

1 MARTIN R. GLICK
2 H. JOSEPH ESCHER III
3 MARLA J. MILLER
4 HOWARD, RICE, NEMEROVSKI, CANADY,
5 ROBERTSON & FALK
6 A Professional Corporation
7 Three Embarcadero Center, 7th Floor
8 San Francisco, California 94111
9 Telephone: 415/434-1600

6 ALDO J. TEST
7 THOMAS O. HERBERT
8 EDWARD S. WRIGHT
9 FLEHR, HOHBACH, TEST,
10 ALBRITTON & HERBERT
11 Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 3400
12 San Francisco, California 94111
13 Telephone: 415/781-1989

11 Attorneys for Defendant
12 Activision, Inc.

HOWARD
RICE
NEMEROVSKI
CANADY
ROBERTSON
& FALK
A Professional Corporation

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
15

16 THE MAGNAVOX COMPANY, a corpora-)
17 tion, and SANDERS ASSOCIATES,)
18 INC., a corporation)
19 Plaintiffs,)
20 vs.)
21 ACTIVISION, INC., a corporation,)
22 Defendant.)

No. C 82 5270 JPV
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF
DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR ORDER
COMPELLING FURTHER ANSWERS
TO INTERROGATORIES

Date: September 21, 1984
Time: 1:30 p.m.

23
24
25
26

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1	
2	
3 Table of Authorities	ii
4 INTRODUCTION	2
5 BACKGROUND	2
6 ARGUMENT	5
7 CONCLUSION	17
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

HOWARD
RICE
NEMEROVSKI
CANADY
ROBERTSON
& FALK

A Professional Corporation

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
Statutes and Regulations

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Page

Rule 26(b)(1), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure	8
Rule 37(a), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure	8

HOWARD
RICE
NEMEROVSKI
CANADY
ROBERTSON
& FALK

A Professional Corporation

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

INTRODUCTION

Defendant Activision, Inc. ("Activision") hereby moves pursuant to Rule 37 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for an order compelling further answers to certain interrogatories served on Plaintiffs The Magnavox Company and Sanders Associates, Inc. ("Magnavox"). For the reasons set forth below, Magnavox' present responses are inadequate, and prevent Activision from discovering the full basis of Magnavox' alleged claims against it.

BACKGROUND

Activision is a California corporation based in Mountain View that designs and manufactures a wide variety of video game cartridges which, when used in combination with a control unit (which Activision does not manufacture) can be played at home on the user's television set. Activision has been sued for allegedly infringing U.S. Patent Re. 28,507 (the "507 patent"), owned by Sanders Associates and licensed to The Magnavox Company. This patent neither mentions nor contemplates anything even resembling the video game cartridges which Activision designs and manufactures.

Magnavox filed its Complaint on September 28, 1982. Activision answered and counterclaimed that it does not infringe the patent, and that the patent itself is invalid and thus unenforceable.

//
//

HOWARD
RICE
NEMEROVSKI
CANADY
ROBERTSON
& FALK
A Professional Corporation

1 Over the course of the last year and a half, the parties
2 have engaged in discovery. Among other things, Activision has
3 served four sets of interrogatories on Magnavox, to which Magnavox
4 has filed responses with varying degrees of thoroughness. This
5 Court has already issued one order compelling Magnavox to make
6 further answers to interrogatories. See Court Order dated May 11,
7 1984.

8 The trial in this action is less than two months away, and
9 Magnavox has yet fully to disclose the basis of its claim against
10 Activision. Magnavox does not hide behind objections of excessive
11 burden or irrelevance, nor does it raise technical or legal objec-
12 tions. Instead, Magnavox simply fails without objection to answer
13 an interrogatory or sub-part, or objects on the ground that a par-
14 ticular interrogatory is "premature," and thus reserves to itself
15 the right to "alter, amend, supplement or change" its response.

16 In an effort to convince Magnavox to commit to final
17 responses, or to supplement its responses where necessary, counsel
18 for Activision have used their best efforts to obtain Magnavox'
19 voluntary supplementation of the responses. See Declaration of
20 Marla J. Miller, filed herewith. Although the parties were able to
21 resolve a number of these issues, ^{1/} several key interrogatories
22

23 1/ Activision and Magnavox, through their attorneys, have
24 reached apparent agreement as to the finality, and, in some cases,
25 supplementation of Magnavox' answers to Interrogatory Nos. 38, 50,

(continued)

26 //

1 remain incompletely answered. While Magnavox' counsel indicated a
2 willingness to seek further answers from his clients, no responses
3 have been forthcoming. Id. at ¶15. Because the trial date is so
4 close at hand, Activision had no choice but to file this motion to
5 compel final and definitive answers.

6 The central problem with many of Magnavox' responses to
7 these Interrogatories is that Magnavox has not stated definitively
8 the basis of its claims against Activision. The patent that is the
9 subject of this lawsuit is composed of 64 claims of differing scope,
10 each of which purports to describe some element or combination of
11 elements of the alleged "invention." Magnavox appears to have
12 finally decided to take the position that seven of these claims are
13 allegedly infringed by the Activision games. However, Magnavox has
14 not yet determined finally which of Activision's more than three
15 dozen games infringe which of these seven claims, nor how they do
16 so. It almost goes without saying that without knowing precisely
17 which games allegedly infringe the 507 patent, Activision is
18 prejudiced in the preparation of its defenses and its preparation
19 for trial. And yet, as to Interrogatory Nos. 39(A)(C); 54; 119;
20 126-127; 130-134; and 184-192, it is still Magnavox' position that
21

22 1/ (FOOTNOTE CONTINUED)

23 128, and 129. The substance of this agreement is spelled out in a
24 letter from Activision's counsel to Magnavox' counsel dated
25 August 22, 1984, and attached hereto as Exhibit D to the Miller
26 Declaration. In the event that this accord falls through, Acti-
vision will immediately move to compel further and/or definitive
answers to the above-mentioned interrogatories.

//

1 it is simply not prepared to respond to straightforward questions
2 about the nature of its claims against Activision.
3
4

5 ARGUMENT

6 Each interrogatory at issue and the corresponding response
7 is set forth below, followed by a discussion of the inadequacy of
8 the response. Where a series of interrogatories are at issue, a
9 representative example and response are set forth, and the complete
10 series of interrogatories is attached in appendices to this
11 Memorandum.

12 INTERROGATORY NO. 39(A), (C):

13 For each of the claims identified in response to
14 Interrogatory No. 38, set forth in detail the manner in
15 which the claim has been infringed by Activision,
including:

16 A. The activities of Activision which
constitute infringement;

17 C. Identify each television game cartridge
18 made, used and/or sold by Activision which constitutes an
19 infringement of the claim either by itself or in com-
bination with a television game console; . . .

20 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 39 (A), (C):

21 Plaintiffs are at this time unable to fully
22 state what contentions they will make at trial as to the
23 subject matter of Interrogatory 39. [emphasis added]
24 This interrogatory seeks information as to plaintiffs'
25 contentions with regard to infringement of the Re. 28,507
26 patent. Plaintiffs have not completed their discovery as
to the television game products manufactured, used, and/or
sold by Activision, so they have been unable to fully
formulate their contentions as to infringement. Plain-
tiffs hereinafter state their contentions as they are
presently best able to determine them in light of the
information presently available to them; they specifically

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

reserve the right to alter these contentions when more complete information becomes available. To the extent interrogatory 39 presently requires any further response than that given hereinafter, plaintiffs object to the interrogatory as premature.

A. The making, using, selling, and offering for sale of the following Activision television game cartridges:

- | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Tennis | Ice Hockey |
| Boxing | Fishing Derby |
| Dolphin | Keystone Kapers |
| Decathlon | Stampede |
| Grand Prix | Barnstorming |
| Sky Jinks | Enduro |
| Pressure Cooker | |

C. As presently advised, plaintiffs contend that the manufacture, use, and/or sale of the following Activision game cartridges in combination with a television game console and, where appropriate, a television receiver, constitutes an act of infringement of the stated claim of U.S. Patent Re. 28,507.

Claim 25: Tennis, Ice Hockey, Fishing Derby, Dolphin, Stampede, Pressure Cooker.

Claim 26: Tennis, Ice Hockey, Boxing, Fishing Derby, Pressure Cooker.

Claim 51: Tennis, Ice Hockey, Boxing, Fishing Derby, Dolphin, Stampede, Pressure Cooker.

Claim 52: Tennis, Ice Hockey, Boxing, Fishing Derby, Pressure Cooker.

Claim 60: Tennis, Ice Hockey, Boxing, Fishing Derby, Dolphin, Keystone Kapers, Decathlon, Stampede, Grand Prix, Barnstorming, Sky Jinks, Enduro, Pressure Cooker.

Claim 61: Tennis, Ice Hockey, Fishing Derby.

Claim 62: Tennis, Ice Hockey.

//
//

HOWARD
RICE
NENIEROVSKI
CANADY
ROBERTSON
& FALK
A Professional Corporation

1 ARGUMENT REGARDING INTERROGATORY NOS. 39(A), (C):

2 At this advanced stage in this litigation, with less than
3 two months before the trial is due to commence, Magnavox cannot
4 fairly claim that it has not yet determined which Activision game
5 cartridges allegedly infringe which claims of the 507 patent. This
6 issue of the specific details of the alleged infringement is the
7 core of Magnavox' lawsuit against Activision. Magnavox certainly
8 has had ample opportunity to examine the Activision game cartridges
9 "to fully formulate their contentions." Activision simply must know
10 the scope of Magnavox' claim against it.^{2/}

11 The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure require no less.
12 Rule 26(b)(1) provides, in relevant part, that "Parties may obtain
13 discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, which is relevant to
14 the subject matter involved in the pending action, whether it
15 relates to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or to
16 the claim or defense of any other party" (Emphasis added).
17 Moreover, for the purposes of moving for an order to compel answers
18

19 ^{2/} It cannot be said that because depositions of two
20 Activision game designers are still outstanding that Magnavox is
21 unable to determine which games infringe which claims. Those
22 depositions were noticed on March 2, 1984 pursuant to Fed. R. Civ.
23 P. 30(b)(6) (deposition of a corporation), and the schedule of
24 matters to be examined at those depositions was explicitly limited
25 to thirteen specific Activision game cartridges alleged to infringe
26 the 507 patent. The depositions were not noticed to determine
whether other Activision games infringed the 507 patent. Moreover,
Magnavox has itself admitted that it needs to "examin[e]" the game
cartridge to determine whether a game allegedly infringes the 507
patent. See Magnavox Response to Interrogatory No. 41, subscribed
and dated May 8, 1984. Game cartridges, of course, can be (and have
been) obtained from Activision, or readily from any number of toy or
department stores.

1 to interrogatories under Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a), an "evasive or
2 incomplete answer is to be treated as a failure to answer." Fed. R.
3 Civ. P. 37(a)(3).
4

5 INTERROGATORY NO. 54:

6 Referring to Paragraph 11 of the Complaint, set
7 forth in detail the basis for the allegations that the
8 alleged infringements, inducements to infringe and
contributory infringements were:

9 A. Willful; and

10 B. With full knowledge of United States
Letters Patent Re. 28,507.

11 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 54:

12 Plaintiffs are presently unable to state all the
13 acts, facts, and circumstances which support the refer-
14 enced allegations because they have not yet completed
15 their discovery of defendant as to that matter. [Emphasis
16 added] However, prior to the filing of the complaint in
this action, plaintiff Magnavox informed Activision of its
need for a license under the patent in suit, but Acti-
vision continued its acts of infringement without taking
such a license up until the time the complaint was filed.

17 ARGUMENT REGARDING INTERROGATORY NO. 54:

18 This incomplete response was provided by Magnavox in
19 February, 1983. Since that time, there has been ample opportunity
20 for extensive discovery. In a telephone conversation with counsel
21 for Activision, Magnavox' attorney has suggested, but will not
22 confirm, that the complete and final answer to this interrogatory
23 should reference the deposition testimony of a particular witness.
24 See Miller Decl. ¶4, and Exhibit D thereto. This compromise would
25 be satisfactory to Activision if Magnavox would commit to the com-
26 pleteness of the response.

1 INTERROGATORY NO. 98(D):

2 With regard to the decision to reissue U.S.
3 Patent 3,659,284:

4 D. Describe in detail the circumstances under
5 which the decision was made; . . .

6 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 98(D):

7 Plaintiffs object to paragraph D of this
8 interrogatory as vague and indefinite; it is impossible to
9 ascertain the nature or scope of the information being
10 requested.

11 ARGUMENT REGARDING INTERROGATORY NO. 98(D):

12 This interrogatory is neither vague nor indefinite. In a
13 letter to Magnavox' attorney dated July 27, 1984 from attorneys for
14 Activision, attached hereto as Exhibit A to the Miller Declaration,
15 Activision made clear that this interrogatory seeks to discover what
16 prompted the persons identified in this interrogatory to seek re-
17 issue of the 284 patent--i.e., to seek approval from the U.S. Patent
18 Office to revise the first version of the patent that is alleged to
19 be infringed by Activision in this lawsuit. In a subsequent tele-
20 phone conversation with Activision's attorneys, counsel for Magnavox
21 suggested, but would not confirm, an additional and final answer to
22 this interrogatory that Magnavox would limit itself to the matters
23 set out in the Reissue Oath for the patent. See Miller Decl. ¶4,
24 and Exhibit D thereto. This additional answer would be satisfactory
25 to Activision if Magnavox would commit to the finality of this
26 answer. Because Magnavox has not, Activision must seek an order
compelling a further, final response.

//

1 INTERROGATORY NO. 100(E) :

2 With regard to the examination and prosecution
3 of the application on which Reissue Patent 28,507 issued:

4 E. Identify any prior art other than the
5 references cited on the face of the reissue patent which
6 was considered the prosecution of the application and
7 determined not to be material to the examination of the
8 application; . . .

9 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 100(E) :

10 E. Plaintiffs object to this interrogatory as
11 vague and indefinite.

12 ARGUMENT REGARDING INTERROGATORY NO. 100(E) :

13 This Interrogatory is neither vague nor indefinite. In a
14 letter to Magnavox' attorney dated July 27, 1984, from attorneys for
15 Activision, attached hereto as Exhibit A to the Miller Declaration,
16 Activision made unmistakably clear, as had co-counsel four months
17 earlier, the response called for by this Interrogatory. Indeed, in
18 a subsequent conversation with attorneys for Activision, Magnavox'
19 attorney demonstrated his understanding of this Interrogatory by
20 suggesting, but not confirming, an additional and final answer. See
21 Miller Decl. ¶4 and Exhibit D thereto. This suggested answer would
22 be satisfactory to Activision if Magnavox would commit to it;
23 because Magnavox has not, Activision must seek an order compelling a
24 further, final response.

25 INTERROGATORY NO. 108 :

26 If the answer to INTERROGATORY NO. 107 is other
 than an unqualified negative, identify each such
 discussion, including:

 A. Identification of each person involved in
 the discussion, including the relationship of each such
 person to Magnavox and/or Sanders;

- 1 B. The date and place of the discussion;
- 2 C. The circumstances under which the discus-
3 sion was held;
- 4 D. The substance of the discussion;
- 5 E. Any action taken by Magnavox and/or Sanders
as a result of the discussion;
- 6 F. Identify all persons having knowledge of
7 the subject matter of parts A through E of this
interrogatory;
- 8 G. Identify all communications relating to the
9 subject matter of parts A through F of this interrogatory;
and
- 10 H. Identify all documents which refer or
11 relate in any way to the subject matter of parts A through
G of this interrogatory.

12 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 108:

13 Mr. Williams discussed the game he observed
14 during the taking of his deposition on March 22, 23, and
26, 1976. Copies of the appearance pages are attached
15 hereto as Exhibit D. Plaintiffs are unable to supply the
remaining information requested in this interrogatory
16 because they are unable to determine for themselves
whether any additional discussion occurred.

17 ARGUMENT REGARDING INTERROGATORY NO. 108:

18 Magnavox' counsel, James T. Williams, is the Mr. Williams
19 referred to in these Interrogatories. In a telephone conversation
20 preceding the filing of this Motion, Magnavox' counsel suggested,
21 but would not confirm, an additional and final answer to this
22 interrogatory, which answer would be satisfactory if Magnavox would
23 commit to it. See Miller Decl. ¶4 and Exhibit D thereto. Because
24 Magnavox has not confirmed the additional answer, Activision seeks
25 an order compelling it to do so.

26 //

1 INTERROGATORY NO. 119:

2 Did Magnavox and/or Sanders ever consider
3 reissuance of U.S. Patent 3,728,480 in view of U.S. Patent
4 2,857,661 (Althouse)?

5 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 119:

6 Plaintiffs are presently unable to ascertain
7 that either plaintiff ever made any such consideration.

8 ARGUMENT REGARDING INTERROGATORY NO. 119:

9 At the time Magnavox responded to this Interrogatory
10 nearly one year ago, it claimed inability to answer it, even though
11 the Interrogatory poses a straightforward question within Magnavox'
12 firsthand knowledge about the decision to seek reissue of a patent
13 relevant to this lawsuit. Magnavox still has not answered
14 definitively one way or the other.

15 INTERROGATORY NO. 126:

16 For each combination of the games identified in
17 response to Interrogatory No. 38 of Defendant's First Set
18 of Interrogatories to Plaintiffs (namely, "Fishing Derby",
19 "Boxing", "Tennis" and "Ice Hockey") and the consoles
20 identified in response to Interrogatory No. 50 of
21 Defendant's First Set of Interrogatories to Plaintiffs
22 (namely, the Atari VCS Model 2600, the Sears Tele-Game
23 Video Arcade, and the combination of the Colecovision game
24 console and the Expansion Module 1) which plaintiffs
25 contend constitutes an infringement of Claim 25 of the
26 United States Patent Re. 28,507, identify the elements
 which plaintiffs contend correspond to the following
 elements of the claim:

- 27 A. A hitting symbol;
- 28 B. Means for generating a hitting symbol;
- 29 C. A hit symbol;
- 30 D. Means for generating a hit symbol;

31 //

1 E. Coincidence between said hitting symbol and
2 said hit symbol;

3 F. Means for ascertaining coincidence between
4 said hitting symbol and said hit symbol;

5 G. A distinct motion imparted to said hit
6 symbol upon coincidence; and

7 H. Means for imparting a distinct motion to
8 said hit symbol upon coincidence.

9 (PARTIAL) RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 126:

10 Plaintiffs are at this time unable to supply all
11 the information requested in Interrogatory 126. Plain-
12 tiffs have not completed their discovery as to the tele-
13 vision game cartridges manufactured, used, and/or sold by
14 Activision, and the television game consoles with which
15 those cartridges are used, and are thus unable to fully
16 state what contentions they will make at trial as to the
17 subject matter of this interrogatory. Plaintiffs object
18 to this interrogatory as premature.

19 However, in order to advance the progress of
20 this action, plaintiffs further respond to interroga-
21 tory 126 as follows while reserving the right to alter,
22 amend, supplement or change the response after discovery
23 is completed and prior to trial. Each response refers to
24 the combination of the indicated Activision television
25 game cartridge and the Atari VCS Model 2600, the Sears
26 Tele-Game Video Arcade, the Colecovision game console with
the Coleco Expansion Module 1, or the Coleco Gemini
television game console.

[Response continues; See Appendix A.]

20 ARGUMENT REGARDING INTERROGATORY NO. 126-127, 130-134, 184-192:

21 Through Interrogatory Nos. 126-127, 130-134 and 184-192,
22 Activision seeks to discover precisely whether and how each
23 Activision game cartridge allegedly infringes which claims of the
24 507 patent. This series of interrogatories was designed so that
25 each breaks down an element of an allegedly infringed claim of the
26 507 patent. (The complete set of this interrogatory series and

1 responses is attached hereto as Appendix A.) For each one of its
2 responses to this series of Interrogatories, Magnavox makes the
3 identical opening statement professing inability to answer whether
4 or how Activision infringes the patent that is the sole basis for
5 this lawsuit. This is inexcusable. By this time Magnavox should be
6 able to state fully and without qualification what contentions it
7 will make at trial as to whether and how each Activision game
8 cartridge allegedly infringes the 507 patent, and Activision is
9 entitled to know in a timely fashion what those contentions are.

10 Counsel for Magnavox has suggested, but will not confirm,
11 that Magnavox' present responses to Interrogatories 126-127,
12 130-134, and 184-192 reflect Magnavox' final position as to whether
13 and how each Activision game allegedly infringes the 507 patent.
14 See Miller Decl. ¶4 and Exhibit D thereto. However, counsel for
15 Magnavox expressly would not state that there were no other Acti-
16 vision game cartridges which might at some later date be added to
17 the list of infringing games. Activision seeks a Court order com-
18 pelling Magnavox to commit to its answers to these Interrogatories
19 finally, once and for all, and without disclaimers.

20 INTERROGATORIES NOS. 138-139:

21 INTERROGATORY NO. 138:

22 Identify all portions of the subject matter described
23 in U.S. Patent 3,728,480 which Magnavox and Sanders
24 contend are not prior art with regard to United States
Patent Re. 28,507.

25 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 138:

26 This interrogatory has been limited by defendant to
the portions of U.S. Patent 3,728,480 enumerated in this

1 response. Circuits as described at column 4, lines 16-21;
2 column 6, lines 7-22 and 45-58; column 8, lines 33-54;
3 column 9, lines 39 - column 10, line 15; column 12, lines
4 23-26, 44-48, and 57-60; Claims 13-23; Claims 26-30, and
5 Claim 41 of U.S. Patent 3,728,480 were built and used with
6 a color television receiver by the inventor thereof prior
7 to the commencement of reasonable diligence toward
8 reduction to practice of the claimed subject matter of
9 U.S. Patent Re. 28,507.

10 INTERROGATORY NO. 139:

11 For each portion of the subject matter of U.S. Patent
12 3,728,480 identified in response to Interrogatory No. 138:

13 A. Set forth in detail the basis of the contention
14 that the portion of the subject matter is not prior art;

15 B. Identify all persons having knowledge of the
16 respective dates of invention of that portion of the
17 subject matter and the subject matter of United States
18 Letters Patent Re. 28,507; and

19 C. Identify all documents which refer or relate in
20 any way to the subject matter of this interrogatory,
21 including all documents which support the contention that
22 the portion of the subject matter is not prior art with
23 regard to United States Letters Patent Re. 28,507.

24 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 139:

25 No response required in view of the response to
26 interrogatory 138.

ARGUMENT REGARDING INTERROGATORY NOS. 138-139:

These interrogatories seek Magnavox' position as to
whether certain portions of another relevant patent, the "480
patent," constitute "prior art" with respect to the 507 patent.
This is a key inquiry which goes to the heart of the issue of the
underlying validity of the 507 patent itself. In an effort to make
easier Magnavox' task of answering these Interrogatories, Activision
subsequently limited the scope of this Interrogatory to certain
portions of the 480 patent. Since that time, Activision has

1 determined that there is one additional portion in the 480 patent
2 (column 7, line 15 to column 8, line 22) about which Activision must
3 learn Magnavox' position. Counsel for Activision have conveyed this
4 request to counsel for Magnavox, who neither refused nor assented to
5 provide further response. In the event that Magnavox does not
6 respond, Activision requests this Court to order it to do so.

7
8 INTERROGATORY NO. 140(G):

9 With regard to the invention of means for
10 denoting coincidence when a dot generated by one dot
11 generator is located in the same position on a television
12 screen as a dot generated by another dot generator, as
13 claimed in Claim 13 of U.S. Patent 3,728,480:

14 Identify all prototypes, laboratory models,
15 breadboard circuits and other physical embodiments of the
16 invention made prior to May 27, 1969, including the
17 following:

- 18 (1) A concise description of each;
19 (2) The date(s) each was made;
20 (3) The person(s) who constructed each;
21 (4) All persons having access to each prior to
22 May 27, 1969; and
23 (5) The present location and condition of each.

24 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 140(G):

25 The earliest written record relating to the work
26 done on television games by employees of plaintiff Sanders
Associates of which plaintiffs are presently aware that
shows or refers to any means for denoting coincidence
between a dot generated by one dot generator is located in
the same position on a television screen as a dot
generated by another dot generator are a page of
handwritten notes dated May 23, 1967 (Sanders Deposition
Exhibit 23, page 23) and prepared by William Harrison
under the direction and at the suggestion of Ralph H.
Baer, and laboratory notebook entries dated May 24, 1967

HOWARD
RICE
NEMEROVSKI
CANADY
ROBERTSON
& FALK
A Professional Corporation

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

(Sanders Deposition Exhibit 16, pages 44 and 45) made by William Harrison under the direction and at the suggestion of Ralph H. Baer. Additional drawings showing such circuitry and references to such circuitry are dated June 14, 1967 (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 23, page 81) July 18, 1967, (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 16, page 78) September 12, 1967 (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 16, page 89, Sanders Deposition Exhibit 9, pages 89 and 90), each of which was prepared by William Harrison under the direction and at the suggestion of Ralph H. Baer. The suggestion for such circuitry was made by Ralph H. Baer in approximately May 1967. Apparatus including such circuitry (Sanders Deposition Exhibit 28) was first constructed during the period May - June 1967.

ARGUMENT REGARDING INTERROGATORY NOS. 140-152(G):

By Court order dated May 11, 1984, Magnavox was compelled to answer these Interrogatory Nos. 140-152, each of which concerns the circumstances surrounding the alleged invention of each claim that is the subject of the 507 patent, and the alleged invention of each claim of a related, relevant patent. (The complete set of this interrogatory series and responses is attached hereto as Appendix B.) Although Magnavox has answered these Interrogatories in part, it has failed entirely to respond to Paragraph (G) which seeks the identification and particulars, including present location, of all prototypes or other physical models of these alleged inventions. Activision seeks a court order to remedy this failure to answer.

//
//
//
//
//
//

HOWARD
RICE
NEMEROVSKI
CANADY
ROBERTSON
& FALK

A Professional Corporation

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Activision requests that this Court order Magnavox to make further and definitive responses to the Interrogatories referred to above.

DATED: August 24, 1984.

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

By Marla J Miller
MARLA J. MILLER

Attorneys for Defendant
Activision, Inc.

HOWARD
RICE
NEMEROVSKI
CANADY
ROBERTSON
& FALK
A Professional Corporation

082484/5-355900Be