| | Case 5:18-md-02834-BLF D | ocument 197 | Filed 10/04/18 | Page 1 of 27 |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------------|-------------------|---------------|
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Michael A. Sherman (SBN 94783) masherman@stubbsalderton.com Jeffrey F. Gersh (SBN 87124) jgersh@stubbsalderton.com Sandeep Seth (SBN 195914) sseth@stubbsalderton.com Wesley W. Monroe (SBN 149211) wmonroe@stubbsalderton.com Stanley H. Thompson, Jr. (SBN 1988 sthompson@stubbsalderton.com Viviana Boero Hedrick (SBN 239359 vhedrick@stubbsalderton.com STUBBS, ALDERTON & MARKILI 15260 Ventura Blvd., 20 th Floor Sherman Oaks, CA 91403 Telephone: (818) 444-4500 | 25))) | | |
| 9 | Facsimile: (818) 444-4520 | | | |
| 10 11 | Attorneys for Plaintiffs [Additional Attorneys listed below] | | | |
| 12 | - | ED STATES DI | STRICT COURT | |
| 13 | | | GOF CALIFORN | |
| 14 | | SAN JOSE D | IVISION | |
| 15 | IN RE PERSONALWEB TECHNO | , | CASE NO.: 5:18 | -md-02834-BLF |
| 16 | LLC, ET AL., PATENT LITIGATIO | | FIDST AMENIDI | ED COMPLAINT |
| 17 | | | DEMAND FOR | |
| 18 | | | DEMAND FOR | JUNI IMAL |
| 19 | PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIE | ES, LLC, | Case No.: 5:18-cv | v-03579-BLF |
| 20 | ET AL., Plaintiffs, | | | |
| 21 | V. | | | |
| 22 | FOOD52, INC., a Delaware corpora | tion | | |
| 23 | Defendant. | | | |
| 24 25 | Derendant. | | | |
| 23 26 | | | | |
| 20 | | | | |
| 28 | | | | |
| | | | | |

DOCKET A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>. Plaintiff PersonalWeb Technologies, LLC ("Plaintiff" or "PersonalWeb") files this First
 Amended Complaint ("Complaint") for patent infringement against Defendant Food52, Inc.
 ("Defendant"). Plaintiff PersonalWeb Technologies, LLC alleges:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

PersonalWeb and Level 3 Communications, LLC ("Level 3") are parties to an
 agreement between Kinetech, Inc. and Digital Island, Inc. dated September 1, 2000 (the "Agreement").
 Pursuant to the Agreement, PersonalWeb and Level 3 each own a fifty percent (50%) undivided
 interest in and to the patents at issue in this action: U.S. Patent Nos. 6,928,442, 7,802,310, 7,945,544,
 and 8,099,420 ("Patents-in-Suit"). Level 3 has joined in this Complaint pursuant to its contractual
 obligations under the Agreement, at the request of PersonalWeb.

Pursuant to the Agreement, Level 3 has, among other rights, certain defined rights to
 use, practice, license, sublicense and enforce and/or litigate the Patents-in-Suit in connection with a
 particular field of use ("Level 3 Exclusive Field"). Pursuant to the Agreement PersonalWeb has,
 among other rights, certain defined rights to use, practice, license, sublicense, enforce and/or litigate
 the Patents-in-Suit in fields other than the Level 3 Exclusive Field (the "PersonalWeb Patent Field").

17 3. All infringement allegations, statements describing PersonalWeb, statements 18 describing any Defendant (or any Defendant's products) and any statements made regarding 19 jurisdiction and venue are made by PersonalWeb alone, and not by Level 3. PersonalWeb alleges that 20 the infringements at issue in this case all occur within, and are limited to, the PersonalWeb Patent 21 Field. Accordingly, PersonalWeb has not provided notice to Level 3—under Section 6.4.1 of the 22 Agreement or otherwise—that PersonalWeb desires to bring suit in the Level 3 Exclusive Field in its 23 own name on its own behalf or that PersonalWeb knows or suspects that Defendant is infringing or 24 has infringed any of Level 3's rights in the patents.

25

4

5

- 26
- 27 28

| 1 THE PARTIES 24. Plaintiff PersonalWeb Technologies, LLC is a limited liability company duly or3and existing under the laws of Texas with its principal place of business at 112 E. Line Street4204, Tyler, TX 75702.55. Plaintiff Level 3 Communications, LLC is a limited liability company organize6the laws of Delaware with its principal place of business at 100 CenturyLink Drive, N7Louisiana, 71203.86. PersonalWeb's infringement claims asserted in this case are asserted by Person9and all fall outside the Level 3 Exclusive Field. Level 3 is currently not asserting patent infrin10in this case in the Level 3 Exclusive Field against any Defendant.117. Defendant Food52, Inc. is, upon information and belief, a Delaware corporation12a principal place of business or regular and established place of business at 122 W. 26th Str13Floor, New York, NY 10001. | t, Suite d under Ionroe, nalWeb gement | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| and existing under the laws of Texas with its principal place of business at 112 E. Line Street 204, Tyler, TX 75702. 5. Plaintiff Level 3 Communications, LLC is a limited liability company organize the laws of Delaware with its principal place of business at 100 CenturyLink Drive, N Louisiana, 71203. 6. PersonalWeb's infringement claims asserted in this case are asserted by Person and all fall outside the Level 3 Exclusive Field. Level 3 is currently not asserting patent infrin in this case in the Level 3 Exclusive Field against any Defendant. 7. Defendant Food52, Inc. is, upon information and belief, a Delaware corporation a principal place of business or regular and established place of business at 122 W. 26th Street | t, Suite d under Ionroe, nalWeb gement | | | |
| 4 204, Tyler, TX 75702. 5 Plaintiff Level 3 Communications, LLC is a limited liability company organize 6 the laws of Delaware with its principal place of business at 100 CenturyLink Drive, N Couisiana, 71203. 6. PersonalWeb's infringement claims asserted in this case are asserted by Person 9 and all fall outside the Level 3 Exclusive Field. Level 3 is currently not asserting patent infrin 10 in this case in the Level 3 Exclusive Field against any Defendant. 7. Defendant Food52, Inc. is, upon information and belief, a Delaware corporation 12 a principal place of business or regular and established place of business at 122 W. 26th Street | d under Ionroe, nalWeb gement | | | |
| 5. Plaintiff Level 3 Communications, LLC is a limited liability company organize the laws of Delaware with its principal place of business at 100 CenturyLink Drive, N Louisiana, 71203. 6. PersonalWeb's infringement claims asserted in this case are asserted by Person and all fall outside the Level 3 Exclusive Field. Level 3 is currently not asserting patent infrin in this case in the Level 3 Exclusive Field against any Defendant. 7. Defendant Food52, Inc. is, upon information and belief, a Delaware corporation a principal place of business or regular and established place of business at 122 W. 26th Str | Ionroe, nalWeb gement | | | |
| 6 the laws of Delaware with its principal place of business at 100 CenturyLink Drive, N 7 Louisiana, 71203. 8 6. PersonalWeb's infringement claims asserted in this case are asserted by Person 9 and all fall outside the Level 3 Exclusive Field. Level 3 is currently not asserting patent infrin 10 in this case in the Level 3 Exclusive Field against any Defendant. 11 7. Defendant Food52, Inc. is, upon information and belief, a Delaware corporation 12 a principal place of business or regular and established place of business at 122 W. 26th Str | Ionroe, nalWeb gement | | | |
| Louisiana, 71203. 6. PersonalWeb's infringement claims asserted in this case are asserted by Person and all fall outside the Level 3 Exclusive Field. Level 3 is currently not asserting patent infrin in this case in the Level 3 Exclusive Field against any Defendant. 7. Defendant Food52, Inc. is, upon information and belief, a Delaware corporation a principal place of business or regular and established place of business at 122 W. 26th Str | nalWeb gement | | | |
| 6. PersonalWeb's infringement claims asserted in this case are asserted by Person and all fall outside the Level 3 Exclusive Field. Level 3 is currently not asserting patent infrin in this case in the Level 3 Exclusive Field against any Defendant. 7. Defendant Food52, Inc. is, upon information and belief, a Delaware corporation a principal place of business or regular and established place of business at 122 W. 26th Str | gement | | | |
| 9 and all fall outside the Level 3 Exclusive Field. Level 3 is currently not asserting patent infrin 10 in this case in the Level 3 Exclusive Field against any Defendant. 11 7. Defendant Food52, Inc. is, upon information and belief, a Delaware corporation 12 a principal place of business or regular and established place of business at 122 W. 26th Str | gement | | | |
| 10 in this case in the Level 3 Exclusive Field against any Defendant. 11 7. Defendant Food52, Inc. is, upon information and belief, a Delaware corporation 12 a principal place of business or regular and established place of business at 122 W. 26th Str | _ | | | |
| 11 7. Defendant Food52, Inc. is, upon information and belief, a Delaware corporation 12 a principal place of business or regular and established place of business at 122 W. 26th Str | having | | | |
| 12 a principal place of business or regular and established place of business at 122 W. 26th Str | having | | | |
| | | | | |
| 13 Floor, New York, NY 10001. | eet, 8th | | | |
| Floor, New York, NY 10001. | | | | |
| 14 | | | | |
| 15 JURISDICTION AND VENUE | | | | |
| 16 8. The court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and | 1338(a) | | | |
| because this action arises under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 1 et seq. | | | | |
| 18 9. Venue is proper in this federal district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)– | (c) and | | | |
| 19 1400(b) because, on information and belief, Defendant has a regular and established place of b | usiness | | | |
| 20 in the Southern District of New York and has committed acts of infringement in such District. | | | | |
| 21 10. Venue is also proper in this Court because this action has been transferred | to this | | | |
| 22 District by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation for consolidated pretrial proceedings p | ursuant | | | |
| to 28 U.S.C. § 1407. | | | | |
| 24 11. This court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because, in addition | to the | | | |
| 25 allegations in above paragraphs, on information and belief, Defendant is domiciled in the S | outhern | | | |
| 26 District of New York. Further, Defendant purposefully directed activities at residents of New | District of New York. Further, Defendant purposefully directed activities at residents of New York, | | | |
| 27 the claims herein arise out of and relate to those activities, and assertion of personal jurisdiction | the claims herein arise out of and relate to those activities, and assertion of personal jurisdiction over | | | |
| 28 Defendant would be fair. | | | | |

DOCKET A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>. 4

5

1 12. On information and belief, Defendant is subject to this Court's jurisdiction because this
 2 action has been transferred to this District by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation for
 3 consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407.

PERSONALWEB BACKGROUND

6 13. The Patents-in-Suit cover fundamental aspects of cloud computing, including the
7 identification of files or data and the efficient retrieval thereof in a manner which reduces bandwidth
8 transmission and storage requirements.

9 14. The ability to reliably identify and access specific data is essential to any computer
10 system or network. On a single computer or within a small network, the task is relatively easy: simply
11 name the file, identify it by that name and its stored location on the computer or within the network,
12 and access it by name and location. Early operating systems facilitated this approach with standardized
13 naming conventions, storage device identifiers, and folder structures.

14 15. Ronald Lachman and David Farber, the inventors of the Patents-in-Suit, recognized 15 that the conventional approach for naming, locating, and accessing data in computer networks could 16 not keep pace with ever-expanding, global data processing networks. New distributed storage systems 17 use files that are stored across different devices in dispersed geographic locations. These different 18 locations could use dissimilar conventions for identifying storage devices and data partitions. 19 Likewise, different users could give identical names to different files or parts of files—or unknowingly 20 give different names to identical files. No solution existed to ensure that identical file names referred 21 to the same data, and conversely, that different file names referred to different data. As a result, 22 expanding networks could not only become clogged with duplicate data, they also made locating and 23 controlling access to stored data more difficult.

Lachman and Farber developed a solution: replacing conventional naming and storing
conventions with system-wide "substantially unique," content-based identifiers. Their approach
assigned substantially unique identifiers to "data items" of any type: "the contents of a file, a portion
of a file, a page in memory, an object in an object-oriented program, a digital message, a digital
scanned image, a part of a video or audio signal, or any other entity which can be represented by a

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Case 5:18-md-02834-BLF Document 197 Filed 10/04/18 Page 5 of 27

sequence of bits." Applied system-wide, this invention would permit any data item to be stored,
 located, managed, synchronized, and accessed using its content-based identifier.

3 17. To create a substantially unique, content-based identifier, Lachman and Farber turned 4 to cryptography. Cryptographic hash functions, including MD4, MD5, and SHA, had been used in 5 computer systems to verify the integrity of retrieved data—a so-called "checksum." Lachman and 6 Farber recognized that these same hash functions could be devoted to a vital new purpose: if a 7 cryptographic hash function was applied to a sequence of bits (a "data item"), it would produce a 8 substantially unique result value, one that: (1) virtually guarantees a different result value if the data 9 item is changed; (2) is computationally difficult to reproduce with a different sequence of bits; and 10 (3) cannot be used to recreate the original sequence of bits.

11 18. These cryptographic hash functions would thus assign any sequence of bits, based on
12 content alone, with a substantially unique identifier. Lachman and Farber estimated that the odds of
13 these hash functions producing the same identifier for two different sequences of bits (i.e., the
14 "probability of collision") would be about 1 in 2 to the 29th power. Lachman and Farber dubbed their
15 content-based identifier a "True Name."

16 19. Using a True Name, Lachman and Farber conceived various data structures and 17 methods for managing data (each data item correlated with a single True Name) within a network— 18 no matter the complexity of the data or the network. These data structures provide a key-map 19 organization, allowing for a rapid identification of any particular data item anywhere in a network by 20 comparing a True Name for the data item against other True Names for data items already in the 21 network. In operation, managing data using True Names allows a user to determine the location of 22 any data in a network, determine whether access is authorized, and to selectively provide access to 23 specific content not possible using the conventional naming arts.

24 20. On April 11, 1995, Lachman and Farber filed their patent application, describing these
25 and other ways in which content-based "True Names" elevated data-processing systems over
26 conventional file-naming systems. The first True Name patent issued on November 2, 1999. The last
27 of the Patents-in-Suit has expired, and the allegations herein are directed to the time period before
28 expiration of the last of the Patents-in-Suit.

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET A L A R M



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.