

1 COOLEY LLP
HEIDI L. KEEFE (178960)
2 (hkeefe@cooley.com)
MARK R. WEINSTEIN (193043)
3 (mweinstein@cooley.com)
LOWELL D. MEAD (223989)
4 (lmead@cooley.com)
3175 Hanover Street
5 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1130
Telephone: (650) 843-5000
6 Facsimile: (650) 849-7400

7 COOLEY LLP
PHILLIP E. MORTON (DC Bar No.
8 1032243)
(pmorton@cooley.com)
9 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20004
10 Telephone: (202) 842-7800

11 Attorneys for Defendant
FACEBOOK, INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION

14 WINDY CITY INNOVATIONS, LLC

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 FACEBOOK, INC.,

18 Defendant.

Case Nos. 4:16-cv-01730-YGR

**DEFENDANT FACEBOOK, INC.'S
RESPONSIVE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION
BRIEF**

Date: July 27, 2018

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Ctrm: Courtroom 1, Fourth Floor

The Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

Table of Contents

		Page
1		
2		
3	I. INTRODUCTION	1
4	II. FACEBOOK’S PROPOSED CONSTRUCTIONS ARE CORRECT.	1
5	A. “Censored” terms (’657 claims 203, 209, 215, 221).....	1
6	1. “censored” and “the first user identity is individually censored	
7	from sending data in the communications”	2
8	2. “determining that the first user identity is censored from the	
9	sending of the data presenting [video / audio / graphic /	
10	multimedia]”	2
11	B. “real time” / “real-time” (’245 claim 19; ’657 claims 203, 209, 215, 221).....	6
12	1. The patents describe “real time” communications that are	
13	transmitted “immediately” in contrast with conventional email.....	6
14	2. During prosecution, the patentee made clear that sending a	
15	communication by storing it on a server is not “real time.”	7
16	3. Windy City’s litigation arguments cannot expand the claim scope.....	9
17	III. THE ASSERTED CLAIMS ARE INDEFINITE.	11
18	A. “other programs” (’245 claim 19; ’657 claims 203, 209, 215, 221).....	12
19	1. The claim language is indefinite.	12
20	2. The claimed “database” is not a program.	14
21	3. The ’657 claim 189 preamble language is limiting.	14
22	4. The IPR record does not change the result.	14
23	B. “obtaining an agent . . .” (’245 claim 19).....	15
24	C. “participator computer” (’245 claim 19) and “computer system” (’245	
25	claim 19; ’657 claims 203, 209, 215, 221)	18
26	1. Legal principles governing “means-plus-function” claims.....	18
27	2. “Participator computer” and “computer system” invoke § 112 ¶ 6.....	20
28	3. The intrinsic record does not disclose required structure for	
	performing the recited functions.....	24
	IV. CONCLUSION.....	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Page(s)****Cases**

1		
2		
3	Cases	
4	<i>Advanced Ground Info. Sys., Inc. v. Life360, Inc.</i> ,	
5	830 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	20
6	<i>Apple Inc. v. Motorola, Inc.</i> ,	
7	757 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	19, 24
8	<i>Augme Techs., Inc. v. Yahoo! Inc.</i> ,	
9	755 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	23
10	<i>Aylus Networks, Inc. v. Apple, Inc.</i> ,	
11	856 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	5
12	<i>Computer Docking Station Corp. v. Dell, Inc.</i> ,	
13	519 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	9
14	<i>Datamize v. Plumtree Software</i> ,	
15	417 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	12
16	<i>Dow Chem. v. Nova Chem.</i> ,	
17	803 F.3d 620 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	12
18	<i>EON Corp. IP Holdings LLC v. AT&T Mobility LLC</i> ,	
19	785 F.3d 616 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	19, 20
20	<i>Ergo Licensing, LLC v. CareFusion 303, Inc.</i> ,	
21	673 F. 3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	19
22	<i>Fenner Invs., Ltd. v. Cellco P'ship</i> ,	
23	778 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	10
24	<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Proofpoint, Inc.</i> ,	
25	No. 13-cv-05808-HSG, 2015 WL 9460295 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 23, 2015)	18
26	<i>Gillespie v. Dywidag Sys. Int'l, USA</i> ,	
27	501 F.3d 1285 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	10
28	<i>Interval Licensing v. AOL</i> ,	
	766 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	12, 15
	<i>IPXL Holdings, L.L.C. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> ,	
	430 F.3d 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	15, 16
	<i>Kingston Tech. Co. v. Polaris Innovations Ltd.</i> ,	
	IPR2016-01621, Paper 8 (Feb. 15, 2017)	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

		Page(s)
1		
2		
3	<i>Konami Gaming, Inc. v. Marks Studios, LLC,</i>	
4	No. 2:14-cv-01485, 2017 WL 3174905 (D. Nev. July 25, 2017).....	20
5	<i>MasterMine Software, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.,</i>	
6	874 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	17, 18
7	<i>Media Rights Techs., Inc. v. Capital One Fin. Corp.,</i>	
8	800 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2015), <i>cert. denied</i> , 136 S. Ct. 1173.....	18, 19, 24, 25
9	<i>Microprocessor Enhancement Corp. v. Texas Instruments Inc.,</i>	
10	520 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	17
11	<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Multi-Tech Sys., Inc.,</i>	
12	357 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	3, 8
13	<i>Nautilus v. Biosig Instruments,</i>	
14	134 S. Ct. 2120 (2014).....	11, 12
15	<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.,</i>	
16	545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	19, 24, 25
17	<i>NTP, Inc. v. Research in Motion, Ltd.,</i>	
18	418 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	8
19	<i>O2 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.,</i>	
20	521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	11
21	<i>Omega Eng'g, Inc. v. Raytek Corp.,</i>	
22	334 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	3
23	<i>Pi-Net Int'l Inc. v. JPMorgan Chase & Co,</i>	
24	No. 12-cv-0282, 2014 WL 1997039 (D. Del. May 14, 2014)	20, 24
25	<i>Rembrandt Data Techs. v. AOL, LLC,</i>	
26	641 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	15, 16
27	<i>Seachange Int'l, Inc. v. C-COR, Inc.,</i>	
28	413 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	1, 3
	<i>Soque Holdings (Bermuda) Ltd. v. Keyscan, Inc.,</i>	
	No. 09-cv-2651, 2010 WL 2292316 (N.D. Cal. June 7, 2010).....	20, 24
	<i>Springs Window Fashions v. Novo Indus.,</i>	
	323 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	3, 11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

		Page(s)
1		
2		
3	<i>Storage Tech. Corp. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> ,	
4	329 F.3d 823 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	14
5	<i>Technology Props. Ltd. v. Huawei Techs.</i> ,	
6	849 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	10
7	<i>TecSec, Inc. v. Int’l Bus. Machs. Corp.</i> ,	
8	731 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	19
9	<i>Telit Wireless v. M2M Solutions</i> ,	
10	IPR2016-00055, Paper 9 (Apr. 22, 2016).....	25
11	<i>Teva Pharms. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> ,	
12	789 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	8
13	<i>UltimatePointer, LLC v. Nintendo Co., Ltd.</i> ,	
14	816 F.3d 816 (Fed. Cir. 2016.).....	18
15	<i>Verint Sys. Inc. v. Red Box Recorders Ltd.</i> ,	
16	166 F. Supp. 3d 364 (S.D.N.Y. 2016).....	20
17	<i>Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC</i> ,	
18	792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	18, 19, 24, 25
19	Statutes	
20	35 U.S.C. § 112.....	12, 15, 18, 24
21	Other Authorities	
22	Local Rule 3-3(d).....	18
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
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.