

# EXHIBIT B

1 George C. Lombardi (*pro hac vice*)  
2 glombardi@winston.com  
3 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP  
4 35 West Wacker Drive  
5 Chicago, IL 60601-9703  
6 Telephone: (312) 558-5600  
7 Facsimile: (312) 558-5700

8 E. Danielle T. Williams (*pro hac vice*)  
9 dwilliams@winston.com  
10 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP  
11 300 South Tryon Street, 16th Floor  
12 Charlotte, NC 28202  
13 Telephone: (704) 350-7700  
14 Facsimile: (704) 350-7800

Dustin J. Edwards (*pro hac vice*)  
dedwards@winston.com  
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP  
800 Capitol St., Suite 2400  
Houston, TX 77002-2925  
Telephone: (713) 651-2600  
Facsimile: (713) 651-2700

Diana Hughes Leiden (SBN: 267606)  
dhleiden@winston.com  
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP  
333 S. Grand Avenue, 38th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-1543  
Telephone: (213) 615-1700  
Facsimile: (213) 615-1750

*Attorneys for Defendants*  
BANK OF AMERICA  
CORPORATION  
and BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.

12 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
13 **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

15 NANTWORKS, LLC, a Delaware  
16 limited liability company, and NANT  
17 HOLDINGS IP, LLC, a Delaware  
18 limited liability company,

17 Plaintiffs,

18 vs.

19 BANK OF AMERICA  
20 CORPORATION, a Delaware  
21 corporation, and BANK OF  
22 AMERICA, N.A., a national banking  
23 association,

23 Defendants.

**Case No. 2:20-cv-07872-GW-PVC**

Honorable George H. Wu

**DEFENDANTS' FINAL INVALIDITY  
CONTENTIONS FOR U.S. PATENT  
NOS. 7,881,529, 7,899,252, 8,478,036,  
8,520,897, 9,031,278, AND 9,324,004**

**CONTAINS MATERIAL  
DESIGNATED "CONFIDENTIAL –  
ATTORNEY EYES ONLY" IN  
SECTION VII.**

**DEFENDANTS’ FINAL INVALIDITY CONTENTIONS**

In accordance with S.P.R. 4.2<sup>1</sup> and the schedule adopted by the Court (Dkt. 201), Defendants Bank of America Corporation and Bank of America, N.A. (together “Defendants” or “Bank of America”) hereby disclose their Final Invalidity Contentions. Bank of America incorporates by reference their April 8, 2021 Preliminary Invalidity Contentions, their August 2, 2021 Supplemental Invalidity Contentions, their April 29, 2022 Second Supplemental Invalidity Contentions, and all associated information and documents produced and/or referenced therein.

**I. GENERAL STATEMENT AND RESERVATION OF RIGHTS**

On August 31, 2023, Plaintiffs NantWorks, LLC and Nant Holdings IP, LLC (collectively “NantWorks” or “Plaintiffs”) served Bank of America with its Final Infringement Contentions and asserted the below listed patent claims (“Asserted Claims”):<sup>2</sup>

Asserted Patent	Asserted Claims
U.S. Pat. No. 7,881,529 (“’529 patent”)	Claims 4 and 20
U.S. Pat. No. 7,899,252 (“’252 Patent”)	Claims 18, 27, 29, and 31
U.S. Pat. No. 8,478,036 (“’036 Patent”)	Claim 1
U.S. Pat. No. 8,520,897 (“’897 Patent”)	Claims 25, 30, 33–34, and 39
U.S. Pat. No. 9,324,004 (“’004 Patent”)	Claims 1, 6, and 18
U.S. Pat. No. 9,031,278 (“’278 Patent”)	Claims 1 and 4–5

Subject to Bank of America’s reservation of rights herein, with respect to each

<sup>1</sup> The Court’s Scheduling Order (Dkt. 201) modifies S.P.R. 4.2.1 by setting the deadlines for opening expert reports on October 26, 2023 and rebuttal expert reports on November 20, 2023.

<sup>2</sup> Plaintiffs dropped their infringement allegations asserting U.S. Pat. No. 8,463,030 (“’030 Patent”) and U.S. Pat. No. 8,326,038 (“’038 Patent”) (including Counts III and IV of their First Amended Complaint).

1 asserted claim in Plaintiffs' Final Infringement Contentions, Bank of America provides  
2 these Final Invalidity Contentions pursuant to S.P.R. 4.2. These Final Invalidity  
3 Contentions include:

- 4 • S.P.R. 2.5.1. The identity of each item of prior art that anticipates each  
5 asserted claim or renders it obvious (*see* Section III);
- 6 • S.P.R. 2.5.2. Whether each item of prior art anticipates each asserted claim  
7 or renders it obvious. For obviousness, an explanation of why the prior art  
8 renders the asserted claim obvious, including an identification of any  
9 combinations of prior art showing obviousness (*see* Section IV);
- 10 • S.P.R. 2.5.3. A chart identifying where specifically in each alleged item of  
11 prior art each limitation of each asserted claim is found, including for each  
12 limitation that such party contends is governed by 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 6, the  
13 identity of the structure(s), act(s), or material(s) in each item of prior art  
14 that performs the claimed function. (*see* Exhibits A-01-H-31); and
- 15 • S.P.R. 2.5.4. Any grounds of invalidity based on 35 U.S.C. § 101,  
16 indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 or enablement or written  
17 description under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1 of any of the asserted claims) (*see*  
18 Sections V and VI).

19 Bank of America's discovery and investigation in connection with this action is  
20 continuing, thus these disclosures are based on information obtained to date. To the  
21 extent that Bank of America obtains additional information, including through third-  
22 party discovery or any supplemental infringement contentions from Plaintiffs (which,  
23 as explained below, Bank of America asserts would be improper), Bank of America  
24 reserves the right to supplement and/or amend these Invalidity Contentions (and, if  
25 required, request leave of the Court to do the same). Bank of America reserves the right  
26 to amend these Invalidity Contentions should Plaintiffs provide the information that it  
27 failed to provide in its S.P.R. 2.1 and 4.1 disclosures or in response to Bank of  
28

1 America's Discovery requests or if Plaintiffs amend or supplement its S.P.R. 2.1 and  
2 4.1 disclosures in any way.

3 Plaintiffs' disclosures under S.P.R. 2.1, 2.2, and 4.1 remain deficient in numerous  
4 respects. For example, Plaintiffs' "Preliminary" Final Contentions fail to comply with  
5 the level of specificity required by SPR 2.1.2 and 2.1.3, and include improper  
6 reservation of rights to supplement with "additional ways in which BoA Accused  
7 Products infringe." Yet another example is that Plaintiffs' doctrine of equivalents  
8 contentions, are deficient and lack the detail required by S.P.R. 2.1. NantWorks failed  
9 to provide a detailed and proper analysis regarding the differences between the Accused  
10 Products and the asserted claims or how those alleged differences are insubstantial.  
11 Further, NantWorks's doctrine of equivalents contentions renders the claim scope  
12 inconsequential or ineffective, including as it relates to disclaimed traditional symbols.

13 Most, if not all, of the deficiencies in Plaintiffs' Preliminary Final Contentions  
14 have been documented by Bank of America through multiple letters since at least May  
15 18, 2021, and up to Bank of America's most recent letter of August 19, 2023. Plaintiffs'  
16 shifting infringement contentions, deficiencies in its infringement contentions, and  
17 changing claim scope have prejudiced Bank of America from being able to reasonably  
18 prepare its defenses, including its invalidity contentions. For example, despite the  
19 Court's most recent claim construction order (Dkt. 236), e.g., differentiating symbols  
20 and decomposition for the Characteristics terms, NantWorks continues to interpret the  
21 claims beyond the scope of the court's constructions and what the patentee regarded as  
22 the invention in the specification of the Asserted Patents. The lack of detail in Plaintiffs'  
23 Infringement Contentions has prejudiced Bank of America's ability to prepare these  
24 Final Invalidity Contentions by forcing it to speculate as to Plaintiffs' actual position  
25 on Bank of America's alleged infringement. Therefore, these Final Invalidity  
26 Contentions are based in whole or in part on the present understanding of the Asserted  
27 Claims and Plaintiffs' apparent positions as to the scope of the Asserted Claims as  
28

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.