	Case 5:18-md-02834-BLF Document 24	6 Filed 10/04/18 Page 1 of 27
1	Michael A. Sherman (SBN 94783)	
2	masherman@stubbsalderton.com Jeffrey F. Gersh (SBN 87124)	
3	jgersh@stubbsalderton.com Sandeep Seth (SBN 195914)	
4	sseth@stubbsalderton.com Wesley W. Monroe (SBN 149211)	
5	wmonroe@stubbsalderton.com Stanley H. Thompson, Jr. (SBN 198825)	
	sthompson@stubbsalderton.com	
6	Viviana Boero Hedrick (SBN 239359) vhedrick@stubbsalderton.com	
7	STUBBS, ALDERTON & MARKILES, LLP 15260 Ventura Blvd., 20 <sup>th</sup> Floor	
8	Sherman Oaks, CA 91403 Telephone: (818) 444-4500 Facsimile: (818) 444-4520	
10	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
11	[Additional Attorneys listed below]	
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
13	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
14	SAN JOSE DIVISION	
15	IN RE PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES,	CASE NO.: 5:18-md-02834-BLF
	LLC, ET AL., PATENT LITIGATION	
16	LLC, ET AL., PATENT LITIGATION	SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT
16 17	LLC, ET AL., PATENT LITIGATION	SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
16	LLC, ET AL., PATENT LITIGATION	
16 17	PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,	
16 17 18	PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, ET AL.,	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
16 17 18 19	PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
16 17 18 19 20	PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, ET AL.,  Plaintiffs, v.  LESSON NINE GMBH, a Germany limited	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
16 17 18 19 20 21	PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, ET AL.,  Plaintiffs, v.	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
16 17 18 19 20 21	PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, ET AL.,  Plaintiffs, v.  LESSON NINE GMBH, a Germany limited	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, ET AL.,  Plaintiffs, v.  LESSON NINE GMBH, a Germany limited liability company,	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, ET AL.,  Plaintiffs, v.  LESSON NINE GMBH, a Germany limited liability company,	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, ET AL.,  Plaintiffs, v.  LESSON NINE GMBH, a Germany limited liability company,	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL



Amended Complaint ("Complaint") for patent infringement against Defendant Lesson Nine GmbH

Plaintiff PersonalWeb Technologies, LLC ("Plaintiff" or "PersonalWeb") files this Second

("Defendant"). Plaintiff PersonalWeb Technologies, LLC alleges:

4

## PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

8

9

15

24

25

26

27

28

1. 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.

- 2. 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").
- 3. All infringement allegations, statements describing PersonalWeb, statements describing any Defendant (or any Defendant's products) and any statements made regarding jurisdiction and venue are made by PersonalWeb alone, and not by Level 3. PersonalWeb alleges that the infringements at issue in this case all occur within, and are limited to, the PersonalWeb Patent Field. Accordingly, PersonalWeb has not provided notice to Level 3—under Section 6.4.1 of the Agreement or otherwise—that PersonalWeb desires to bring suit in the Level 3 Exclusive Field in its own name on its own behalf or that PersonalWeb knows or suspects that Defendant is infringing or has infringed any of Level 3's rights in the patents.

•

### **THE PARTIES**

- 4. Plaintiff PersonalWeb Technologies, LLC is a limited liability company duly organized and existing under the laws of Texas with its principal place of business at 112 E. Line Street, Suite 204, Tyler, TX 75702.
- 5. Plaintiff Level 3 Communications, LLC is a limited liability company organized under the laws of Delaware with its principal place of business at 100 CenturyLink Drive, Monroe, Louisiana, 71203.
- 6. PersonalWeb's infringement claims asserted in this case are asserted by PersonalWeb and all fall outside the Level 3 Exclusive Field. Level 3 is currently not asserting patent infringement in this case in the Level 3 Exclusive Field against any Defendant.
- 7. Defendant Lesson Nine GmbH is, upon information and belief, a Germany limited liability company having a principal place of business or regular and established place of business at Max-Beer-Str. 2, 10119 Berlin, Germany.

## JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 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*.
- 9. Venue is proper in this federal district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)–(c) and 1400(b) because, on information and belief, Defendant is not resident in the United States and thus may be sued in any judicial district.
- 10. Venue is also proper in this Court because this action has been transferred to this District by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation for consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407.
- 11. This court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant pursuant to Rule 4(k)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure because Defendant, a German limited liability company, is not incorporated in the United States and Defendant's principal place of business in not in the United States. On information and belief, Defendant has sufficient contacts with the United States such that exercise of jurisdiction over Defendant comports with due process.



1

4

5

6

#### PERSONALWEB BACKGROUND

7

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

9

10

11

8

14. The ability to reliably identify and access specific data is essential to any computer system or network. On a single computer or within a small network, the task is relatively easy: simply name the file, identify it by that name and its stored location on the computer or within the network, and access it by name and location. Early operating systems facilitated this approach with standardized

1213

14

15

15. Ronald Lachman and David Farber, the inventors of the Patents-in-Suit, recognized that the conventional approach for naming, locating, and accessing data in computer networks could not keep pace with ever-expanding, global data processing networks. New distributed storage systems

naming conventions, storage device identifiers, and folder structures.

controlling access to stored data more difficult.

16 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. Likewise, different users could give identical names to different files or parts of files—or unknowingly

1920

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

2324

16. Lachman and Farber developed a solution: replacing conventional naming and storing

25

conventions with system-wide "substantially unique," content-based identifiers. Their approach

26

assigned substantially unique identifiers to "data items" of any type: "the contents of a file, a portion

27

of a file, a page in memory, an object in an object-oriented program, a digital message, a digital

28

scanned image, a part of a video or audio signal, or any other entity which can be represented by a



2

1

3 4

5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

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.

- 17. To create a substantially unique, content-based identifier, Lachman and Farber turned to cryptography. Cryptographic hash functions, including MD4, MD5, and SHA, had been used in computer systems to verify the integrity of retrieved data—a so-called "checksum." Lachman and Farber recognized that these same hash functions could be devoted to a vital new purpose: if a cryptographic hash function was applied to a sequence of bits (a "data item"), it would produce a substantially unique result value, one that: (1) virtually guarantees a different result value if the data item is changed; (2) is computationally difficult to reproduce with a different sequence of bits; and (3) cannot be used to recreate the original sequence of bits.
- 18. These cryptographic hash functions would thus assign any sequence of bits, based on content alone, with a substantially unique identifier. Lachman and Farber estimated that the odds of these hash functions producing the same identifier for two different sequences of bits (i.e., the "probability of collision") would be about 1 in 2 to the 29<sup>th</sup> power. Lachman and Farber dubbed their content-based identifier a "True Name."
- 19. Using a True Name, Lachman and Farber conceived various data structures and methods for managing data (each data item correlated with a single True Name) within a networkno matter the complexity of the data or the network. These data structures provide a key-map organization, allowing for a rapid identification of any particular data item anywhere in a network by comparing a True Name for the data item against other True Names for data items already in the network. In operation, managing data using True Names allows a user to determine the location of any data in a network, determine whether access is authorized, and to selectively provide access to specific content not possible using the conventional naming arts.
- 20. On April 11, 1995, Lachman and Farber filed their patent application, describing these and other ways in which content-based "True Names" elevated data-processing systems over conventional file-naming systems. The first True Name patent issued on November 2, 1999. The last of the Patents-in-Suit has expired, and the allegations herein are directed to the time period before expiration of the last of the Patents-in-Suit.



# DOCKET

# 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.

