

Exhibit 5

1 Michael A. Sherman (SBN 94783)
 masherman@stubbsalderton.com
 2 Jeffrey F. Gersh (SBN 87124)
 jgersh@stubbsalderton.com
 3 Sandeep Seth (SBN 195914)
 sseth@stubbsalderton.com
 4 Wesley W. Monroe (SBN 149211)
 wmonroe@stubbsalderton.com
 5 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., 20th Floor
 8 Sherman Oaks, CA 91403
 Telephone: (818) 444-4500
 9 Facsimile: (818) 444-4520

10 **Attorneys for PersonalWeb Technologies, LLC**
and Level 3 Communications, LLC
 11 [Additional Attorneys listed below]

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 13 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 14 SAN JOSE DIVISION

15 IN RE PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES,
 16 LLC, ET AL., PATENT LITIGATION

CASE NO.: 5:18-md-02834-BLF

17 AMAZON.COM, INC., et al.,

18 Plaintiffs,

19 v.

20 PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, et
 21 al.,

22 Defendants.

Case No.: 5:18-cv-00767-BLF

**DECLARATION OF ERIK DE LA
 IGLESIA IN SUPPORT OF
 PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC
 AND LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS,
 LLC'S OPPOSITION TO AMAZON.COM,
 INC. AND AMAZON WEB SERVICES,
 INC.'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY
 JUDGMENT ON DECLARATORY
 JUDGMENT CLAIMS AND DEFENSES
 UNDER THE CLAIM PRECLUSION AND
 KESSLER DOCTRINE**

23 PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC
 and LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,

24 Counterclaimants,

25 v.

26 AMAZON.COM, INC. and AMAZON WEB
 27 SERVICES, INC.,

28 Counterdefendants.

Date: February 7, 2019
 Time: 2:00 PM
 Dept.: Courtroom 3, 5th Floor
 Judge: Hon. Beth L. Freeman

Trial Date: March 16, 2020

1 I, Erik de la Iglesia, declare as follows:

2 1. I, Erik de la Iglesia, am over the age of 18 and competent to make this declaration.
3 The facts herein are, unless otherwise stated, based upon personal knowledge, and if called upon to
4 do so, I could, and would testify to their truth under oath. I submit this declaration in support of
5 PersonalWeb and Level 3 Communications' Opposition to Amazon.com, Inc. and Amazon Web
6 Services, Inc.'s Motion for Summary Judgment of Declaratory Judgment Claims and Defenses
7 Under the Claim Preclusion and Kessler Documents.

8 2. I hold a BS in Electrical Engineering with Highest Honors from the University of
9 Florida and an MS in Electrical Engineering from Stanford where I was a National Science
10 Foundation Graduate Research Fellow. I have been an entrepreneur and technologist in the area of
11 network communication for the last 20 years with 68 issued US patents. Startups I have worked for
12 and founded have been acquired by large, public networking companies (including Extreme
13 Networks and McAfee). My industry work in Hypertext Transfer Protocol ("HTTP") analysis and
14 handling qualifies me as a person of ordinary skill in the art during the timeframes relevant to this
15 matter. More information regarding my qualifications and industry experience are described in my
16 CV (Ex. A).

17 3. I have reviewed both the Infringement Contentions for the Amazon entities in
18 PersonalWeb's Disclosures Pursuant to Patent Local Rules 3-1 and 3-2 served on October 29, 2018
19 and those for Twitch Interactive in PersonalWeb's Disclosures Pursuant to Patent Local Rules 3-1
20 and 3-2 served on December 22, 2018 in the current Multidistrict Litigation (5:18-md-02834-BLF),
21 including the exhibits thereto. In the infringement contentions, PersonalWeb uses the terms
22 "webpage base file," "asset file," and "fingerprint." I understand that "webpage base file," "webpage
23 asset file," "webpage file," and "fingerprint" have been defined in discovery requests served by
24 PersonalWeb, including, for example, the Notice of Taking Deposition of Amazon.com, Inc. and
25 Amazon Web Services, Inc. Pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 30(b)(6) served on November 16, 2018. I am
26 using those terms herein in a manner consistent with those definitions. Generally speaking, the
27 infringement contentions against both the Amazon entities and Twitch allege that those entities
28 assign content-based ETags, described in more detail below, to webpage files and use those ETags to

1 control the mechanism by which anonymous browsers cache those webpage files in order to reduce
2 the number of times a webpage file has to be sent to the browser while directing that the content
3 displayed in the browser is updated when there is a change at the origin server. Additionally, the
4 infringement contentions for Twitch Interactive allege that Twitch uses fingerprints, described in
5 more detail below, in the filenames of webpage files to control the caching behavior of anonymous
6 browsers and direct that the content displayed in the browser is updated when there is a change at the
7 origin server.

8 4. I will now address the nature and use cases of content-based ETags and their
9 relationship with cache control for web browsers. The document RFC 2616 is recognized in the
10 industry as the specification for HTTP/1.1. RFC Documents (Request for Comment Documents)
11 represent a standard when adopted by the industry and HTTP/1.1 is revision 1.1 of the HyperText
12 Transfer Protocol (June 1999) that serves as the basis of most communication over the internet
13 today. HTTP is a request-response protocol in which a “client” computer program sends a request
14 message (typically a GET message) and the “server” provides a response message. HTTP messages
15 contain header fields specifying the nature of the request or response and an optional body providing
16 data such as the web page contents requested by a client. Response messages include three-digit
17 numbers identifying the nature of the response (e.g. 200, 304, 404). The GET request message
18 includes a Universal Resource Identifier (URI) identifying the resource on the server requested by
19 the client. A true and correct copy of RFC 2616 obtained from <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc2616> is
20 attached hereto as Exhibit B.

21 5. Part 14 of RFC 2616 specifies the syntax of header fields in requests and responses in
22 HTTP/1.1. One such header is the ETag response-header field in Part 14.19 which “provides the
23 current value of the entity tag for the requested variant.” When a client receives a value in an ETag
24 header of a response, it may, in a subsequent request for the same resource, use that ETag in an If-
25 None-Match header as described in Part 14.26. An If-None-Match header is “used with a method to
26 make it conditional.” When an ETag value is used in an If-None-Match header, the server compares
27 the ETag value against current ETag of the requested resource and if there is a match it will not carry
28 out the requested method (send the resource another time). In the case of a GET method using an If-

1 None-Match header, Part 14.26 specifies that the server should not perform the GET and instead
2 should respond with a 304 (Not Modified) response.

3 6. I understand that PersonalWeb has previously referred to four categories of infringing
4 activity in this action. If an ETag value is content-based, *i.e.*, the value is derived from the content of
5 a resource, then its value can be used to verify whether the content of a requested resource has
6 changed since the resource's content was previously delivered and cached. If the content-based ETag
7 values match, it may be assumed that resource's content has not changed since it was cached and an
8 HTTP 304 message can be sent reauthorizing the use of the previously cached content. In
9 Categories 1 and in all other categories based upon the use of a content-based ETag (*i.e.*, categories
10 2, 3 and '544), the ETag is generated using a method that produces a substantially unique value from
11 the content of the resource, such as by applying the MD5 algorithm to the content of a resource to
12 produce an MD5 hash of its content. In this manner, an ETag may be used for cache control
13 purposes to avoid serving an object (sending a 304 response instead) if the requesting client's cache
14 contains an asset having content that matches the current content of the requested resource. A
15 content-based ETag may be used by a website operator to communicate to the browser when it is
16 permitted to re-use previously cached content for a given webpage file, as in when the browser
17 already has the latest authorized content in its cache, and when it must instead obtain the newer
18 content for that file so as to use that new content in rendering the webpage.

19 7. PersonalWeb alleges that Twitch infringes certain asserted patents in a manner
20 described as Category 1. Category 1 infringement involves assigning an ETag to a webpage base
21 file. This ETag is not generated by the S3 system but rather by Twitch's own web server application
22 system. When an anonymous browser or intermediate cache server has received a webpage base file
23 with an ETag on a previous request and makes a subsequent request for the same resource using a
24 conditional GET request with an If-None-Match header, the previously received ETag is sent for
25 comparison to the ETag assigned to the current version of that resource. If the ETag values match,
26 the requesting browser or intermediate cache server receives a 304 response from the server
27 confirming authorization to continue using the locally cached file. If the ETag values do not match,
28

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.