## **EXHIBIT 6**

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS TYLER DIVISION

PERSONALWEB TECHNOLGIES, LLC  Plaintiff,  vs.  NEC CORPORATION OF AMERICA, INC.  Defendant.	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	CASE NO. 6:11-CV-655 PATENT CASE
PERSONALWEB TECHNOLGIES, LLC Plaintiff, vs. GOOGLE INC. AND YOUTUBE, LLC Defendants.	************	CASE NO. 6:11-CV-656 PATENT CASE
PERSONALWEB TECHNOLGIES, LLC Plaintiff, vs. NETAPP, INC. Defendant.	***************************************	CASE NO. 6:11-CV-657 PATENT CASE



	§	
PERSONALWEB TECHNOLGIES, LLC	§	
	§ §	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
S.	§	CASE NO. 6:11-CV-658
	§	PATENT CASE
AMAZON.COM, INC.; AMAZON WEB		
SERVICES LLC; AND DROPBOX, INC.	<b>§</b> <b>§</b>	
,	§	
Defendants.	Ð	
	§	
ERSONALWEB TECHNOLGIES, LLC	§	
,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
,	§	
S.	§	CASE NO. 6:11-CV-660
	§	PATENT CASE
CMC CORPORATION, AND	§	
MWARE, INC.	§	
112,1112129, 11101	ş Ş	
Defendants.	8	
_ VAVARWANU.	§	
PERSONALWEB TECHNOLGIES, LLC	§	
	8	
Plaintiff,	§ §	
2 20111111119	8 §	
S.	8 §	CASE NO. 6:11-CV-683
J•	8 §	PATENT CASE
LITONOMY INC. ET AI		TATENT CASE
AUTONOMY, INC., ET AL.,	8	
Defendents	§ § §	
Defendants.	8	

	§	
ERSONALWEB TECHNOLGIES, LLC	\$ §	
	\$ §	
Plaintiff,	§	
<u> 1 1411111111,</u>	\$ §	
vs.	\$ §	CASE NO. 6:12-CV-658
	8 §	PATENT CASE
YAHOO! INC.		TATENT CASE
TAHOO: INC.	§ § §	
Defendant.	8	
Defendant.	8	
	§	
PERSONALWEB TECHNOLGIES, LLC	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	<b>§</b> <b>§</b> <b>§</b>	
vs.	§	CASE NO. 6:12-CV-660
	§	PATENT CASE
APPLE INC.		
	8	
Defendant.	§ § §	
Belendant.	3	
	§	
PERSONALWEB TECHNOLGIES, LLC	§ § §	
	§	
Plaintiff,		
	§	
ys.	§	CASE NO. 6:12-CV-662
	§	PATENT CASE
FACEBOOK, INC.		
,	§ § §	
Defendant.	o	

### MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

This Memorandum Opinion construes the disputed claim terms in U.S. Patent Nos. 5,978,791 ("the '791 Patent), 6,415,280 ("the '280 Patent), 6,928,442 ("the '442 Patent), 7,802,310 ("the '310 Patent), 7,945,539 ("the '539 Patent), 7,945,544 ("the '544 Patent), 7,949,662 ("the '662 Patent), 8,001,096 ("the '096 Patent), and 8,099,420 ("the '420 Patent).



Autonomy and Hewlett-Packard's Motion for Summary Judgment of Indefiniteness (6:11-CV-683, Docket No. 164) is **DENIED**. Facebook's Motion for Summary Judgment of Indefiniteness (6:12-CV-662, Docket No. 66) is **DENIED**.

### **BACKGROUND**

The Plaintiff PersonalWeb Technologies LLC ("PersonalWeb") sued the following Defendants for infringement: NEC Corporation of America, Inc. ("NEC"); Google, Inc. and YouTube, LLC ("Google"); NetApp, Inc. ("NetApp"); Amazon.com, Inc. and Amazon Web Services LLC ("Amazon"); Dropbox, Inc. ("Dropbox"); EMC Corp. and VMWare, Inc. ("EMC"); Autonomy, Inc., Hewlett-Packard Co., and HP Enterprise Services, LLC ("HP"); Yahoo! Inc. ("Yahoo"); Apple Inc. ("Apple"); and Facebook, Inc. ("Facebook"). The Court heard oral argument on July 18, 2013.

There are nine asserted patents, all claiming priority to a common application. A number of the Patents have been the subject of post-issuance examination. Inter Partes Reviews ("IPRs") have been initiated for several of the Patents, and the Patent Trial and Appeal Board ("PTAB") has issued decisions for at least three Patents. The Patents generally relate to methods for identifying data items in a data processing system.

### APPLICABLE LAW

"It is a 'bedrock principle' of patent law that 'the claims of a patent define the invention to which the patentee is entitled the right to exclude." *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc) (quoting *Innova/Pure Water Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration Sys.*, *Inc.*, 381 F.3d 1111, 1115 (Fed. Cir. 2004)). In claim construction, courts examine the patent's intrinsic evidence to define the patented invention's scope. *See id.*; *C.R. Bard, Inc. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.*, 388 F.3d 858, 861 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *Bell Atl. Network Servs., Inc. v. Covad* 



# 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.

