11 PILLSBURY, MADISON & SUTRO Robert P. Taylor 2 225 Bush Street Mailing Address: 37.324 3 P.O. Box 7880 CH. TEST FLEHR, HOH ALBRITTON & HERBERT San Francisco, CA 94120 DOCKETED Telephone: (415) 983-1000 4 JUN 14 1984 5 NEUMAN, WILLIAMS, ANDERSON & OLSON YYN Theodore W. Anderson James T. Williams 6 RESPONSE DUE . 77 West Washington Street 7 Chicago, IL 60602 Telephone: (312) 346-1200 8 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 9 The Magnavox Company and Sanders Associates, Inc. 10 11 United States District Court For The Northern District Of California 12 13 THE MAGNAVOX COMPANY, a corporation, and SANDERS ASSOCIATES, INC., 14 a corporation, No. C 82 5270 JPV 15 Plaintiffs, PLAINTIFFS' SECOND 16 v. SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO TO DEFENDANT'S 17 INTERROGATORIES ACTIVISION, INC., a corporation, 18 Defendant. 19 20 Plaintiffs herewith supplement their responses to 21 defendant's interrogatories 33, 35, 37, 77, 78, 104, 109-112, 128, 22 129, 138-152 and 154. 23 24 INTERROGATORY NO. 33 25 If the answer to INTERROGATORY NO. 32 is other than an 26 unqualified negative, identify each such study, including: 27 28 PLAINTIFFS' SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO APPENDIX B

DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

11	
1	INTERROGATORY NO. 140
2	With regard to the invention of means for denoting
3	coincidence when a dot generated by one dot generator is located
4	in the same position on a television screen as a dot generated by
5	another dot generator, as claimed in Claim 13 of U.S. Patent
6	3,728,480:
7	A. What is the earliest date for each of the follow-
8	ing:
9	(1) Conception;
10	(2) Actual reduction to practice; and
11	(3) Diligence toward reduction to practice;
12	B. Describe in detail the events which constitute the
13	conception, reduction to practice and diligence on
14	which the dates set forth in response to Parts
15	A(1)-A(3) of this interrogatory are based;
16	C. Identify all persons who participated in each of
17	the events described in response to Part B of this
18	interrogatory, including the role of each such
19	person;
20	D. Identify the first person(s) to suggest the inven-
21	tion, state the date the invention was first
22	suggested, and identify the person(s) to whom the
23	invention was suggested;
24	E. Identify all persons to whom the invention was
25	disclosed prior to May 27, 1969 and the date and
26	place of each such disclosure;
27	-20-
28	PLAINTIFFS' SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES
	11

1	F. Identify all persons who had knowledge of the
2	invention prior to May 27, 1969 and the date each
3	such person learned of the invention;
4	G. Identify all prototypes, laboratory models, bread-
5	board circuits and other physical embodiments of
6	the invention made prior to May 27, 1969, including
7	the following:
8	 A concise description of each;
9	(2) The date(s) each was made;
10	(3) The person(s) who constructed each;
11	(4) All persons having access to each prior to May
12	27, 1969; and
13	(5) The present location and condition of each.
14	H. Identify all persons not otherwise identified in
15	response to this interrogatory who have knowledge
16	of the subject matter of any of Parts A through G
17	of this interrogatory, and indicate the subject
18	matter of which each such person has knowledge; and
19	I. Identify all documents which refer or relate in any
20	way to the subject matter of this interrogatory.
21	
22	RESPONSE:
23	The earliest written record relating to the work done on
24	television games by employees of plaintiff Sanders Associates of
25	which plaintiffs are presently aware that shows or refers to any
26	means for denoting coincidence between a dot generated by one dot
27	-21-
28	PLAINTIFFS' SECOND
	SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES
1	1

•

generator is located in the same position on a television screen 1 2 as a dot generated by another dot generator are a page of handwritten notes dated May 23, 1967 (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 3 23, page 23) and prepared by William Harrison under the direction 4 5 and at the suggestion of Ralph H. Baer, and laboratory notebook 6 entries dated May 24, 1967 (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 16, pages 7 44 and 45) made by William Harrison under the direction and at the 8 suggestion of Ralph H. Baer. Additional drawings showing such 9 circuitry and references to such circuitry are dated June 14, 1967 10 (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 23, page 81) July 18, 1967, (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 16, page 78) September 12, 1967 (Sanders 11 Deposition Exhibit 16, page 89, Sanders Deposition Exhibit 9, 12 13 pages 89 and 90), each of which was prepared by William Harrison under the direction and at the suggestion of Ralph H. Baer. 14 The 15 suggestion for such circuitry was made by Ralph H. Baer in 16 approximately May 1967. Apparatus including such circuitry 17 (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 28) was first constructed during the period May - June 1967. 18

19

24

25

26

27

28

20 INTERROGATORY NO. 141

21 With regard to the invention of means for ascertaining 22 coincidence between a hitting symbol and a hit symbol as claimed 23 in Claim 25 of United States Letters Patent Re. 28,507:

- A. What is the earliest date for each of the following:
- Conception;

-22-

~	C	
1	9	(2) Actual reduction to practice; and
2		(3) Diligence toward reduction to practice;
3	в.	Describe in detail the events which constitute the
4		conception, reduction to practice and diligence on
5		which the dates set forth in response to Parts
6		A(1)-A(3) of this interrogatory are based;
7	с.	Identify all persons who participated in each of
8		the events described in response to Part B of this
9		interrogatory, including the role of each such
10		person;
11	D.	Identify the first person(s) to suggest the inven-
12		tion, state the date the invention was first
13		suggested, and identify the person(s) to whom the
14		invention was suggested;
15	E.	Identify all persons to whom the invention was
16		disclosed prior to May 27, 1969 and the date and
17		place of each such disclosure;
18	F.	Identify all persons who had knowledge of the
19		invention prior to May 27, 1969 and the date each
20		such person learned of the invention;
21	G.	Identify all prototypes, laboratory models, bread-
22		board circuits and other physical embodiments of
23		the invention made prior to May 27, 1969, including
24		the following:
25		 A concise description of each;
26		(2) The date(s) each was made;
27		-23-
28		PLAINTIFFS' SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

_	
1	(3) The person(s) who constructed each;
2	(4) All persons having access to each prior to May
3	27, 1969; and
4	(5) The present location and condition of each.
5	H. Identify all persons not otherwise identified in
6	response to this interrogatory who have knowledge
7	of the subject matter of any of Parts A through G
8	of this interrogatory, and indicate the subject
9	matter of which each such person has knowledge; and
10	I. Identify all documents which refer or relate in any
11	way to the subject matter of this interrogatory.
12	
13	RESPONSE:
14	The earliest written record relating to the work done on
15	television games by employees of plaintiff Sanders Associates of
16	which plaintiffs are presently aware that shows or refers to any
17	means for ascertaining coincidence between a hitting symbol and a
18	hit symbol are a memorandum dated May 10, 1967 to R. Baer from W.
19	Rusch (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 9, pages 44-50), laboratory
20	notebook entries dated September 25, 1967 through January, 1968
21	(Sanders Deposition Exhibits 17-19) made by William T. Rusch, and
22	pages of handwritten notes and drawings dated in October, 1967
23	through January, 1968 and prepared by William Harrison at the
24	suggestion of William T. Rusch. Additional drawings showing such
25	circuitry are dated December 22, 1967 (Sanders Deposition Exhibit
26	23, pages 160-163) and were prepared by William Harrison at the
27	-24-
28	PLAINTIFFS' SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

suggestion of William T. Rusch. The suggestion for such circuitry was made by William T. Rusch in approximately May, 1967. Apparatus including such circuitry (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 30) was first constructed during the period October - December 1967; other apparatus, including such circuitry was constructed subsequently.

7 INTERROGATORY NO. 142

8 With regard to the invention of means for imparting a 9 distinct motion to the hit symbol upon coincidence, as claimed in 10 Claim 25 of United States Letters Patent Re. 28,507: 11 What is the earliest date for each of the Α. 12 following: 13 Conception; 14 (2) Actual reduction to practice; and 15 Diligence toward reduction to practice; 16 Β. Describe in detail the events which constitute the 17 conception, reduction to practice and diligence on which the dates set forth in response to Parts 18 A(1)-A(3) of this interrogatory are based; 19 C. Identify all persons who participated in each of 20 the events described in response to Part B of this 21 interrogatory, including the role of each such 22

person;

23

24

25

26

27

28

-25-

11		
1	D.	Identify the first person(s) to suggest the inven-
2		tion, state the date the invention was first
3		suggested, and identify the person(s) to whom the
4		invention was suggested;
5	E.	Identify all persons to whom the invention was
6		disclosed prior to May 27, 1969 and the date and
7		place of each such disclosure;
8	F.	Identify all persons who had knowledge of the
9		invention prior to May 27, 1969 and the date each
10		such person learned of the invention;
11	G.	Identify all prototypes, laboratory models, bread-
12		board circuits and other physical embodiments of
13		the invention made prior to May 27, 1969, including
14		the following:
15		 A concise description of each;
16		(2) The date(s) each was made;
17		(3) The person(s) who constructed each;
18		(4) All persons having access to each prior to May
19		27, 1969; and
20		(5) The present location and condition of each.
21	н.	Identify all persons not otherwise identified in
22		response to this interrogatory who have knowledge
23		of the subject matter of any of Parts A through G
24		of this interrogatory, and indicate the subject
25		matter of which each such person has knowledge; and
26		
27		-26-
28		-20- PLAINTIFFS' SECOND
		SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

 Identify all documents which refer or relate in any way to the subject matter of this interrogatory.

4 RESPONSE:

1

2

3

5 The earliest written record relating to the work done on 6 television games by employees of plaintiff Sanders Associates of 7 which plaintiffs are presently aware that shows or refers to any 8 means for imparting a distinct motion to the hit symbol upon 9 coincidence are a memorandum dated May 10, 1967 to R. Baer from W. 10 Rusch (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 9, pages 44-50), laboratory 11 methods entries dated September 25, 1967 through January, 1968 12 (Sanders Deposition Exhibits 17-19) made by William T. Rusch, and pages of handwritten notes and drawings dated in October, 1967 13 14 through January, 1968 and prepared by William Harrison at the 15 suggestion of William T. Rusch. Additional drawings showing such 16 circuitry are dated December 22, 1967 (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 17 23, pages 160-163) and were prepared by William Harrison at the suggestion of William T. Rusch. The suggestion for such circuitry 18 19 was made by William T. Rusch in approximately May, 1967. Apparatus including such circuitry (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 30) 20 was first constructed during the period October - December 1967; 21 other apparatus, including such circuitry was constructed 22 subsequently. 23 INTERROGATORY NO. 143 24 25 26 27 -27-28 PLAINTIFFS' SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

л. 1		
1	With	regard to the invention of means for denoting
2	coincidence be	tween hit and hitting spots, as claimd in Claim 44
3	of United Stat	es Letters Patent Re. 28,507:
4	Α.	What is the earliest date for each of the
5		following:
6		<pre>(1) Conception;</pre>
7		(2) Actual reduction to practice; and
8		(3) Diligence toward reduction to practice;
9	В.	Describe in detail the events which constitute the
10		conception, reduction to practice and diligence on
11		which the dates set forth in response to Parts
12		A(1)-A(3) of this interrogatory are based;
13	c.	Identify all persons who participated in each of
14		the events described in response to Part B of this
15		interrogatory, including the role of each such
16		person;
17	D.	Identify the first person(s) to suggest the inven-
18	28	tion, state the date the invention was first
19		suggested, and identify the person(s) to whom the
20		invention was suggested;
21	E.	Identify all persons to whom the invention was
22		disclosed prior to May 27, 1969 and the date and
23		place of each such disclosure;
24	F.	Identify all persons who had knowledge of the
25		invention prior to May 27, 1969 and the date each
26		such person learned of the invention;
27		-28-
28		PLAINTIFFS' SECOND
5		SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES
	1	

Identify all prototypes, laboratory models, bread-G. 1 board circuits and other physical embodiments of 2 the invention made prior to May 27, 1969, including 3 the following: 4 5 (1)A concise description of each; The date(s) each was made; 6 (2)7 (3)The person(s) who constructed each; 8 (4)All persons having access to each prior to May 9 27, 1969; and 10 (5) The present location and condition of each. 11 H. Identify all persons not otherwise identified in 12 response to this interrogatory who have knowledge 13 of the subject matter of any of Parts A through G 14 of this interrogatory, and indicate the subject 15 matter of which each such person has knowledge; and 16 Ι. Identify all documents which refer or relate in any 17 way to the subject matter of this interrogatory. 18 **RESPONSE:** 19 The earliest written record relating to the work done on 20 television games by employees of plaintiff Sanders Associates of 21 which plaintiffs are presently aware that shows or refers to any 22 means for denoting coincidence between hit and hitting spots are a 23 memorandum dated May 10, 1967 to R. Baer from W. Rusch (Sanders 24 Deposition Exhibit 9, pages 44-50), laboratory methods entries 25 dated September 25, 1967 through January, 1968 (Sanders Deposition 26 27 -29-28 PLAINTIFFS' SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

	Public 17,10) made by William T. Duceb, and pages of bandwritten
1	Exhibits 17-19) made by William T. Rusch, and pages of handwritten
2	notes and drawings dated in October, 1967 through January, 1968
3	and prepared by William Harrison at the suggestion of William T.
4	Rusch. Additional drawings showing such circuitry are dated
5	December 22, 1967 (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 23, pages 160-163)
6	and were prepared by William Harrison at the suggestion of William
7	T. Rusch. The suggestion for such circuitry was made by William
8	T. Rusch in approximately May, 1967. Apparatus including such
9	circuitry (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 30) was first constructed
10	during the period October - December 1967; other apparatus,
11	including such circuitry was constructed subsequently.
12	
13	INTERROGATORY NO. 144
14	With regard to the invention of the concept of the hit
15	spot reversing direction, as claimed in Claim 44 of United States
16	Letters Patent Re. 28,507:
17	A. What is the earliest date for each of the
18	following:
19	 Conception;
20	(2) Actual reduction to practice; and
21	(3) Diligence toward reduction to practice;
22	B. Describe in detail the events which constitute the
23	conception, reduction to practice and diligence on
24	which the dates set forth in response to Parts
25	A(1)-A(3) of this interrogatory are based;
26	
27	
28	-30-
	PLAINTIFFS' SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

2.

1	с.	Identify all persons who participated in each of
2		the events described in response to Part B of this
3		interrogatory, including the role of each such
4		person;
5	D.	Identify the first person(s) to suggest the inven-
6		tion, state the date the invention was first
7		suggested, and identify the person(s) to whom the
8		invention was suggested;
9	E.	Identify all persons to whom the invention was
10		disclosed prior to may 27, 1969 and the date and
11		place of each such disclosure;
12	F.	Identify all persons who had knowledge of the
13		invention prior to May 27, 1969 and the date each
14		such person learned of the invention;
15	G.	Identify all prototypes, laboratory models, bread-
16		board circuits and other physical embodiments of
17		the invention made prior to May 27, 1969, including
18		the following:
19		(1) A concise description of each;
20		(2) The date(s) each was made;
21		(3) The person(s) who constructed each;

- (4) All persons having access to each prior to May
 27, 1969; and
 - (5) The present location and condition of each.

-31-

H. Identify all persons not otherwise identified in response to this interrogatory who have knowledge of the subject matter of any of Parts A through G of this interrogatory, and indicate the subject matter of which each such person has knowledge; and I. Identify all documents which refer or relate in any

way to the subject matter of this interrogatory.

9 RESPONSE:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

27

28

10 The earliest written record relating to the work done on 11 television games by employees of plaintiff Sanders Associates of which plaintiffs are presently aware that shows or refers to any 12 13 means for reversing the direction of a hit spot are a memorandum dated May 10, 1967 to R. Baer from W. Rusch (Sanders Deposition 14 15 Exhibit 9, pages 44-50), laboratory methods entries dated 16 September 25, 1967 through January, 1968 (Sanders Deposition 17 Exhibits 17-19) made by William T. Rusch, and pages of handwritten notes and drawings dated in October, 1967 through January, 1968 18 and prepared by William Harrison at the suggestion of William T. 19 Rusch. Additional drawings showing such circuitry are dated 20 December 22, 1967 (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 23, pages 160-163) 21 and were prepared by William Harrison at the suggestion of William 22 T. Rusch. The suggestion for such circuitry was made by William 23 T. Rusch in approximately May, 1967. Apparatus including such 24 25 26

-32-

ing t, as 7:
ing t, as
t, as
t, as
t, as
t, as
7:
the
e on
of
this
k,
ven-
the

÷

1	E.	Identify all persons to whom the invention was
2		disclosed prior to May 27, 1969 and the date and
3		place of each such disclosure;
4	F.	Identify all persons who had knowledge of the
5		invention prior to May 27, 1969 and the date each
6		such person learned of the invention;
7	G.	Identify all prototypes, laboratory models, bread-
8		board circuits and other physical embodiments of
9		the invention made prior to May 27, 1969, including
10		the following:
11		 A concise description of each;
12		(2) The date(s) each was made;
13		(3) The person(s) who constructed each;
14		(4) All persons having access to each prior to May
15		27, 1969; and
16		(5) The present location and condition of each.
17	H.	Identify all persons not otherwise identified in
18		response to this interrogatory who have knowledge
19		of the subject matter of any of Parts A through G
20		of this interrogatory, and indicate the subject
21		matter of which each such person has knowledge; and
22	Ι.	Identify all documents which refer or relate in any
23		way to the subject matter of this interrogatory.
24		
25		
26		
27		-34-
28		PLAINTIFFS' SECOND
		SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

RESPONSE:

1

2	The earliest written record relating to the work done on
3	television games by employees of plaintiff Sanders Associates of
4	which plaintiffs are presently aware that shows or refers to any
5	means for ascertaining coincidence between either of two hitting
6	spots and a hit spot are a memorandum dated May 10, 1967 to R.
7	Baer from W. Rusch (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 9, pages 44-50),
8	laboratory methods entries dated September 25, 1967 through
9	January, 1968 (Sanders Deposition Exhibits 17-19) made by William
10	T. Rusch, and pages of handwritten notes and drawings dated in
11	October, 1967 through January, 1968 and prepared by William
12	Harrison at the suggestion of William T. Rusch. Additional
13	drawings showing such circuitry are dated December 22, 1967
14	(Sanders Deposition Exhibit 23, pages 160-163) and were prepared
15	by William Harrison at the suggestion of William T. Rusch. The
16	suggestion for such circuitry was made by William T. Rusch in
17	approximately May, 1967. Apparatus including such circuitry
18	(Sanders Deposition Exhibit 30) was first constructed during the
19	period October - December 1967; other apparatus, including such
20	circuitry was constructed subsequently.

21

27

28

22 INTERROGATORY NO. 146

With regard to the invention of means for imparting a distinct motion to a hit spot upon coincidence with one of two hitting spots, as claimed in Claim 45 of United States Letters Patent Re. 28,507:

-35-

1	λ.	What is the earliest date for each of the
2		following:
3		(1) Conception;
4		(2) Actual reduction to practice; and
5		(3) Diligence toward reduction to practice;
6	В.	Describe in detail the events which constitute the
7		conception, reduction to practice and diligence on
8		which the dates set forth in response to Parts
9		A(1)-A(3) of this interrogatory are based;
10	c.	Identify all persons who participated in each of
11		the events described in response to Part B of this
12		interrogatory, including the role of each such
13		person;
14	D.	Identify the first person(s) to suggest the inven-
15		tion, state the date the invention was first
16		suggested, and identify the person(s) to whom the
17		invention was suggested;
18	Ε.	Identify all persons to whom the invention was
19		disclosed prior to May 27, 1969 and the date and
20		place of each such disclosure;
21	F.	Identify all persons who had knowledge of the
22		invention prior to May 27, 1969 and the date each
23		such person learned of the invention;
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		-36-
		PLAINTIFFS' SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

G. Identify all prototypes, laboratory models, bread-1 board circuits and other physical embodiments of 2 3 the invention made prior to May 27, 1969, including the following: 4 5 A concise description of each; (1)6 (2) The date(s) each was made; 7 (3)The person(s) who constructed each: 8 All persons having access to each prior to May (4)9 27, 1969; and 10 (5) The present location and condition of each. 11 Η. Identify all persons not otherwise identified in 12 response to this interrogatory who have knowledge 13 of the subject matter of any of Parts A through G 14 of this interrogatory, and indicate the subject 15 matter of which each such person has knowledge; and Identify all documents which refer or relate in any 16 Ι. way to the subject matter of this interrogatory. 17 18 **RESPONSE:** 19 The earliest written record relating to the work done on 20 television games by employees of plaintiff Sanders Associates of 21 which plaintiffs are presently aware that shows or refers to any 22 means for imparting a distinct motion to a hit spot upon 23 coincidence with one of two hitting spots are a memorandum dated 24 May 10, 1967 to R. Baer from W. Rusch (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 25 9, pages 44-50), laboratory methods entries dated September 25, 26 27 -37-28 PLAINTIFFS' SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

. 1	1967 through January, 1968 (Sanders Deposition Exhibits 17-19)
2	made by William T. Rusch, and pages of handwritten notes and
3	drawings dated in October, 1967 through January, 1968 and prepared
4	by William Harrison at the suggestion of William T. Rusch.
5	Additional drawings showing such circuitry are dated December 22,
6	1967 (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 23, pages 160-163) and were
7	prepared by William Harrison at the suggestion of William T.
8	Rusch. The suggestion for such circuitry was made by William T.
9	Rusch in approximately May, 1967. Apparatus including such
10	circuitry (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 30) was first constructed
11	during the period October - December 1967; other apparatus,
12	including such circuitry was constructed subsequently.
13	INTERROGATORY NO. 147
14	With regard to the invention of means for ascertaining
15	coincidence between a hitting symbol and a hit symbol, as claimed
16	in Claim 51 of United States Letters Patent Re. 28,507:
17	A. What is the earliest date for each of the
18	following:
19	(1) Conception;
20	(2) Actual reduction to practice; and
21	(3) Diligence toward reduction to practice;
22	B. Describe in detail the events which constitute the
23	conception, reduction to practice and diligence on
24	which the dates set forth in response to Parts
25	A(1)-A(3) of this interrogatory are based;
26	
27	-38-
23	
	SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

	1	
	C	
1	с.	Identify all persons who participated in each of
2		the events described in response to Part B of this
3		interrogatory, including the role of each such
4		person;
5	D.	Identify the first person(s) to suggest the inven-
6		tion, state the date the invention was first
7		suggested, and identify the person(s) to whom the
8		invention was suggested;
9	E.	Identify all persons to whom the invention was
10		disclosed prior to May 27, 1969 and the date and
11		place of each such disclosure;
12	F.	Identify all persons who had knowledge of the
13		invention prior to May 27, 1969 and the date each
14		such person learned of the invention;
15	G.	Identify all prototypes, laboratory models, bread-
16		board circuits and other physical embodiments of
17	17	the invention made prior to May 27, 1969, including
18		the following:
19		 A concise description of each;
20		(2) The date(s) each was made;
21		(3) The person(s) who constructed each;
22		(4) All persons having access to each prior to May
23		27, 1969; and
24		(5) The present location and condition of each.
25		
26		
27		-39-
28		PLAINTIFFS' SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

.*

.

 H. Identify all persons not otherwise identified in response to this interrogatory who have knowledge of the subject matter of any of Parts A through G of this interrogatory, and indicate the subject matter of which each such person has knowledge; and
 I. Identify all documents which refer or relate in any way to the subject matter of this interrogatory.

9 RESPONSE:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

28

10 The earliest written record relating to the work done on 11 television games by employees of plaintiff Sanders Associates of 12 which plaintiffs are presently aware that shows or refers to any 13 means for ascertaining coincidence between a hitting symbol and a 14 hit symbol are a memorandum dated May 10, 1967 to R. Baer from W. 15 Rusch (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 9, pages 44-50), laboratory 16 methods entries dated September 25, 1967 through January, 1968 17 (Sanders Deposition Exhibits 17-19) made by William T. Rusch, and pages of handwritten notes and drawings dated in October, 1967 18 through January, 1968 and prepared by William Harrison at the 19 suggestion of William T. Rusch. Additional drawings showing such 20 circuitry are dated December 22, 1967 (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 21 23, pages 160-163) and were prepared by William Harrison at the 22 suggestion of William T. Rusch. The suggestion for such circuitry 23 was made by William T. Rusch in approximately May, 1967. 24 Apparatus including such circuitry (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 30) 25 26 27

-40-

1	was first constructed during the period October - December 1967;
2	other apparatus, including such circuitry was constructed
3	subsequently.
4	INTERROGATORY NO. 148
5	With regard to the invention for imparting a distinct
6	motion to the hit symbol upon coincidence with a hitting symbol,
7	as claimed in Caim 51 of United States Letters Patent Re. 28,507:
8	A. What is the earliest date for each of the
9	following:
10	Conception;
11	(2) Actual reduction to practice; and
12	(3) Diligence toward reduction to practice;
13	B. Describe in detail the events which constitute the
14	conception, reduction to practice and diligence on
15	which the dates set forth in response to Parts
16	A(1)-A(3) of this interrogatory are based;
17	C. Identify all persons who participated in each of
18	the events described in response to Part B of this
19	interrogatory, including the role of each such
20	person;
21	D. Identify the first person(s) to suggest the inven-
22	tion, state the date the invention was first
23	suggested, and identify the person(s) to whom the
24	invention was suggested;
25	
26	
27	-41-
28	PLAINTIFFS' SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

•

1	E.	Identify all persons to whom the invention was
2		disclosed prior to May 27, 1969 and the date and
3		place of each such disclosure;
4	F.	Identify all persons who had knowledge of the
5		invention prior to May 27, 1969 and the date each
6		such person learned of the invention;
7	G.	Identify all prototypes, laboratory models, bread-
8		board circuits and other physical embodiments of
9		the invention made prior to May 27, 1969, including
10		the following:
11		 A concise description of each;
12		(2) The date(s) each was made;
13		(3) The person(s) who constructed each;
14		(4) All persons having access to each prior to May
15		27, 1969; and
16		(5) The present location and condition of each.
17	н.	Identify all persons not otherwise identified in
18		response to this interrogatory who have knowledge
19		of the subject matter of any of Parts A through G
20		of this interrogatory, and indicate the subject
21		matter of which each such person has knowledge; and
22	Ι.	Identify all documents which refer or relate in any
23		way to the subject matter of this interrogatory.
24		
25		
26		
27		-42-
28		PLAINTIFFS' SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

. *

RESPONSE:

· 2	The earliest written record relating to the work done on
3	television games by employees of plaintiff Sanders Associates of
4	which plaintiffs are presently aware that shows or refers to any
5	means for imparting a distinct motion to the hit symbol upon
6	coincidence with a hitting symbol are a memorandum dated May 10,
7	1967 to R. Baer from W. Rusch (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 9, pages
8	44-50), laboratory methods entries dated September 25, 1967
Э	through January, 1968 (Sanders Deposition Exhibits 17-19) made by
10	William T. Rusch, and pages of handwritten notes and drawings
11	dated in October, 1967 through January, 1968 and prepared by
12	William Harrison at the suggestion of William T. Rusch.
13	Additional drawings showing such circuitry are dated December 22,
14	1967 (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 23, pages 160-163) and were
15	prepared by William Harrison at the suggestion of William T.
16	Rusch. The suggestion for such circuitry was made by William T.
17	Rusch in approximately May, 1967. Apparatus including such
18	circuitry (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 30) was first constructed
19	during the period October - December 1967; other apparatus,
20	including such circuitry was constructed subsequently.
21	
22	INTERROGATORY NO. 149
23	With regard to the invention of means for determining a
24	first coincidence between first and second symbols, as claimed in
25	Claim 60 of United States Letters Patent Re. 28,507:
26	
27	-43-
28	PLAINTIFFS' SECOND
	SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

1

1	Α.	What is the earliest date for each of the
2		following:
3		 Conception;
4		(2) Actual reduction to practice; and
5		(3) Diligence toward reduction to practice;
6	в.	Describe in detail the events which constitute the
7		conception, reduction to practice and diligence on
8		which the dates set forth in response to Parts
9		A(1)-A(3) of this interrogatory are based;
10	с.	Identify all persons who participated in each of
11		the events described in response to Part B of this
12		interrogatory, including the role of each such
13		person;
14	D.	Identify the first person(s) to suggest the inven-
15		tion, state the date the invention was first
16		suggested, and identify the person(s) to whom the
17		invention was suggested;
18	E.	Identify all persons to whom the invention was
19		disclosed prior to May 27, 1969 and the date and
20		place of each such disclosure;
21	F.	Identify all persons who had knowledge of the
22		invention prior to May 27, 1969 and the date each
23		such person learned of the invention;
24		
25		
26		
27		-44-
28		PLAINTIFFS' SECOND
		SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

Identify all prototypes, laboratory models, bread-G. 1 board circuits and other physical embodiments of 2 the invention made prior to May 27, 1969, including 3 the following: 4 5 A concise description of each; (1)The date(s) each was made; 6 (2)7 The person(s) who constructed each: (3)8 All persons having access to each prior to May (4)9 27, 1969; and 10 The present location and condition of each. (5) Identify all persons not otherwise identified in 11 Η. 12 response to this interrogatory who have knowledge 13 of the subject matter of any of Parts A through G of this interrogatory, and indicate the subject 14 15 matter of which each such person has knowledge; and 16 Identify all documents which refer or relate in any Ι. way to the subject matter of this interrogatory. 17 18 **RESPONSE**: 19 The earliest written record relating to the work done on 20 television games by employees of plaintiff Sanders Associates of 21 which plaintiffs are presently aware that shows or refers to any 22 means for determining a first coincidence between first and second 23 symbols are a page of handwritten notes dated May 23, 1967 24 (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 23, page 23) and prepared by William 25 Harrison under the direction and at the suggestion of Ralph H. 26 27 -45-28 PLAINTIFFS' SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES I HOLEDOOK CHILLES DELED MAY

--position Exhibit 1 pages 44 and 45) made by h 3 under the direction and at the suggestion of Ralph 4 Additional drawings showing such circuitry and ref. circuitry are dated June 14, 1967 (Sanders Depositi 5 6 page 81) July 18, 1967, (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 7 September 12, 1967 (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 16, p 8 Sanders Deposition Exhibit 9, pages 89 and 90), each prepared by William Harrison under the direction and . 9 suggestion of Ralph H. Baer. The suggestion for such 10 11 was made by Ralph H. Baer in approximately May 1967. 4 including such circuitry (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 28 12 13 constructed during the period May - June 1967. 14 15 INTERROGATORY NO. 150 16 With regard to the invention of means for impart 17 distinct motion to the second symbol, as claimed in Claim (United States Letters Patent Re. 28,507: 18 What is the earliest date for each of the Α. 19 following: 20 Conception; 21 Actual reduction to practice; and (2) 22 Diligence toward reduction to practice; 23 24 25 26 27 -46-28 PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL RESP DEFENDANT'S INTERROG

1	В.	Describe in detail the events which constitute the
2		conception, reduction to practice and diligence on
3		which the dates set forth in response to Parts
4		A(1)-A(3) of this interrogatory are based;
5	с.	Identify all persons who participated in each of
6		the events described in response to Part B of this
7		interrogatory, including the role of each such
8		person;
9	D.	Identify the first person(s) to suggest the inven-
10		tion, state the date the invention was first
11		suggested, and identify the person(s) to whom the
12		invention was suggested;
13	E.	Identify all persons to whom the invention was
14		disclosed prior to May 27, 1969 and the date and
15		place of each such disclosure;
16	F.	Identify all persons who had knowledge of the
17		invention prior to May 27, 1969 and the date each
18		such person learned of the invention;
19	G.	Identify all prototypes, laboratory models, bread-
20		board circuits and other physical embodiments of
21		the invention made prior to May 27, 1969, including
22		the following:
23		(1) A concise description of each;
24		(2) The date(s) each was made;
25		(3) The person(s) who constructed each;
26		
27		-47-
28		PLAINTIFFS' SECOND
		SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

.

1	(4) All persons having access to each prior to May
2	27, 1969; and
3	(5) The present location and condition of each.
4	H. Identify all persons not otherwise identified in
5	response to this interrogatory who have knowledge
6	of the subject matter of any of Parts A through G
7	of this interrogatory, and indicate the subject
8	matter of which each such person has knowledge; and
9	I. Identify all documents which refer or relate in any
10	way to the subject matter of this interrogatory.
11	
12	RESPONSE:
13	The earliest written record relating to the work done on
14	television games by employees of plaintiff Sanders Associates of
15	which plaintiffs are presently aware that shows or refers to any
16	means for imparting a distinct motion to the second symbol are a
17	memorandum dated May 10, 1967 to R. Baer from W. Rusch (Sanders
18	Deposition Exhibit 9, pages 44-50), laboratory methods entries
19	dated September 25, 1967 through January, 1968 (Sanders Deposition
20	Exhibits 17-19) made by William T. Rusch, and pages of handwritten
21	notes and drawings dated in October, 1967 through January, 1968
22	and prepared by William Harrison at the suggestion of William T.
23	Rusch. Additional drawings showing such circuitry are dated
24	December 22, 1967 (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 23, pages 160-163)
25	and were prepared by William Harrison at the suggestion of William
26	T. Rusch. The suggestion for such circuitry was made by William
27	-48-
28	PLAINTIFFS' SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

.

.

T. Rusch in approximately May, 1967. Apparatus including such 1 2 circuitry (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 30) was first constructed 3 during the period October - December 1967; other apparatus, including such circuitry was constructed subsequently. 4 5 INTERROGATORY NO. 151 6 With regard to the invention for determining a second 7 coincidence between a third symbol and the second symbol, as claimed in Claim 61 of United States Letters Patent Re. 28,507: 8 9 Α. What is the earliest date for each of the 10 following: 11 Conception; 12 (2)Actual reduction to practice; and 13 (3) Diligence toward reduction to practice; 14 Β. Describe in detail the events which constitute the 15 conception, reduction to practice and diligence on 16 which the dates set forth in response to Parts 17 A(1)-A(3) of this interrogatory are based; C. Identify all persons who participated in each of 18 the events described in response to Part B of this 19 interrogatory, including the role of each such 20 person; 21 Identify the first person(s) to suggest the inven-22 D. tion, state the date the invention was first 23 suggested, and identify the person(s) to whom the 24 invention was suggested; 25 26 27 -49-28 PLAINTIFFS' SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

1	1	
1	Ε.	Identify all persons to whom the invention was
2		disclosed prior to May 27, 1969 and the date and
3		place of each such disclosure;
4	F.	Identify all persons who had knowledge of the
5		invention prior to May 27, 1969 and the date each
6		such person learned of the invention;
7	G.	Identify all prototypes, laboratory models, bread-
8		board circuits and other physical embodiments of
9		the invention made prior to May 27, 1969, including
10		the following:
11		 A concise description of each;
12		(2) The date(s) each was made;
13		(3) The person(s) who constructed each;
14		(4) All persons having access to each prior to May
15		27, 1969; and
16		(5) The present location and condition of each.
17	н.	Identify all persons not otherwise identified in
18		response to this interrogatory who have knowledge
19		of the subject matter of any of Parts A through G
20		of this interrogatory, and indicate the subject
21		matter of which each such person has knowledge; and
22	Ι.	Identify all documents which refer or relate in any
23		way to the subject matter of this interrogatory.
24		
25		
26		
27		-50-
23		-50- PLAINTIFFS' SECOND
		SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

.

.

RESPONSE:

1

2	The earliest written record relating to the work done on
3	television games by employees of plaintiff Sanders Associates of
4	which plaintiffs are presently aware that shows or refers to any
5	means for determining a second coincidence between a third symbol
6	and the second symbol are a memorandum dated May 10, 1967 to R.
7	Baer from W. Rusch (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 9, pages 44-50),
8	laboratory methods entries dated September 25, 1967 through
9	January, 1968 (Sanders Deposition Exhibits 17-19) made by William
10	T. Rusch, and pages of handwritten notes and drawings dated in
11	October, 1967 through January, 1968 and prepared by William
12	Harrison at the suggestion of William T. Rusch. Additional
13	drawings showing such circuitry are dated December 22, 1967
14	(Sanders Deposition Exhibit 23, pages 160-163) and were prepared
15	by William Harrison at the suggestion of William T. Rusch. The
16	suggestion for such circuitry was made by William T. Rusch in
17	approximately May, 1967. Apparatus including such circuitry
18	(Sanders Deposition Exhibit 30) was first constructed during the
19	period October - December 1967; other apparatus, including such
20	circuitry was constructed subsequently.

21

27

28

22 INTERROGATORY NO. 152

With regard to the invention of means for impartng a distinct motion to the second symbol in response to the second coincidence, as claimed in Claim 61 of United States Letters Patent Re. 28,507:

-51-

	<u>,</u>	
1	Α.	What is the earliest date for each of the
2		following:
3		(1) Conception;
4		(2) Actual reduction to practice; and
5		(3) Diligence toward reduction to practice;
6	В.	Describe in detail the events which constitute the
7		conception, reduction to practice and diligence on
8		which the dates set forth in response to Parts
9		A(1)-A(3) of this interrogatory are based;
10	c.	Identify all persons who participated in each of
11		the events described in response to Part B of this
12		interrogatory, including the role of each such
13		person;
14	D.	Identify the first person(s) to suggest the inven-
15		tion, state the date the invention was first
16		suggested, and identify the person(s) to whom the
17		invention was suggested;
18	E.	Identify all persons to whom the invention was
19		disclosed prior to May 27 1969 and the date and
20		place of each such disclosure;
21	F.	Identify all persons who had knowledge of the
22		invention prior to May 27, 1969 and the date each
23		such person learned of the invention;
24		
25		
26	K	-
27		-52-
28		PLAINTIFFS' SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

Identify all prototypes, laboratory models, bread-1 G. board circuits and other physical embodiments of 2 3 the invention made prior to May 27, 1969, including the following: 4 5 A concise description of each; (1)6 (2) The date(s) each was made; 7 (3)The person(s) who constructed each; 8 (4)All persons having access to each prior to May 9 27, 1969; and 10 (5) The present location and condition of each. 17 H. Identify all persons not otherwise identified in 12 response to this interrogatory who have knowledge 13 of the subject matter of any of Parts A through G 14 of this interrogatory, and indicate the subject 15 matter of which each such person has knowledge; and 16 Ι. Identify all documents which refer or relate in any 17 way to the subject matter of this interrogatory. 18 **RESPONSE:** 19 20 The earliest written record relating to the work done on television games by employees of plaintiff Sanders Associates of 21 which plaintiffs are presently aware that shows or refers to any 22 means for imparting a distinct motion to the second symbol in 23 response to the second coincidence are a memorandum dated May 10, 24 1967 to R. Baer from W. Rusch (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 9, pages 25 44-50), laboratory methods entries dated September 25, 1967 26 27 -53-28 PLAINTIFFS' SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

1	through January, 1968 (Sanders Deposition Exhibits 17-19) made by
2	William T. Rusch, and pages of handwritten notes and drawings
3	dated in October, 1967 through January, 1968 and prepared by
4	William Harrison at the suggestion of William T. Rusch.
5	Additional drawings showing such circuitry are dated December 22,
6	1967 (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 23, pages 160-163) and were
7	prepared by William Harrison at the suggestion of William T.
8	Rusch. The suggestion for such circuitry was made by William T.
9	Rusch in approximately May, 1967. Apparatus including such
10	circuitry was first constructed during the period October -
11	December 1967; other apparatus, including such circuitry was
12	constructed subsequently.
13	
14	INTERROGATORY NO. 154
15	Identify each of the certain games known as "Spacewar"
16	which plaintiffs have acknowledged at Massachusetts Institute of
17	Technology in the early 1960's in response to Part (c) of Inter-
18	rogatory No. 75 of Defendant's First Set of Interrogatories to
19	Plaintiffs, including the following:
20	(a) A description of the game;
21	(b) The date(s) when each such game was played;
22	(c) State when and under what circumstances Magnavox and/or
23	Sanders first became aware of each such game;
24	(d) Identify all personnel of Magnavox and/or Sanders having
25	knowledge of each such game and the date(s) each such person
26	acquired such knowledge; and
27	
28	-54-
	PLAINTIFFS' SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

(e) Paragraph (e) of this interrogatory has been 1 limited by defendant to documents reflecting searches, opinions, 2 3 discussions or evaluations of the games known as "Spacewar" as prior art. Plaintiffs are presently aware of no such documents. 4 5 6 6.1984 7 Magna 8 Subscribed and sworn to before me 9 this 6 th day of Q , 1984, Con in Know anda 10 Notary Fublic 11 My Commission Expires: 12 23.1986 13 NE 11, 19P4 0 1984 14 Sanders Associates Inc. 15 Subscribed and sworn to before me this It day of June , 1984, 16 in Nashur Ver Hampsh man 17 Une Notary Public 18 My Commission Expires: Mark 3, 1987 19 The foregoing contentions are asserted or stated on behalf of plaintiffs by: 2:)11 21 Theodore W. Anderson 22 Jame's T. Williams NEUMAN, WILLIAMS, ANDERSON & OLSON 23 Attorneys for The Magnavox Company 24 and Sanders Associates, Inc. 77 West Washington Street Chicago, Illinois 60602 25 (312) 346-1200 26 27 -57-28 PLAINTIFFS' SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S INTERROGATORIES

2	
1	CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
2	
3	I hereby certify that unexecuted copies of Plaintiffs'
4	Second Supplemental Resonse To Defendant's Interrogatories were
5	forwarded by Federal Express Courier Service on May 25, 1984, and
6	that executed copies of Plaintiffs' Second Supplemental Resonse To
7	Defendant's Interrogatories were forwarded by Federal Express
S	Courier Service on June 13, 1984, to the following:
9	Thomas O. Herbert, Esq. Flehr, Hohbach, Test,
10	Albritton & Herbert Suite 3400
11	Four Embarcadero Center San Francisco, California 94111
12	and
13	Michael A. Ladra, Esq.
11	Wilson, Sonsini, Goodrich & Rosati Two Palo Alto Square
15	Palo Alto, California 94304
16	
. 17	-
18	James T. Williams
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
25	