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As far as significant gaming law developments are concerned, 2011 was a tough act to follow. Last year a new paradigm emerged—courts applied the test set forth in Hart v. Electronic Arts, Inc. to lawsuits involving celebrities’ publicity rights in video games, and the Supreme Court validated a new art form in Brown v. Entertainment Merchants Association. While not new in 2012, an important trend certainly continued in a significant way: the video game industry continued to become more mainstream. As video games continue to cross demographic lines and become more ubiquitous, production companies begin to resemble those in other industries. As a result of risk-focused business decisions and industry growth, many of last year’s contentious lawsuits have settled.

As the scope of a business expands, the variety of its contracts tends to expand as well. Video game companies faced everything from old-fashioned employment disputes to celebrity licensing deals gone awry. While the video game market continued to expand, intellectual property (IP) litigation—initiated by competitors and non-practicing entities (NPEs) alike—plagued gaming companies. The well-known threat of IP infringement claims affected the largest players, and even the smallest mobile app startups proved vulnerable to NPE’s troll-like claims. Plaintiffs discovered new IP mediums through which to litigate; some even taking pages from old IP portfolios to find new defendants.

Slow economic growth negatively impacted nearly every gaming company. The shift to less profitable, yet more popular, mobile gaming has perpetuated the problem. This trend could explain why some gaming companies are beginning to litigate against competitors in more ways and on a greater scale than ever before. Likewise, the evolution of the industry to one popu-
lated with an increasing number of businesspeople and investors could explain why more of these suits settled out of court.

I. PATENT INFRINGEMENT

In 2012, the video game industry seemed to avoid the mass attacks from NPEs that characterized 2011. However, NPEs are still pressuring some major players. Several cases between practicing entities have threatened foundations of the industry. Independent developers and startups usually avoid major patent traps; however, giants like Nintendo and Microsoft have been consistently dragged into the courtroom over their console technologies, sometimes at the mercy of smaller technology companies. Video game litigation in 2012 was comprised of a collection of suits that threatened Xbox, iPhone, and every gadget in-between. Consequently, wise counsel must clear new technologies early to avoid lengthy litigation.

A. Microsoft Corp. v. Motorola, Inc.6

In 2010, after acquiring Motorola, Google flexed its muscle and sued Microsoft and Apple over their H.264 video compression and wireless patents.7 After making initial headway with the International Trade Commission (ITC), the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) began an antitrust investigation into Google's conduct, and federal district judges denied Google's injunction petitions against the Xbox and other products.8 The Xbox's fate seems somewhat secure since Google recently dropped the video-encoding patents from the investigation.9 This came on the heels of the settlement resulting from the FTC's antitrust investigation, which ruled that Google must cease seeking

6. 696 F.3d 872 (9th Cir. 2012).
injunctions against competitors using standard-essential patents (such as the H.264 patent) and, instead, continue third-party negotiations. Nevertheless, several patent-related district court cases are still ongoing. Although negotiations have been spurred on, conclusions are not close at hand.

B. Worlds, Inc. v. Activision Blizzard, Inc.12

On March 30, 2012, Worlds Inc. (“Worlds”), a NPE, sued World of Warcraft and Call of Duty mastermind, Activision Blizzard (“Activision”). Worlds claimed that Activision allegedly infringed United States Patent Numbers 8,082,501; 7,493,558; 7,945,856; and 7,181,690, collectively titled “System and Method for Enabling Users to Interact in a Virtual Space.” These patents arguably give Worlds a monopoly on the technology at the core of most massively multiplayer online games (MMOs). A Markman hearing, also called a patent claim construction hearing, is set for June 27, 2013. If this hearing construes the patent as broadly as its title suggests,


hundreds of other game creators could be held liable. This lawsuit could possibly settle with a licensing deal, giving Worlds an opportunity to sue other MMOs using similar technology.

C. Tomita Technologies USA, LLC v. Nintendo Co., Ltd.

The first in-depth look at an augmented reality patent infringement case was presented in 2012 when Seijiro Tomita, the founder of Tomita Technologies and holder of a glasses-free 3D patent, sued Nintendo. The Nintendo 3DS’s 3D imaging and augmented reality capabilities seem similar enough to United States Patent Number 7,417,664, titled “Stereoscopic Image Picking Up and Display System Based Upon Optical Axes Cross-Point Information,” for the Federal District Court of the Southern District of New York to deny Nintendo’s motion for summary judgment. Nintendo is usually forced to defend against patent infringement lawsuits at least twice each year, typically focused on the Wii and its peripherals. Tomita, however, is the first case to target its 3D applications.

D. Uniloc v. Everyone

By filing no fewer than fifty lawsuits in the Eastern District of Texas in 2012, Uniloc USA—a prominent NPE—plagued the gaming industry this year. Among the defendants were every kind of technology company, including several game developers: Mojang, the creator of Minecraft; Half-brick, the makers of Fruit Ninja; Gameloft, a mobile game mogul; Madfinger, producer of mobile first-person shooting games (FPSs) like

22. Id.
Shadowgun; and even Square Enix and Electronic Arts. Uniloc owns U.S. Patent Number 6,857,067, entitled “System and Method for Preventing Unauthorized Access to Electronic Data,” and asserted that mobile games, like Minecraft—Pocket Edition, use their patented process for server authorization, including “a portable licensing medium configured to communicate with the electronic device and to store license data.” As of December 27, 2012, Uniloc had also filed suit against Take-Two Interactive and 2K Games regarding United States Patent No. 5,490,216, “System for Software Registration,” mentioning Borderlands as the culprit. The litigation is still ongoing, but Minecraft creator Markus “Notch” Persson has vowed he “will throw piles of money at making sure they do not get a cent.” If Notch keeps his word a patent infringement ruling might be forthcoming—a key to future patent defense.

E. Wildcat Intellectual Property Holdings, LLC v. Wizards of the Coast LLC

A different NPE has filed an infringement case against a game over ten years old; this time in the Northern District of Texas. Wildcat Intellectual Property Holdings LLC, of Dallas sued Wizards of the Coast, LLC, on November 1, 2012, targeting Magic: The Gathering Online, claiming it infringes upon United States Patent Number 6,200,216, “Electronic Trading Cards.” Interestingly, in 2011 Wildcat asserted this patent in similar suits against numerous defendants. All but one ended in dismissal without
prejudice.32 Wildcat asked the judge for an injunction to immediately take down the website—a cash cow for Wizards of the Coast.33 The details of the settlement from the previous case have not been released, but Wildcat was not dealt the hand it actually wanted.34

F. Walker Digital and Lodsys v. Everyone

A Review of 2011 Video Game Litigation and Selected Cases reported on pending patent litigation aiming to educate conference attendees on the trends in patent law.35 Somewhat expectedly, most of the suits discussed are still being fought, and few court opinions have issued. However, NPEs, such as Walker Digital, LLC, and Lodsys, LLC, have been vicious and are constant threats to videogame developers, large and small.36 Walker Digital’s infamous 2011 deluge of fifteen patent infringement cases against over 100 defendants included nearly every major player in the video game industry,37 while Lodsys attacked iOS developers in nearly forty suits.38 This type of behavior by NPEs has apparently prompted some independent developers to move to Europe.39 This is a shift to watch, as video game copyright law


35. Jordan & Wilkinson, supra note 1, at 278-79.


38. Rooney, supra note 36; Syverson, supra note 36.

abroad is constantly changing. But, more often, developers simply pay up to avoid the costs of long, drawn-out litigation.

G. Impulse Tech. v. Nintendo of America; Impulse Tech. v. Microsoft; ThinkOptics Inc. v. Nintendo of America

Patent litigation not involving NPEs was more focused and was more quickly resolved. In 2012, closure from litigation came when console makers Microsoft and Nintendo—and even their developers and retailers—were sued over motion-tracking peripherals such as the Wii Remote and the Xbox Kinect. One suit, brought by Impulse Technology in the Northern District of Ohio, was voluntarily dismissed after the court’s Markman hearing construed the claim in favor of the defendant. A plaintiff, however, emerged victorious in 2011 when ThinkOptics, Inc. sued Nintendo over the Wii remote. The two companies have now settled and have entered into a licensing agreement. Why these companies waited five years to attack the Wii is uncertain, but, in the end, motion-controlled virtual bowling continues.


II. COPYRIGHT AND TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT

Copyright and trademark law in the video game industry has always been interesting, and often entertaining; this year was no exception. As virtual tattoos, video game plot lines, and depicted helicopters, among others, are accused of infringement, the subject matter of litigation has grown wider and more diverse.

A. Tetris Holding, LLC v. Xio Interactive, Inc.49

Tetris Holding, LLC’s victory over Xio-makers of a Tetris clone for the iPhone—was arguably the most important development in video game copyright law in 2012.50 In response to Tetris’s complaint, Xio admitted that they were copying, but claimed that “the only similarities between the games are elements not protected by copyright law.”51 While code and graphical elements of a game are copyrightable, the rules and mechanics are not.52 As the court stated, the “doctrine is simple to state—copyright will not protect an idea, only its expression—but difficult to apply.”53 The court proffered the “Squint Test,” declaring: “If one has to squint to find distinctions only at a granular level, then the works are likely to be substantially similar.”54 In applying the Squint Test, the court found “the overall look and feel of the two games [to be] identical.” Thus Xio had almost copied, per se, the “visual expression” of Tetris, infringing its copyright.55 With copying in the industry so commonplace, this opinion will surely cause companies to rethink strategies for avoiding suit.

B. Ubisoft Entertainment, S.A. v. Beiswaenger56

In April, many industry professionals and gamers were troubled to hear that the popular Assassin’s Creed series’ entire premise might have been lifted from the pages of a self-published novel titled “Link,” written by John

52. Tetris Holding, 863 F. Supp. 2d at 404.
53. Id. at 400.
54. Id. at 410.
55. Id.
L. Beiswenger in 2003. The novel, which pre-dated the first game by five years, includes familiar touchstones such as a machine that allowed characters to relive their ancestors’ memories and analogous spiritual and Biblical overtones. Beiswenger sued Ubisoft, the makers of Assassin’s Creed, for copyright infringement, but dropped the suit without prejudice only a month later. This prompted Ubisoft to immediately pursue declaratory judgment to end the dispute. While a ruling in this case would have interested developers who might be tempted to “borrow” a few ideas from a favorite sci-fi novel, the case settled fairly quickly in August, though this time without prejudice.

C. Electronic Arts Inc. v. Zynga Inc.

Copying between competing developers in the social game sphere has escalated from copying a game’s basic concepts to blatant cloning of code, but how much is too much is still a legal gray area. In June, Zynga revealed one of its most ambitious projects yet, The Ville, only to be sued a month later by Electronic Arts (“EA”) for infringing upon Sims Social. Zynga geared up for what could be the biggest infringement lawsuit to date between


the companies, and counterclaimed in three parts. The most important claim asserted that EA originally stole Sims Social from their own CityVille, a game they released eighteen months earlier. However, Professor Eric Goldman believes that this is a lawsuit that “EA [cannot] afford to win.”

The legal precedent in copyright law allows copying of “the basic game concept,” and even the general appearance of the game. EA needs to push the boundaries of what is considered infringement in order to win this case; but if it does, it will be much easier for copyright owners to win on these types of claims and could potentially create more work for EA in developing its next social game.

Further complicating the suit, Zynga is sun-setting The Ville. The impact this may have on pending litigation remains to be seen, but a possible settlement could be imminent.

D. Electronic Arts, Inc. v. Textron, Inc.

In apparent déjà vu, Textron, the maker of Bell Helicopters, again claimed trademark infringement against EA games over the helicopters depicted in the Battlefield series. In 2006, the same suit was settled with a licensing agreement, but, surprisingly, the negotiations for licensing the Bell trademark for Battlefield 3 seem to have broken down. EA, in its Mo-


67. Id.

68. Id.

69. Thomas, supra note 63.


73. EA’s Video Game ‘Battlefield 3’ Turning into ‘Battlefield Trademark’ as Video Game Manufacturer Sues to Adjudicate Non-Infringement of Military Helicopters, LEXISNEXIS COPYRIGHT & TRADEMARK LAW COMMUNITY (Jan. 25, 2012,
tion to Dismiss, claimed First Amendment protections like those acknowledged in the Supreme Court’s *Brown* decision, but was disappointed when the motion was denied in July. The suit is ongoing and could provide a first look at how courts will handle the implementation of the *Brown* decision. However, EA will likely steer clear of that potential minefield and end up settling with new licensing terms.

E. EMI April Music, Inc. v. 4MM Games

Musical video games create an exciting collision of two of the edgiest sectors in the entertainment industry. However, this intersection could raise new issues regarding copyright infringement. EMI filed a suit against 4MM Games, creator of the *Def Jam Rapstar* music video game, alleging copyright infringement. The complaint claimed that the developer used certain songs in which EMI had an interest without obtaining the proper permissions; EMI only owned portions of some of the songs it claimed infringement upon; including Kanye West’s *Stronger*, which samples the EMI-owned *Better, Faster, Stronger* by Daft Punk. EMI claimed statutory damages of $150,000 per violation, net profits from the game, and requested an injunction.

Games like *Rock Band* and *Guitar Hero* have left a well-blazed trail in the world of music licensing for video games. However, some commentators believe that because rap songs often sample multiple tracks from various contributors and they generally have a more complicated ownership portfolio; thus, a much more complex legal system is required to address these

---


78. Compl., *EMI*, *supra* note 76, at 19; Gardner, *supra* note 77.

issues. EMI claims that 4MM Games did not do the necessary work, resulting in infringement of EMI’s property. The industry should watch this case and consider the added costs associated with this market sector before attempting to expand music-based video games.

F. SocialApps, LLC v. Zynga, Inc

Throughout 2011, NPEs and Zynga were ever-present in the courtroom. Zynga is still in the midst of numerous lawsuits—on both sides of cease and desist letters. One such suit involved SocialApps, LLC, creator of the Facebook game myFarm, in which players give farm animals and plants to friends to raise and grow on their virtual farms. Zynga began negotiations with SocialApps to buy or license myFarm, but after a due diligence review of SocialApps’ source code, Zynga created Farmville. Shortly thereafter, SocialApps filed suit, claiming breach of implied contract, confidence, and implied covenant; in 2012 SocialApps overcame Zynga’s Motion to Dismiss. SocialApps demanded $100,000 in punitive damages, a permanent injunction, and Zynga’s Farmville profits—estimated at over $500,000. If most of the allegations in the complaint are true, SocialApps has a strong case. If Zynga proceeds to trial, it may be difficult to avoid a ruling that it engaged in willful copyright infringement, which is typical in copyright litigation.

80. Gardner, supra note 77.
81. Compl., EMI, supra note 75, at 6, ¶ 27; Gardner, supra note 77.
82. No. 4:11-cv-04910-YGR (N.D. Cal. June 17, 2011).
G. The Learning Company v. Zynga Inc.87

In May 2011, Zynga was accused of infringing on the trademark of a game that introduced many children to PC gaming—The Oregon Trail.88 Zynga’s Frontierville expansion, called Oregon Trail, was the last straw for The Learning Company, which sued Zynga for trademark infringement.89 This suit was recently settled on December 18, 2012.90 However, details of the settlement have yet to be divulged. During the suit Zynga voluntarily removed Oregon Trail from all of its products and the court ordered this removal to remain in effect throughout the litigation; it seems unlikely that Zynga will use this bit of history in future game development.91

H. Augusta National, Inc. v. CustomPlay Games Ltd.92; Atari Interactive, Inc. v. Wan93

A Review of 2011 Video Game Litigation and Selected Cases reported on two other cases from 2011 that were rare among the ubiquitous pack of social game infringement suits: a trade dress case about a virtual rendition of a golf course94 and a copyright infringement case that involved knock-off Ataris.95 When a cease and desist letter failed to prompt CustomPlay Games to remove Augusta National’s golf course map and other notable locations from CPG Golf, Augusta National sued.96 However, that same year, CustomPlay Games went bankrupt, and a settlement was negotiated with the other defendants.97 Sadly, no legal direction has resulted from this trade dress

89. Id. at 1, ¶ 1.
claim in the Eleventh Circuit, but it is known that other defendants settled with Augusta National in some fashion.

Likewise, in the Atari case, defendants John Wan and Tommi, Inc., ended litigation in 2012 by agreeing to license copyrights and trademarks from Atari.98 Evidence suggested the defendants were wise to settle as soon as possible.

III. TATTOO CASES

Alleged infringement on tattoo designs is quickly becoming the next trend of copyright litigation, evidenced by two recent suits involving tattoos. Little precedent in this area exists, but legal scholars suggest that tattoos satisfy the requirements for copyright protection—a work of art fixed in a tangible medium—even if the medium of art is someone else’s body.

A. Escobedo v. THQ, Inc.99

When THQ recreated UFC fighters for UFC: Undisputed 3, licensing copyrighted tattoos on each fighter from each of their respective tattoo artists was probably the last thing they thought to do. Perhaps they should have; Chris Escobedo, a tattoo artist whose work was recreated on fighter Carlos Condit in the game, sued THQ.100 This may sound similar to the suit involving Mike Tyson’s infamous face tattoo created by artist Victor Whitmill.101 Whitmill sued Warner Brothers over its recreation of his design in The Hangover II.102 That suit settled, leaving no precedent to guide Escobedo, but legal experts believe that tattoos are copyrightable.103


102. Id.; see also THE HANGOVER II (Warner Bros. 2011)

B. Allen v. Electronic Arts\(^\text{104}\)

Recently, Stephen Allen sued EA after former NFL running back Ricky Williams and his tattoos appeared on the cover of NFL Street, a game released in 2004.\(^\text{105}\) Allen, a tattoo artist from Louisiana, argued that the tattoos are not Williams’, but instead were his intellectual property.\(^\text{106}\) Whether this lawsuit will spark more claims from tattoo artists across the country whose works are prominently displayed in sports-themed video games remains to be seen. Nonetheless, general counsel for developers should consider recommending licensing deals with tattoo artists or significantly change in-game tattoo recreation.

IV. RIGHT OF PUBLICITY

In 2011, the landmark Hart case and its “transformative test” made massive changes to the right of publicity landscape.\(^\text{107}\) By comparison, 2012 was fairly quiet; though one case is of interest.

A. No Doubt v. Activision\(^\text{108}\)

No Doubt’s long-running dispute with Activision came to an end this year when the parties settled on undisclosed terms.\(^\text{109}\) The suit concerned No Doubt’s licensing of its images and selected songs to Activision for the game Band Hero.\(^\text{110}\) No Doubt claimed that Activision improperly used its members’ likenesses and exceeded the terms of the licensing agreement by allowing players to “unlock” the band’s virtual avatars to play any song in the game (including songs the band claims they would never perform); by creating content that permitted the lead singer, Gwen Stefani, to sing in a male voice; and splitting up the band members to perform individually.\(^\text{111}\)

A California appellate court had already ruled that there could be no First Amendment protection for Activision under the Hart “transformative test” because the band members’ avatars could not be edited or transformed


\(^{106}\) Compl., Allen, supra note 105, at 3–4, ¶ 7–9, 14.

\(^{107}\) Hart, 808 F. Supp. 2d at 776.

\(^{108}\) 122 Cal. Rptr. 3d 397 (Cal. Ct. App. 2011).


\(^{110}\) No Doubt, 122 Cal. Rptr. 3d at 402–03.

\(^{111}\) Id.
in the game. Because the parties settled, the potential legal impact of the case remains unknown.

V. CONTRACT DISPUTES

A. Silicon Knights, Inc. v. Epic Games Inc.

The apparent conclusion of the five-year-long lawsuit between Silicon Knights, Inc., and Unreal Engine, the creator of Epic Games, came in 2012. Although initiated by Silicon Knights, Epic Games prevailed on several different claims with a large judgment in its favor.

Silicon Knights, a licensee of the Unreal Engine 3 (UE3), sued creator Epic Games in 2007 for fraudulent misrepresentation, and claimed that the UE3 engine contained so many flaws that it was unusable for its game Too Human. Silicon Knights claimed that these flaws forced it to create its own proprietary engine for the game to meet its planned timelines. Although it originally claimed upwards of $63 million in damages, Silicon Knights is liable to Epic Games for nearly $10 million.

In response to Silicon Knights’ claims, Epic Games counterclaimed under theories of copyright infringement, trade secret misappropriation, and breach of contract. Epic Games claimed that Silicon Knights’ new engine, SKE, violated the UE3 Licensing Agreement and used portions of UE3’s code in violation of Epic Games’ copyrights and trade secrets.

112. Id. at 410–11.
113. Kidd, supra note 70.
117. Compl. at 1, Silicon Knights, No. 5:07-cv-00275-D (E.D.N.C. July 8, 2007), ECF No. 1; See Order at 1, Silicon Knights, No. 5:07-cv-00275-D (E.D.N.C. Dec. 22, 2011), ECF No. 697.
119. Order (Post-Trial), Silicon Knights, supra note 115, at 47; Order, Silicon Knights, supra note 117, at 2.
121. Id. at 1.
Upon comparison of the companies’ codes, clear evidence of copying was observed.\(^{122}\) The court was aided in its decision by evidence that Silicon Knights not only copied Epic Games’ functional code, but also some of its non-functioning programmer comments—some copied code even contained typographical errors left intact by Silicon Knights.\(^{123}\)

On May 30, 2012, the jury returned a verdict in favor of Epic Games, awarding $2.65 million for its breach of contract damages and $1.8 million for copyright infringement and trade secret misappropriation damages.\(^{124}\) The court entered a judgment reflecting this verdict the same day.\(^{125}\) In accordance with court rules and applicable laws, the court also awarded Epic Games’ costs ($277,852.13), attorney’s fees for the copyright and trade secret counterclaims (but not for the breach of contract counterclaim) ($2,091,722.83), prejudgment interest ($2,302,147.96), and expert witness fees ($680).\(^{126}\) The expert witness fee award was a pittance, since over $1,000,000 was claimed.\(^{127}\) Silicon Knights was also required to wipe all UE3 code from its engine and to “recall and destroy” any existing copies of games in which UE3 code could be found, including Too Human, The Box/Ritualist, The Sandman, X-Men: Destiny, and Siren in the Maelstrom.\(^{128}\) This case shows that even “borrowing” portions of code or ideas from copyrighted software can be a very expensive undertaking.

B. Gate Five, LLC v. Knowles-Carter\(^{129}\)

In 2011, Gate Five, LLC, filed suit against singer Beyoncé Knowles-Carter (Beyoncé) for allegedly breaching a contract related to the in-development game Superstar: Beyoncé.\(^{130}\) The conflict arose when Beyoncé terminated the contract that she had negotiated licensing her image and songs for the game—a move that cost Gate Five $6.7 million in prior investment, as well as 70 jobs.\(^{131}\) Beyoncé claims that she merely exercised a financing contingency in the contract, which required Gate Five to raise a certain

122. Order (Post-Trial), Silicon Knights, supra note 115, at 17–18.
123. Id. at 18.
124. Id. at 1.
125. Id.
126. Id. at 47.
127. Id. at 26, 47.
131. Compl., Gate Five, supra note 130, at 5–6, ¶ 12–13; Rogers, supra note 130.
amount of capital for the game by a deadline; if Gate Five did not raise the capital in time, Beyoncé could terminate the deal.132 Gate Five failed to meet the deadline, but countered with an estoppel argument; the argument asserted that Beyoncé waived her right to financing contingency based on representations she and her agents made, namely that the financing arrangements, though late, were acceptable to them.133

It now seems that this case may proceed to trial, as the New York Superior Court denied Beyoncé’s motion for summary judgment, which has been confirmed by the appellate division.134 Gate Five seeks to recover its lost investment and lost profits (which it estimates at $172 million) and to enjoin Beyoncé from working on any competing video games.135 As one commentator noted, this case could be significant because it demonstrates the potential for disconnection between the talent and video game industries. Additionally, this case could indicate that an especially high level of communication is needed for joint ventures; such as the game at the center of this dispute.136

C. Zynga v. KIXEYE137

A war of words that began with a KIXEYE recruiting video lobbing thinly veiled criticisms at Zynga has culminated in an equally vitriolic lawsuit.138 The legal dispute centers around Dan Patmore, a former programmer on Zynga’s popular free-to-play game, CityVille, who was hired by KIXEYE.139 In Zynga’s complaint—alleging breach of contract and misappropriation of trade secrets—the social games giant accuses Patmore of violating

133. Gate Five, 953 N.Y.S.2d at 193–94.
134. Id.; Ron Dicker, Beyoncé Lawsuit: $100 Million Claim Against Singer over Dance Video Game Gets Go-Ahead, HUFFPOST SMALL BUSINESS (Nov. 19, 2012, 1:06 PM), http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/11/19/beyonce-lawsuit-100-milli_n_2158954.html; see Gate Five, 953 N.Y.S.2d at 193-94.
135. Compl., Gate Five, supra note 130, at 28–32.
138. Id.
his employment agreement and engaging in “wholesale theft” of Zynga documents and secrets.140 Zynga originally sued only Patmore, but has since amended its complaint, naming KIXEYE as a co-defendant.141 This lawsuit is still in its early stages, but could be the bellwether of things to come. The demand for talent in the industry, especially social-games programming talent, is well publicized.142 If the litigious Zynga continues to lose talent to competitors, similar lawsuits could become the story of the next year.

D. Bethesda Softworks LLC v. Interplay Entertainment Corp.143

Bethesda Softworks LLC and Interplay Entertainment Corp. settled their long-running dispute at the beginning of 2013.144 Bethesda sued Interplay for breach of contract and trademark infringement stemming from Interplay’s use of Bethesda’s Fallout brand.145 Interplay—which created the Fallout series and sold it to Bethesda in 2007—retained the rights to sell preexisting Fallout games and licensed back the series so it could develop a Fallout massively multiplayer online role-playing game (MMORPG).146 Bethesda claimed Interplay failed to seek approval on marketing materials for the pre-existing titles and Interplay entered into licensing agreements for those titles with distribution channels, such as Steam.147 Both actions would be violations of the licensing agreement between Bethesda and Interplay.148 In a

146. Compl., Bethesda, supra note 145, at 5–6, ¶¶ 15–19; Graft, supra note 145.
147. Compl., Bethesda, supra note 145, at 12, ¶ 44.
148. Id. at 15–16, ¶¶ 67–68; Graft, supra note 145.
somewhat unusual development, announcement of settlement details is expected, at least in part, later this year.\textsuperscript{149}

E. \textbf{Antonick v. Electronic Arts, Inc.}\textsuperscript{150}

EA is locked in a legal battle with Robin Antonick, a longtime employee and creator of the software that allowed the football teams in EA’s \textit{Madden NFL} series to use eleven-man teams rather than five.\textsuperscript{151} This feature plays a huge part in \textit{Madden}’s realism and, arguably, its popularity.\textsuperscript{152} Antonick ultimately signed a few employment contracts, including one in 1986 that guaranteed him royalties “on not only the versions of the \textit{Madden} game developed by him but also any derivative works and any works ‘derived’ from derivative works.”\textsuperscript{153} Antonick claims modifications to the contract were made in subsequent years, though the contract itself was never voided nor did it expire.\textsuperscript{154} The case centers on whether the more recent \textit{Madden} games are derivative works of the ones Antonick worked on and whether EA deceived Antonick in any way regarding this aspect of development.\textsuperscript{155}

The case also mentions several other EA sports titles that may contain vestiges of Antonick’s engine.\textsuperscript{156} Antonick alleges that EA told him the new games were based on new code, which did not include any of his work.\textsuperscript{157} He further claims that he remained unaware of the new games’ existence until 2009—a fact that is critically important to the case because of statute of limitations considerations.\textsuperscript{158} In fact, EA originally filed a motion to dismiss on statute of limitations grounds, but the court found that the statute of limitations did not begin to run until Antonick’s discovery in 2009.\textsuperscript{159} In theory, this should be a relatively simple case, comparing Antonick’s code to that of the EA games alleged to be using it. However, the financial consequences for EA could prove to be dire, as the \textit{Madden} games have earned about $4 billion for EA, and Antonick potentially has a claim for royalties from his con-

\textsuperscript{149} Id.
\textsuperscript{150} No. 3:11-cv-01543-CRB (N.D. Cal. Mar. 30, 2011).
\textsuperscript{151} Compl. at 1, 4–5, \textit{Antonick}, No. 3:11-cv-01543-CRB (N.D. Cal. Mar. 30, 2011), ECF No. 1.
\textsuperscript{152} Id.
\textsuperscript{153} Id. at 1.
\textsuperscript{154} Id. at 8, 19.
\textsuperscript{155} Id. at 1, 19–20.
\textsuperscript{156} Id. at 23.
\textsuperscript{157} Compl., \textit{Antonick}, supra note 151 at 1–2, 21–22.
\textsuperscript{158} Id. at 1, 4–5.
\textsuperscript{159} Order Denying Mot. to Dismiss at 1, 9–10, \textit{Antonick}, No. 3:11-cv-01543-CRB (N.D. Cal. Sept. 27, 2011), ECF No. 47.
tract based on that figure. The case was tangled in continuance motions and delayed hearings throughout 2012. Most recently, EA's motion for summary judgment was denied in late January.


This highly contentious case settled—somewhat surprisingly—on the eve of trial this year. The terms are undisclosed, but EA (opposite Activision in the suit) described the settlement as "a vindication of Vince [Zampella] and Jason [West], and the right of creative artists to collect the rewards due for their hard work." This description seems to imply the settlement, at least in EA's opinion, was more favorable to West and Zampella.

In 2002, Activision acquired Infinity Ward Studios—founded by West and Zampella—and was responsible for the popular Modern Warfare and Call of Duty titles. The two signed employment agreements that allowed them to retain creative control over Infinity Ward and set the terms of their compensation, including royalty payments for Modern Warfare 2. However, Activision terminated West and Zampella for insubordination on March 1, 2010, just weeks before the royalty payments for Modern Warfare 2 were due. West and Zampella sued, alleging the termination was pretextual so Activision could avoid making royalty payments. Activision countersued West and Zampella, and later added EA based on interference grounds.
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This was precisely the high-stakes, contentious case that many assumed would go to trial; ultimately a settlement was reached.

VI. FINANCIAL REVIEW OF 2012

Continuing a trend started in 2008, retail sales of games continued to fall in 2012 as more gamers moved to mobile and social gaming.\(^\text{172}\) Although console gamers are now considerably outnumbered, they spend about 35% more than the typical mobile gamer.\(^\text{173}\) The decline leveled off in the fourth quarter as *Halo 4, Assassin’s Creed III*, and *Call of Duty: Black Ops 2* were released for the holiday season.\(^\text{174}\) These titles actually sold better than the top five games last year.\(^\text{175}\) Problematically, titles outside of the Top Five did not sell quite as well.\(^\text{176}\) Overall, 2012 continued the trend of reaching a more broad and diverse, albeit less profitable, consumer market.\(^\text{177}\)

Unfortunately, a bleak 2012 saw a few game companies declare bankruptcy, most notably THQ and 38 Studios.\(^\text{178}\) The 38 Studios collapse was quite a mainstream story, partly due to the fact that the company was owned by sports legend Curt Schilling.\(^\text{179}\) Part of this bankruptcy concerned state
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support for video game development. Schilling, who played perhaps his most storied seasons for the Boston Red Sox, was lured to Rhode Island by millions of dollars in preferential loans issued by the Rhode Island state government. 38 Studios defaulted on its first payment and, subsequently, was forced to lay off its entire workforce—some 400 employees. To stay solvent, experts estimated that 38 Studios needed to sell two million copies of its game, Kingdoms of Amalur: Reckoning, but ultimately it only shipped between 1.3 million and 1.4 million copies. When paired with the chilling of the MMO market—which negatively affected investment prospects of 38 Studios’ primary in-development title, Copernicus—this lackluster performance doomed 38 Studios, which ultimately filed for Chapter 7 bankruptcy. Any potential impact of this debacle may have on government involvement in video game funding remains to be seen, but it certainly is an example of how things can go very wrong. 

THQ—in financial trouble for most of the year—filed for bankruptcy protection on December 19, 2012. Originally set to be quickly sold in its entirety to investor Clearlake Capital for around $60 million, Bankruptcy Judge Mary Walrath declared earlier this year that she did not believe the quick sale was required to satisfy THQ’s creditors. Instead, investors bid on THQ’s various studios and titles on January 22, 2013. The individual sale was conditional: THQ’s assets would be sold separately only if the net bids of the individual assets totaled more than Clearlake’s $60 million bid for
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the whole package.\textsuperscript{189} The auction was successful, generating approximately $72 million for THQ and allowing many beloved game franchises to continue into the future.\textsuperscript{190} Koch Media's Deep Silver reportedly purchased Saints Row at the January sale,\textsuperscript{191} but other major titles such as Red Faction and Darksiders were unsold and included in a second auction that is set to close on April 1, 2013.\textsuperscript{192} Some of THQ's in-development projects will be carried forward, including South Park: The Stick of Truth, purchased by Ubisoft;\textsuperscript{193} Company of Heroes 2, acquired by Sega;\textsuperscript{194} and Metro: Last Light, also picked up by Deep Silver.\textsuperscript{195}
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