1 PILLSBURY, MADISON & SUTRO ROBERT T. TAYLOR 225 Bush Street Mailing Address P. O. Box 7880 3 San Francisco, CA 94120 Telephone: (415) 983-1000 4 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 5 The Magnavox Company and Sanders Associates, Inc. 6 Of Counsel: 7 NEUMAN, WILLIAMS, ANDERSON & OLSON 8 THEODORE W. ANDERSON JAMES T. WILLIAMS 77 West Washington Street Chicago, IL 60602 10 Telephone: (312) 346-1200 11 12 United States District Court for the 13 Northern District of California 14 15 THE MAGNAVOX COMPANY, a Corpora-16 tion, and SANDERS ASSOCIATES, INC., a Corporation, No. C 82 5270 TEH 17 Plaintiffs, REPLY TO FIRST AND 18 THIRD COUNTERCLAIMS vs. 19 ACTIVISION, INC., a Corporation, 20 Defendant. 21 22 23 Plaintiffs, The Magnavox Company and Sanders 24 25 of defendant, Activision, Inc., as follows, the numbered

Associates, Inc., reply to the First and Third counterclaims paragraphs hereof corresponding to the numbered paragraphs of those counterclaims:

28

26

27

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

20 21

22

23

24

25

27

22. The allegations of paragraph 22 of the First Counterclaim are admitted.

- 23. Plaintiffs admit that plaintiff The Magnavox Company has alleged in the Complaint herein that it is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, that plaintiff Sanders Associates, Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, and that both plaintiffs are before this Court for the purposes of defendants First and Third counterclaims by reason of filing their Complaint herein; plaintiffs otherwise deny each and every other allegation of paragraph 23 of the First Counterclaim.
- The allegations of paragraph 24 of the First Counterclaim are admitted.
- The allegations of paragraph 25 of the First 25. Counterclaim are admitted.
- 26. Plaintiffs admit that in the Complaint they 19 have asserted ownership of United States Letters Patent Re. 28,507 and infringement of that patent by defendant, that plaintiff The Magnavox Company has previously charged defendant with infringement of said patent, and that an actual and justiciable controversy exists between defendant and plaintiffs involving the validity and infringement by defendant of Letters Patent Re. 28,507; plaintiffs otherwise deny each and every other allegation of paragraph 26 of the First Counterclaim.

8 9

11

10

13

12

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27 28

Plaintiffs deny each and every allegation of 27. paragraph 27 of the First Counterclaim, and plaintiffs further reply to paragraphs 13 through 19 of the Answer as follows:

- Plaintiffs admit that United States Letters Patent Re. 28,507 is one of a plurality of United States and foreign patents owned by plaintiff herein Sanders Associates, Inc. which relate specifically to television gaming apparatus, that said plurality of television gaming patents includes, without limitation, Patent No. Re. 28,507 charged herein to be infringed and its predecessor Patent No. 3,659,284, United States Letters Patent No. 3,659,285 and its reissue patent Re. 28,598, and United States Letters Patent 3,728,480, that in his decision upholding the Re. 28,507 patent Judge Grady characterized said Patent 3,728,480 as the "pioneer patent" in the art of playing games on a small scale with the players participating in the game in an environment such as a home or some place where a large computer would clearly not be available, and that U.S. Patent 3,728,480 has not been included by plaintiffs in the present litigation; plaintiffs deny each and every other allegation of paragraph 13.
- (b) Plaintiffs admit that plaintiff The Magnavox Company has attempted to license certain ones of the plurality of television game patents owned by plaintiff Sanders Associates, Inc. to parties involved in the manufacture and/or sale of television game apparatus, or cartridges therefor, coming within the scope of those patents; plaintiffs deny each and every other allegation of paragraph 14.

	(c)	Plaintiffs	deny	each	and	every	allegation	of
aragraph	15.							

- Plaintiffs deny each and every allegation of paragraph 16.
 - Plaintiffs deny each and every allegation of (e)
- Plaintiffs deny each and every allegation of (f) paragraph 18.
- Plaintiffs deny each and every allegation of (g) paragraph 19.
- Plaintiffs deny each and every allegation of 28. 12 paragraph 28 of the First Counterclaim.

SECOND COUNTERCLAIM

Contemporaneously herewith, plaintiffs have moved 16 under Rule 12(b), F.R.Civ.P., to dismiss defendant's Second Counterclaim for lack of jurisdiction over the subject matter and failure to state a claim upon which relief can be Therefore, the Second Counterclaim and paragraphs 29 through 36 thereof require no reply at this time.

REPLY TO THIRD COUNTERCLAIM

Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate herein by 24 reference their replies to paragraphs 13 through 19 and 22 through 28 of the Answer and Counterclaims and further reply to paragraphs 20 and 21 of the Answer as follows:

27 28

26

7 8

(a) Plaintiffs deny each and every allegation of paragraph 20.

- (b) Plaintiffs admit that many of defendant's cartridges charged to infringe are suitable for use only in television game consoles heretofore manufactured and/or sold by Atari, Inc. and that Atari's manufacture and sale of television games comprising a game console and a game cartridge for use together in combination therewith or a cartridge for use in such a console is licensed by plaintiff herein The Magnavox Company; plaintiffs deny each and every other allegation of paragraph 21.
- 38. Plaintiffs admit that defendant's Third Counterclaim purports to arise under the laws of the United States 28 U.S.C. §1338(b), but otherwise deny each and every allegation of paragraph 38 of the Third Counterclaim.
- 39. Plaintiffs deny each and every allegation of paragraph 39 of the Third Counterclaim.
- 40. Plaintiffs deny each and every allegation of paragraph 40 of the Third Counterclaim.

WHEREFORE, plaintiffs pray as follows:

- That each of defendant's First and Third Counterclaims be dismissed.
- 2. That defendant's Second Counterclaim be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.