookhaven National Laboratories in Upton, New York ("Higinbotham tennis game"). Thousands of people, including school children, attended the open house and saw the game being played. Some actually played the game.

HOWARD
RICE 12
NEMEROVSKI
CANADY 13
ROBERTSON
& FALK 14

ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

HOWARD RICE NEMEROVSKI CANADY ROBERTSON & FALK A Professional Corporation 1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Dr. Higinbotham's video tennis game was played on a cathode ray tube display. The tennis game could be played by two persons, each of whom controlled an invisible "racket" by means of a hand control. The view on the screen was that of a tennis court, seen from the perspective of one standing on the sidelines. "net" was a vertical line in the middle of the screen. player "hit" the "ball," the ball would appear to move in a realistic fashion, depending upon how it was "hit." Thus, the "ball" would appear to bounce off the court, bounce off the net (if the net were hit) or move beyond the baseline. When the ball was hit by the invisible racket, the ball would reverse direction and move with a velocity controlled by the player. The tennis game contained electronic analog circuitry. Dr. Higinbotham's tennis game also provided horizontal and vertical control signals so that the horizontal and vertical positions of the ball symbol could be The Higinbotham tennis game is prior art with respect to the '507 patent.

-5-

CANADY ROBERTSON & FALK 7. On August 12, 1958, United States Patent No.

2,847,661 was issued to Charles F. Althouse. Althouse invented a device for displaying dots on a television screen or other display, which dots (symbols) could be moved by the user realistically to approximate the location of aircraft, helicopters or ships. The Althouse invention comprised an apparatus which was used in combination with a standard television receiver to generate at least one symbol upon the television screen. The location of this symbol could be altered by the user of the device. The Althouse invention further contained the electronic analog circuitry to generate horizontal and vertical control signals for varying the horizontal and vertical positions of the symbol.

-9-

On June 2, 1964, U.S. Patent No. 3,135,815 was issued 8. to Fritz Spiegel. Spiegel invented a device for using a standard television set or other display to simulate target shooting with guided missiles. The goal of the exercise was for the user to manipulate a "quided missile" to "hit" the target that was displayed on the screen, at which point the missile and the target appeared to explode. The device was used in several ways: the target could be kept stationary, the target could move randomly in response to the electronic circuitry in the device, or a second person could move the "target" while the first person was trying to steer the "guided missile" to "hit" the target. The Spiegel invention contained the electronic analog circuitry to generate symbols upon the screen of the television receiver to be manipulated by at least one participant. The Spiegel patent further comprised the circuitry to generate a hitting symbol (the guided missile), generate a hit symbol (the target), and circuitry to ascertain coincidence between the hitting symbol and the hit symbol. The Spiegel patent further contained the electronic analog circuitry to provide horizontal and vertical control signals so that the horizontal and vertical positions of the hitting symbol could be varied. 11 11

-10-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

HOWARD RICE 12 NEMEROVSKI CANADY 13 ROBERTSON & FALK 14

A Professional Corporation

16 17

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

9. In 1964, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) purchased a system from General Electric Co. which, with NASA equipment, portrayed scenes on a raster scan television screen for design engineers to simulate astronaut docking and landing maneuvers in outer space ("the NASA scene generator").

HOWARD **NEMEROVSKI** CANADY **ROBERTSON** & FALK

-11-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

10 11 HOWARD 12 RICE NEMEROVSKI CANADY 13 ROBERTSON & FALK 14 nal Corpore 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 . 23 24

25

26

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

In 1967, NASA purchased from General Electric 10. equipment and programs for the NASA scene generator, which allowed for three-dimensional objects to be generated on the television The NASA scene generator could then be used to simulate a lunar excursion module landing on the moon, a rendezvous in outer space in which the lunar excursion module docks with the command module, a tank game which was used for demonstrations, and an aircraft carrier landing.

-12-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

14. In the aircraft carrier landing simulation, the view on the screen was an aircraft carrier from the perspective of a pilot in an airplane. The pilot controlling the airplane, using a device similar to a joystick, landed the airplane on the deck of the carrier. The simulator detected coincidence between the airplane and the aircraft carrier.

HOWARD **NEMEROVSKI** CANADY ROBERTSON

A Professional Corpo

& FALK

HOWARD

NEMEROVSKI CANADY

ROBERTSON & FALK

.. 23

15. In San Francisco, California at the Fall 1966 Joint Computer Conference sponsored by the American Federation of Information Processing Societies and the Association of Computing Machineries, a video game for playing pool, written by John Drumheller, was publicly demonstrated and played. ("Drumheller pool game").

-17-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES the Michigan pool game. In Drumheller's version, the player-controlled symbol was the cue stick, and the distinct motion imparted to the cue ball, when hit by the cue stick, was proportional to the velocity with which the cue stick was moved. In 1967 Patrick Mullarky and Drumheller collaborated to produce a similar pool game for demonstration at the Spring 1967 Joint Computer Conference. Both of these pool games are prior art with respect to the '507 patent.

HOWARD RICE 12 NEMEROVSKI CANADY 13 ROBERTSON & FALK 14

-18-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

From September 28 through October 1, 1967, RCA held 17. an open house for the 25th anniversary of the David Sarnoff Research Center in Princeton, New Jersey. A pool game similar to Drumheller's pool game was demonstrated to and played by visitors at the open house. The RCA pool game is prior art with respect to the '507 patent.

HOWARD

NEMEROVSKI CANADY

> ROBERTSON & FALK

> > -19-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

18. From 1961 through the early 1970's, Ralph Baer was the Division Manager for the Equipment Design Division of Sanders Associates. As part of his job, Ralph Baer oversaw the development of electronic display systems that Sanders designed for the military. In early 1967, a technician named William Harrison came to work with Baer.

HOWARD RICE 12 NEMEROVSKI CANADY 13 ROBERTSON & FALK 14

NEMEROVSKI

CANADY ROBERTSON & FALK 19. In September of 1966, Baer wrote a memorandum indicating he was considering the development of video games. The memorandum describes no circuitry or other means for implementing Baer's video game. Any person skilled in the art, <u>i.e.</u>, a basic electronics technician, would have been able to develop the circuitry to implement Baer's memorandum.

//

-21-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

20. In early 1967, Baer gave his memorandum to Harrison and told Harrison to make some electronic circuitry to implement the memorandum. Harrison constructed this circuitry in part by using a "Heathkit" Baer had at home. Baer's Heathkit was a commercially available piece of equipment which was used to check the horizontal and vertical signals on a standard television set.

RICE ROBERTSON & FALK

HOWARD

A Professional Corporatio

10. In 1967, NASA purchased from General Electric equipment and programs for the NASA scene generator, which allowed for three-dimensional objects to be generated on the television screen. The NASA scene generator could then be used to simulate a lunar excursion module landing on the moon, a rendezvous in outer space in which the lunar excursion module docks with the command module, a tank game which was used for demonstrations, and an aircraft carrier landing.

,

9

10

11

HOWARD RICE 1

CANADY ROBERTSON & FALK

Professional Corporation 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

22. On January 15, 1968, Baer applied for a patent entitled "Television Gaming and Training Apparatus." The Patent and Trademark Office assigned Baer's application Serial No. 697,798. The application was eventually issued as U.S. Patent No. 3,728,480. This patent (the "'480 patent" or "Baer 1 patent") purports to describe circuitry for playing games on a television display by generating dots, getting the dots to move and "hit" each other, detecting coincidence of the dots, and altering one of the dots in response to coincidence. The Michigan pool game, Higinbotham tennis game, Space War, Spiegel patent, NASA scene generator, Drumheller pool game, and the RCA pool game were not disclosed to nor considered by the Patent Office prior to the issuance of the '480 patent. //

-24-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

11 HOWARD 12 NEMEROVSKI CANADY 13 ROBERTSON & FALK

14

16

15

1

3

6

7

10

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

23. William Rusch, an engineer at Sanders Associates, was formally assigned to work for Ralph Baer on the video game effort in July of 1967. Rusch's notebooks reflect the fact that his first work on video games began toward the end of September, 1967.

NEMEROVSKI CANADY ROBERTSON & FALK

HOWARD RICE & FALK A Professional Corporate

24. Prior to the time Rusch actually began work on Sanders Associates' video game, Baer had, with Harrison's help, constructed the circuitry that would generate two moveable spots and ascertain coincidence between the spots.

NEMEROVSKI CANADY ROBERTSON

- 23

Before Rusch began any work on Sanders Associates' 25. video game project, Rusch became thoroughly familiar with all of Baer and Harrison's ideas, designs and circuits.

"Patent Disclosure Sheet" (an in-house form) and sent it to Sanders Associates' patent counsel. The purpose of the form was to set out for counsel the important innovation(s) worthy of consideration for patent. In his Patent Disclosure Sheet, Rusch informed patent counsel at Sanders Associates that he wanted to patent some circuitry that would "provide[] another positioning method for spots on TV screen." He informed patent counsel that the idea for his circuitry was suggested by the "desire to have voltage control and spot shapes other than rectangular. (Round spot for example.)"

HOWARD RICE 12 NEMEROVSKI CANADY 13 ROBERTSON & FALK 14

ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

1 28. By way of his patent disclosure, Rusch informed Sanders Associates that the "basic theory" of his circuits was similar to Baer's. As Rusch described the connection, Baer had "thought of generating spots and patterns" on television sets for 5 various games, and Rusch had drawn circuits that used a different 6 method of generating spots and patterns. 7 11 8 9 10 11 HOWARD 12 RICE **NEMEROVSKI** 13 CANADY ROBERTSON & FALK 14 A Professional Corporation 15 16 17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

-30-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES 30. William Harrison constructed the circuits for Rusch, as he had for Baer. Rusch's circuits were tested by Harrison, Baer and Rusch.

HOWARD RICE 12 NEMEROVSKI CANADY 13 ROBERTSON & FALK 14

A Professional Corporation

1 31. On May 27, 1969, Rusch applied for a patent entitled 2 "Television Gaming Apparatus." The Patent and Trademark Office 3 assigned Rusch's application Serial No. 828,154. The application was eventually issued as U.S. Patent No. 3,659,284 ("the '284 patent") and later reissued as U.S. Patent Re. No. 28,507 ("the '507 6 patent" or "Rusch 2 patent"). This patent purports to describe 7 circuitry for playing games on a television display by generating 8 dots, getting the hitting dot(s) to move and "hit" the other(s), detecting coincidence of the dots, and "imparting a distinct motion" 10 to the hit dot upon coincidence. The Michigan pool game, 11 Higinbotham tennis game, Space War, Spiegel patent, NASA scene HOWARD 12 generator, Drumheller pool game, and the RCA pool game were not disclosed to nor considered by the Patent Office prior to the & FALK 14 issuance of the '284 patent. Baer's pending application for what 15 was to become the '480 or Baer 1 patent was not cited to the Patent 16 Office as prior art, but only cross-referenced as a related 17 The Patent Office examiner did not consider the impact 18 of the '480 patent on the validity of the '284. 19 // 20 11 21 22 23 24

> -33-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

NEMEROVSKI CANADY ROBERTSON

25

34. Baer described the '598 patent as the culmination of Baer, Harrison and Rusch's work on video games. According to Magnavox, the '598 contains superior circuits than those described in the '507 or "Rusch 2" patent. The '598 patent disclosed and claimed Harrison's digital equivalent of Rusch's simple electronic circuits for generating spots on the screen, i.e., spot generators. The '598 patent disclosed circuitry which could generate screen-width walls off of which spots could bounce. The '507 patent neither disclosed nor claimed wall generator circuitry or digital spot generators.

HOWARD
RICE 12
NEMEROVSKI
CANADY 13
ROBERTSON
& FALK 14

35. The claims of the '598 patent alleged to be infringed in Magnavox v. Chicago Dynamics Industries, 201 U.S.P.Q. 25 (N.D. Ill. 1977) were found by the court to be invalid and obvious in light of the prior art.

-37-

1

3

5

7

8

26

36. On April 25, 1974, Rusch filed an application for reissue of the '284 patent with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Pursuant to the terms of 35 U.S.C. §251, a patent holder may file an application for reissue when the patent is "deemed wholly or partly inoperative or invalid, by reason of a defective specification or drawing, or by reason of the patentee claiming more or less than he had a right to claim in the patent. . . " Michigan pool game, Higinbotham tennis game, Space War, Spiegel patent, NASA scene generator, Drumheller pool game, and the RCA pool game were not disclosed to nor considered by the Patent Office prior to the issuance of the '507 patent. The '480 patent was not cited to the patent office as prior art, but only cross-referenced as a related patent.

-39-

37. The '284 reissue application was allowed by the Commissioner. Sanders Associates surrendered the '284 patent. The reissue patent was issued on August 5, 1975, and was given the number U.S. Patent Re. 28,507 (the "'507 patent" or "Rusch 2" patent). The Patent Office examiner did not consider the impact of the '480 patent on the validity of the '507 patent.

HOWARD
RICE 12
NEMEROVSKI
CANADY 13
ROBERTSON
& FALK 14

38. The '507 or Rusch 2 patent describes a set of simple electronic analog circuits which are soldered together ("hardwired"). The '507 patent discloses a box which could be used only to play a discrete number of games whose circuits were actually built into the box.

-41-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

The teachings of the '507 patent would have been 39. obvious to one skilled in the art and having knowledge of the prior art.

RICE **NEMEROVSKI** CANADY **ROBERTSON** & FALK

40. On April 25, 1974, Baer, Harrison and Rusch filed an application for reissue of the '285 patent with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Baer, Rusch and Harrison gave the same reasons for seeking reissue of the '285 patent that Rusch gave in seeking reissue of the '284 patent. The Michigan pool game, Higinbotham tennis game, Space War, Spiegel patent, NASA scene generator, Drumheller pool game, and the RCA pool game were not disclosed to nor considered by the Patent Office prior to the issuance of the '598 patent. The '480 or Baer 1 patent was not cited to the patent office as prior art, but only cross-referenced as a related patent.

HOWARD 12 **NEMEROVS** 13 **ROBERTSON** & FALK 14

15

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25 26

ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

-43-

41. The '285 reissue application was allowed by the Sanders Associates surrendered the '285 patent. Commissioner. reissue patent was issued on October 28, 1975, and was given the number U.S. Patent Re. 28,598 ("the '598 patent"). The Patent Office examiner did not consider the impact of the '480 patent on the validity of the '598 patent.

HOWARD

ROBERTSON & FALK

RICE NEMEROVSKI CANADY

> -44-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

42. On June 27, 1977, Baer filed an application for reissue of the '480 patent with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, stating that as the '480 read, it was "partly inoperative or invalid" because Baer had claimed more than he had a right to claim in the patent. Baer's "error" was to include claims in the '480 patent that "appear to be too broad" in light of the invention described by Fritz Spiegel in U.S. Patent 3,135,815. (See paragraph 8, supra.)

26

1

3

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

HOWARD

ROBERTSON & FALK

RICE

HOWARD

NEMEROVSKI CANADY

ROBERTSON & FALK 43. The United States Patent Office sorts the patent applications it receives into subject matter groupings called "art units". Since it is impossible to compartmentalize the breadth of subjects which are potentially patentable, the Patent Office art units cross-reference related classes. The classes which are concerned with amusement games such as video games cross-reference educational claims which include flight trainers and simulators.

-46-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

//

44. During the more than 6% years that the '480 reissue application has been sought, the Patent Office, on five separate occasions, has rejected various of Sanders Associates' claims, and Sanders has filed at least five amendments to its application. has submitted 96 claims which purport to set out the metes and bounds of his "invention." On April 23, 1982, the Patent Office Primary Examiner finally rejected substantially all of the submitted Specifically, 78 of the claims were rejected, primarily because the teachings of the Spiegel patent, combined with the teachings of the video game Space War, made the '480 patent obvious to one skilled in the art. The 18 remaining claims relate primarily to very specific circuitry and to a light detecting target shooting game unrelated to Activision's video games here in suit.

-47-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

45. For the four years between January, 1968 and January 1972, Sanders tried without success to sell or license the circuitry described in the Baer 1 patent (the '480 patent), the Rusch 2 patent ('507) and the '598 patent held by Baer, Rusch and Harrison together. The alleged invention described in the '507 patent did not meet a long felt need.

HOWARD

NEMEROVSKI CANADY

ROBERTSON & FALK

> -48-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

47. Magnavox' Odyssey game was based on the analog circuitry described in the '598 patent.

//

//

HOWARD
RICE 12
NEMEROVSKI
CANADY 13
ROBERTSON
& FALK 14
A Professional Corporation

HOWARD

CANADY ROBERTSON & FALK

RICE NEMEROVSKI

48. Magnavox' "Odyssey" game was initially sold for more than \$100.00. This was more than three times the price Baer believed necessary to make the product commercially successful. In the three years between 1972 and 1974, 218,000 Odyssey units were sold.

-51-

HOWARD RICE **NEMEROVSKI** CANADY ROBERTSON & FALK

The '507 patent was never embodied in a commercial 49. product marketed by Magnavox or its sublicensees.

HOWARD

CANADY

& FALK

RICE

To the extent Sanders Associates developed an idea 50. for playing video games on home television sets, that idea was developed by Baer, not Rusch, and was embodied in the '480 patent.

-53-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

51. Activision is a California corporation based in Mountain View, California, that designs and manufactures a wide variety of video game cartridges and disks. A video game cartridge is a small plastic box, the size of a tape cassette, which contains a computer program in a micro-chip.

-54-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

//

52. Activision was founded in 1979 for the specific purpose of designing copyrighted video games which were ultimately sold to owners of master video game consoles, primarily the Atari 2600. Activision currently employs approximately 130 individuals.

-55-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

video game cartridges to be played on the user's television set in connection with a master console and a hand-held control known as a "joystick". Activision does not manufacture master consoles or joysticks. The master console is, in effect, a computer; the video game cartridge is the program for that computer. The player inserts into the master console the video game cartridge which contains the program for the Activision game of his or her choice, turns on the television set, and the television set then displays the computer-generated images. The player uses a hand-held control or "joystick" which, among other things, controls the horizontal and vertical position of the player-controlled object on the display.

ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

54. images.

HOWARD

NEMEROVSKI CANADY

> ROBERTSON & FALK

54. Activision designs and manufactures cartridges and disks to be played on home or personal computers. To date, Activision has designed and manufactured fourteen such games. The video game cartridge or disk is the program for the computer. The player inserts into the computer or disk drive the cartridge or disk which contains the program for the Activision game of his or her choice, and the computer then displays the computer-generated images.

-57-

55. The creative process of designing, manufacturing, and marketing an Activision video game cartridge usually takes about eight to nine months. Thus, the end product produced at Activision is an original carefully designed product significantly different from and superior to the products of its competitors.

///

CANADY 13
ROBERTSON & FALK 14
A Professional Corporation 15

HOWARD RICE NEMEROVSKI

//

56. One of the guiding principles of Activision is to recognize and give credit to each game designer for the game he or she designs. Activision, for example, identifies the individual game designer on the game package and/or in the instruction booklet for each game, much the same as a book is identified by its author.

-59-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

57. Video game cartridges are marketed in toy stores, 2 department stores, video/electronics specialty stores, chain stores 3 and catalogue showrooms. The master consoles with which these video game cartridges are compatible are generally located nearby, the one serving as advertising for the other. Joysticks for use with master consoles and video game cartridges are located nearby. Each and every Atari, Mattel and Coleco master console is manufactured. offered for sale and sold under a Magnavox patent license which includes the '507 and '480 patents. There are no warnings in the sales area nor on any products or literature which would alert a consumer or the retailer that only Atari cartridges may be used with Atari master consoles, Mattel cartridges with Mattel consoles, or Coleco cartridges with Coleco consoles. The consumer sees only that certain cartridges are compatible with certain master consoles without restrictions.

> -60-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

11 HOWARD RICE 12 **NEMEROVSKI** CANADY ROBERTSON

& FALK 15

16

17 18

1

8

10

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

HOWARD

& FALK

that they may purchase Activision cartridges or compatible cartridges made by any manufacturer without violating any law or infringing any patent. Thus by 1982 an estimated one-half of the 10 million homes with an Atari master console had at least one Activision cartridge. Magnavox has been well aware of the consumer's expectations and actions and has taken no steps whatever, either directly or through their licensees, to affect either the consumer's expectations or the consumer's resulting actions. Existence of desirable, saleable cartridges enhances the sale of master consoles.

-61-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

HOWARD RICE **NEMEROVSKI** CANADY **ROBERTSON** & FALK A Professional Corporation

59. The consumer of an Atari, Mattel or Coleco master console has an implied license for reasonable use of his or her master console, including the purchase and use of compatible game cartridges.

60. The 13 Activision video game cartridges alleged to infringe the '507 patent are manufactured and sold for Atari, Coleco, and Mattel master consoles as follows:

	<u>Atari</u>	Coleco	<u>Mattel</u>
Boxing	x		
Fishing Derby	x		
Tennis	x		
Stampede	x		x
Ice Hockey	x		7.5.
Barnstorming	x		
Grand Prix	x		
Sky Jinks	x		
Keystone Kapers	x	x	
Dolphin	x		
Enduro	x		
Decathlon	x	x	
Pressure Cooker	x		
	10000	190	

The Atari, Coleco and Mattel master consoles which play the 13 games are sublicensed by Magnavox under the '507 patent.

HOWARD
RICE
NEMEROVSKI
CANADY
13
ROBERTSON
& FALK
A Professional Corporation
15

61. The Activision game cartridges and disks listed 2 below, released between September 10, 1984 and November 3, 1984, do not infringe the '507 patent:

1

23

24

25

		1				₩.
	5		Title	Shipment Date	System	
	6					
	7 8	1.	Zone Ranger	9/12/84 9/12/84 9/28/84	Atari Home Commodore Commodore	
	9	2.	Zenji	9/17/84	Commodore	cartridge
	10	3.	Park Patrol	9/17/84	Commodore	disk
HOWARD RICE	11	4.	River Raid	9/17/84 10/22/84	Commodore Commodore	
NEMEROVSKI CANADY ROBERTSON	13	5.	Designer's Penci	9/24/84 9/28/84	Commodore Commodore	
& FALK A Professional Corporation	14	6.	Space Shuttle	10/5/84 10/17/84 10/26/84	Commodore Atari HC Commodore	
	16	7.	Pitfall II	10/5/84	IBM	
	17	8.	Ghostbusters	10/26/84	Commodore	disk
	18	9.	Past Finder	11/2/84	Atari HC	
	19			11/2/84 11/2/84	Commodore Commodore	
	20	11				
	21	11				

62. Activision game cartridges are computer software. The cartridge itself does not generate dots, detect coincidence, or provide a means for imparting a distinct motion. Each Activision cartridge, depending upon the theme of the video game, is itself programmed to instruct the master console to perform these functions. Each Activision game cartridge is programmed to inform the master console to generate colorful and realistic backgrounds and sound effects.

10 11

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

HOWARD 12 RICE

NEMEROVSKI 13 **ROBERTSON** & FALK

14 A Professional Corporats

> 15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

-23

24

25

HOWARD

CANADY

& FALK

63. The '507 patent does not describe or disclose the use of video game cartridges such as those made, designed and sold by Activision and there is nothing in any of the language of the patent to indicate that use of interchangeable cartridges was contemplated to be a part of the '507 device.

-66-

HOWARD RICE **NEMEROVSKI** CANADY ROBERTSON & FALK

The computer and video game cartridge technology that 64. forms the basis of Activision's product is not equivalent to the '507 patent.

26

During the prosecution of the '284 application 65. (which, upon reissue, became the '507 patent), the Patent Office Primary Examiner required Rusch to define what he meant by "hit symbol" and "hitting symbol". In the course of his response, Rusch described the movement that would be imparted to the "hit" spot (e.g., the ball) upon being hit by the "hitting" spot (e.g., the player-controlled symbol). Either the hit spot would reverse direction, or the hit spot would "travel in a direction and with a velocity proportional to the direction and velocity of the 'hitting' spot, causing it to move toward an off-screen position, whereupon it will bounce away from the screen in the same fashion as a ball The terms "hit symbol", "hitting symbol," and "imparting a distinct motion" in the '284 and '507 patents are limited to situations where either the "hit" spot reverses direction and/or travels in a direction and with a velocity proportional to the direction and velocity of the "hitting" spot.

-68-

1 66. In at least nine of the Activision video games which 2 Magnavox alleges infringe the '507 patent, there is no imparting of 3 a distinct motion to the hit symbol upon coincidence with the hitting symbol. These games include Fishing Derby, Stampede, 5 Barnstorming, Grand Prix, Sky Jinks, Keystone Kapers, Dolphin, 6 Enduro, and Decathlon. 7 // 8 9 10 11 HOWARD 12 **NEMEROVSKI** CANADY 13 ROBERTSON & FALK 14 nel Core 15 16 17 18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

No software-only manufacturer of video game programs 67. has purchased a license from Magnavox under the '507 patent. Unlicensed program manufacturers include Imagic, Parker Brothers, Broderbund, Synapse, Epyx, Sierra, Electronic Arts, Spinnaker, and CBS. Also unlicensed are most manufacturers of home computers which play video games, including IBM, Apple and Commodore. HOWARD ROBERTSON & FALK

..23

-70-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

68. There is a substantial market for consumer joysticks of varying models, styles and features, manufactured and sold by third parties who do not also manufacture master consoles or software. No manfuacturer of consumer joysticks only has purchased a license from Magnovox under the '507 patent, nor has Magnoavox sought to obtain any such license.

CANADY ROBERTSON

Activision maintains that the findings, decisions and outcome in Magnavox v. Chicago Dynamics Industries and Magnavox v. Mattel have no relevance whatsoever to this action, except as set forth specifically herein at Paragraph 35, supra. The following four paragraphs set forth facts which are important to this Court's determination of the weight to be accorded to the prior decisions, should the Court determine them to have any relevance at all. 11 11

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

. 23

HOWARD

ROBERTSON & FALK

RICE NEMEROVSKI CANADY

> -72-ACTIVISION'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT RE DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

69. Magnavox v. Chicago Dynamics Industries was initiated in 1974 in the Northern District of Illinois against several defendants. One of the defendants, Atari, Inc., sued Magnavox for declaratory relief in the Northern District of California and, after a battle over venue, the Atari case was consolidated for trial in Illinois. Atari and several other defendants settled before trial. Chicago Dynamics Industries, another defendant, declared bankruptcy at the outset of the litigation leaving Seeburg Industries, Inc. as the sole defendant. Seeburg manufactured only coin-operated video arcade games. After Magnavox obtained a judgment against Seeburg, the case was settled for a \$42,500 payment to Magnavox by Seeburg.

HOWARD
RICE 12
NEMEROVSKI
CANADY 13
ROBERTSON
& FALK 14

70. In accordance with the terms of the Atari-Magnovox settlement agreement, Atari paid Magnavox \$150,000 in June, 1976; \$150,000 in January, 1977; and \$200,000 annually in each of the six succeeding years, and received, therefore, a paid-up license under the '507 patent. Since 1976 Atari has sold at least 10 million consoles, receiving an estimated \$2 billion in revenue. In addition Atari has sold at least 100 million video game cartridges since 1976 for an estimated \$2 billion in revenue.

HOWARD RICE NEMEROVSKI CANADY ROBERTSON & FALK

71. In 1980 Magnavox initiated litigation against Mattel alleging infringement of the '507 patent. Mattel was effectively precluded from contesting the validity of the '507 patent in that lawsuit and did not do so. Mattel manufactured and sold complete units, i.e., television master console, joysticks, and educational and game cartridges for their master console.

HOWARD
RICE 12
NEMEROVSKI
CANADY 13
ROBERTSON
& FALK 14
A Professorial Corporation

72. In the period between 1960 and 1982 patent holders received significantly disparate results depending on the federal judicial circuit in which patent infringement actions were brought. During the same period it was generally known to counsel who practiced patent litigation that the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was significantly more favorable to patent holders than the Ninth Circuit. Both Magnavox v. Chicago Dynamic Industries and Magnavox v. Mattel were tried in the Seventh Circuit. As a result of serious differences between the manner in which the various Circuits dealt with patent cases, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit was created in 1982 to bring reasonable uniformity to this area of the law.

HOWARD
RICE 12
NEMEROVSKI
CANADY 13
ROBERTSON
& FALK 14

In 1977 Magnavox brought suit against APF Electronics 73. and several other entities for infringement of the '507 patent. suit against APF was dismissed for lack of venue. In November 1980 APF acquired the Spiegel patent; in January 1981 APF intervened in litigation between Magnavox and APF customers Sears, Roebuck and Montgomery Ward and counter-claimed against Magnavox for infringement of the Spiegel patent. The case was ultimately settled; as part of the settlement, APF conveyed the Spiegel patent (which by then had expired) to Magnavox.

//

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

//

HOWARD 12 **JEMEROVSKI** CANADY 13 ROBERTSON & FALK

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

25

26

HOWARD

CANADY

& FALK

RICE

Activision, in the conduct of its business, takes great care to avoid infringing valid patents which might affect any of its products. Activision has proceeded at all relevant times in the good faith belief that its products do not infringe any applicable patent.

DATED: December 3, 1984.

> MARTIN R. GLICK H. JOSEPH ESCHER III MARLA J. MILLER HOWARD, RICE, NEMEROVSKI, CANADY, ROBERTSON & FALK A Professional Corporation

Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant Activision, Inc.

120384/3-355900Cg-5

1

S 40 0 6

10

11

12

RICE MEROVSKI CANADY 13 ROBERTSON & FALK 14

HOWARD

A Professional Corporation

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

I, MARIE SPIEGL, declare as follows:

- I am a resident of the City and County of San Francisco, over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action. My business address is Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 700, San Francisco, California.
- On December 3, 1984 I served the following document: PRETRIAL STATEMENT OF ACTIVISION, INC. REGARDING DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES as follows:

By FEDERAL EXPRESS, a true and correct copy in a sealed envelope addressed as follows:

> James T. Williams, Esq. NEUMAN, WILLIAMS, ANDERSON & OLSON 77 W. Washington Street Chicago, IL 60602

By HAND DELIVERY, by causing a true and correct copy to be personally delivered addressed as follows:

> Robert L. Ebe, Esq. McCutchen, Doyle, Brown & ENERSEN 3 Embarcadero Center Twenty-eighth Floor San Francisco, CA 94111

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 3rd day of December 1984 at San Francisco, Calfornia.