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 198825)
sthompson@stubbsalderton.com
VIVIANA BOERO HEDRICK (SBN 239359)
vhedrick@stubbsalderton.com
STUBBS, ALDERTON & MARKILES, LLP
15260 Ventura Blvd., 20th Floor
Sherman Oaks, CA 91403
Telephone: (818) 444-4500
Facsimile: (818) 444-4520

Attorneys for PersonalWeb Technologies, LLC
[Additional Attorneys listed below]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN JOSE DIVISION

IN RE PERSONAL WEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, ET., AL., PATENT LITIGATION	**CASE NO.: 5:18-md-02834-BLF**
AMAZON.COM, INC., et., al., Plaintiffs, v. PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, et., al., Defendants.	**Case No.: 5:18-cv-00767-BLF** **Case No.: 5:18-cv-05619-BLF** **PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC'S OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**
PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC and LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC, Counterclaimants, v. AMAZON.COM, INC. and AMAZON WEB SERVICES, INC., Counterdefendants.	
PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, a	

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TWITCH INTERACTIVE, INC. a Delaware corporation,

Defendant.

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1
II. DISPUTED CONSTRUCTIONS 1
A. "Authorization" Terms 1
1. This group of claim phrases does not need to be construed because their plain and ordinary meaning suffices. 2
2. Amazon's proposed erroneously makes the term "unauthorized" synonymous with the term "unlicensed" contradicting the specification and prosecution history. 4
3. Collateral Estoppel Does Not Apply. 6
B. "Selectively" Terms 7
1. "Selectively permit" ('420 at Claim 166) 7
a) The plain and ordinary meaning of this term is sufficient. 8
b) Amazon's proposed construction renders the claim element internally inconsistent and confusingly redundant. 8
2. "selectively allowing a copy of the particular sequence of bits to be provided to or accessed by or from at least one of the computers in a network of computers" ('420 at Claim 25) 9
a) The plain and ordinary meaning of this term is sufficient. 10
b) Amazon's proposed construction is inconsistent with the claim language. 10
C. "Permitting"/"Allowing" Terms 11
1. "the first device (A) permitting the content to be provided to or accessed by the at least one other computer if it is not determined that the content is unauthorized or unlicensed, otherwise, (B) if it is determined that the content is unauthorized or unlicensed, not permitting the content to be provided to or accessed by the at least one other computer" ('310 at Claim 20) 11
a) The Court should apply the plain and ordinary meaning of this term. 11
b) Amazon's proposed construction is inconsistent with the claim language. 12
2. "based on whether or not it is determined that access to the data item is authorized or unauthorized, to allow the data item to be provided to or accessed by the second computer if it is not determined that access to the data item is unauthorized" ('310 at Claim 69) 12
a) The Court should apply the plain and ordinary meaning of this term. 13
b) Amazon's proposed construction is inconsistent with the claim language. 13

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

D. "the request including at least a content dependent name of a particular data item" ('310 at Claim 20) and "the request including at least a content-dependent name for the data item" ('310 patent, 69).....13

E. "Names for Data Items" Terms.....14

1. "Content-dependent name of a particular data item" ('310 at Claim 20), "content-dependent name for the data item" ('310 at Claim 69), and "content-dependent name for a particular sequence of bits" ('420 patent, claim 25).....14

a) PersonalWeb's construction flows from the claim language.....15

b) PersonalWeb's construction is consistent with the specification.....16

2. "Name for a data file" ('442 patent, claim 10).....16

3. "content-dependent digital identifier" ('420 patent, claim 166) and "content-dependent digital identifiers for said particular data item" ('420 patent, claim 166).....17

4. "digital key for the particular file" / "file key for each particular file" ('544 patent, claims 46, 52).....17

F. "Based on a Function" Terms.....18

1. "[being] based at least in part on a function of at least some of the data comprising the particular data item" ('310 at claim 20).....18

a) The Court should apply the plain and ordinary meaning of this term.....19

b) PersonalWeb's alternative construction flows from the claim language.....19

2. "[being] based at least in part on a function of the data in the data item, wherein the data used by the function to determine the content-dependent name comprises at least some of the contents of the data item" ('310 patent, claim 69) and "[being] based at least in part on a given function of the data, wherein the data used by the function comprises the contents of the particular file" ('442 patent, claim 10).....19

3. "at least in part by applying a particular function to at least some of the particular sequence of bits" ('420 patent, claim 25).....20

4. "based at least in part on a given function of at least some of the bits in the particular sequence of bits" ('420 patent, claim 166).....20

5. "being based on a first function of the contents of the specific part" ('544 patent, claim 46).....21

6. "wherein the particular digital key for the particular file is determined using a second function of the one or more of part values of said first one or more parts" ('544 patent, claim 46).....21

a) Only "particular digital key for the particular file" and "part value" should be construed in this term.....22

b) Amazon's proposed construction of the phrase as a whole

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

improperly rewrites the claim. 22

7. "the file key for each particular file being based on a second hash function of the part values of the one or more parts of that file" ('544 patent, claim 52)....23

G. "Database" ('544 patent, claims 46, 52, 55) 23

H. "part" ('544 patent, claims 46, 52)....24

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.