1	J. DAVID HADDEN (CSB No. 176148)/	
2	dhadden@fenwick.com SAINA S. SHAMILOV (CSB No. 215636)	
3	sshamilov@fenwick.com TODD R. GREGORIAN (CSB No. 236096)	
4	tgregorian@fenwick.com PHILLIP J. HAACK (CSB No. 262060)	
5	phaack@fenwick.com RAVI R. RANGANATH (CSB No. 272981)	
6	rranganath@fenwick.com CHIEH TUNG (CSB No. 318963)	
7	ctung@fenwick.com FENWICK & WEST LLP	
8	Silicon Valley Center 801 California Street	
9	Mountain View, CA 94041 Telephone: 650.988.8500	
10	Facsimile: 650.938.5200	
11	Counsel for AMAZON.COM, INC. and AMAZON WEB SERVICES, INC.	
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
13	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
14		
15	IN RE PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES,	Case No.: 5:18-md-02834-BLF
16	LLC, ET AL., PATENT LITIGATION	
17	AMAZON.COM, INC. and AMAZON WEB SERVICES, INC.,	STATEMENT OF AMAZON.COM,
18	Plaintiffs,	INC. AND AMAZON WEB SERVICES, INC. REGARDING REPRESENTA-
19	V.	TIVE CASES
20	PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, and	
21	LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,	
22	Defendants.	
23	PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC and	Case No. 5:18-cv-00767-BLF
24	LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,	
25	Counterclaimants,	
26	V.	
27	AMAZON.COM, INC. and AMAZON WEB SERVICES, INC.,	
28	Counter-Defendants	



In response to the Court's request to select a representative case, the parties agreed to designate PersonalWeb's case against Twitch Interactive, Inc. (Case No. 5:18-cv-05619-BLF). PersonalWeb Technologies, LLC and Level3 Communications LLC ("PersonalWeb"), however, request that an additional case, against Kongregate, Inc., Case No. 5:18-cv-04625-BLF, also proceed. But there is no need for another representative case. In its case against Twitch, PersonalWeb asserts *all* of its infringement categories. And as it admitted at the last case management conference, if the Twitch case culminates in "a verdict against PersonalWeb that no infringement was found," "none of the customer cases could go forward because there would be findings in each of the buckets." (Nov. 2, 2018 CMC Hrg. Tr. at 6:17-22.) The Kongregate case, which involves only a subset of the buckets, adds nothing to the already selected representative case against Twitch.

During the parties' discussions, PersonalWeb's sole reason for requesting that the Kongregate case proceed as well was its "concern" that because Twitch became a wholly-owned subsidiary of Amazon.com, Inc. in 2014, its case will not adequately represent the interests of other defendants. But this concern is not valid. First, no defendant has raised such a concern or requested that its case be designated as representative. Kongregate itself opposes PersonalWeb's request. Second, PersonalWeb's concern would not even be addressed by the Kongregate case. As Kongregate told PersonalWeb in July, it used Amazon S3 during the relevant time period and is therefore no different than any other indemnified Amazon customer sued by PersonalWeb. And to be clear, every current defendant (or its predecessor) was an Amazon S3 customer before the patents expired. Third, although Twitch became an Amazon subsidiary in 2014, it retained full control of its website and its design. Accordingly, the technology to be litigated in the Twitch case is Twitch's own, and not one controlled by Amazon (outside of the implicated S3 functionality). Indeed, PersonalWeb alleges that Twitch's purported infringement began in 2012, years before Amazon's acquisition. Finally, Twitch, like Amazon and any other defendant, has a significant interest in defeating *all* of PersonalWeb's claims under *any* theory and vindicating its business and technology.

Accordingly, the Court should reject PersonalWeb's proposal to have an unnecessary and duplicative case against Kongregate proceed along with the Twitch case and Amazon's declaratory judgment action.



