

EXHIBIT 4

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

IN RE: PERSONALWEB)	C-18-02834 BLF
TECHNOLOGIES, LLC ET AL.,)	
PATENT LITIGATION,)	SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA
_____)	
)	MAY 24, 2019
AMAZON.COM, INC., AND AMAZON)	
WEB SERVICES, INC.,)	PAGES 1-108
)	
PLAINTIFFS,)	
)	
VS.)	
)	
PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC)	
AND LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS,)	
LLC,)	
)	
DEFENDANTS.)	
_____)	
PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC)	
AND LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS,)	
LLC,)	
)	
PLAINTIFF,)	
)	
VS.)	
)	
TWITCH INTERACTIVE, INC.,)	
)	
DEFENDANT.)	
_____)	

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE BETH LABSON FREEMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES ON NEXT PAGE

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER: LEE-ANNE SHORTRIDGE, CSR, CRR
CERTIFICATE NUMBER 9595
PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY MECHANICAL STENOGRAPHY
TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED WITH COMPUTER

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S:

FOR PLAINTIFF
PERSONALWEB:

STUBBS ALDERTON MARKILES, LLP
BY: MICHAEL A. SHERMAN
SANDEEP SETH
WESLEY W. MONROE
STANLEY H. THOMPSON
VIVIANA B. HEDRICK
15260 VENTURA BOULEVARD, 20TH FLOOR
SHERMAN OAKS, CALIFORNIA 91403

FOR DEFENDANTS
AMAZON AND
TWITCH:

FENWICK & WEST
BY: J. DAVID HADDEN
SAINA S. SHAMILOV
PHILLIP J. HAACK
TODD R. GREGORIAN
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CALIFORNIA 94041

1 CONTENT-BASED NAMES FOR A COMPOUND DATA ITEM. AND WE DO IT BY
2 BREAKING UP THE SEQUENCE OF BITS TO MAKE UP THE FILE INTO
3 PARTS, AND THEN WE CREATE A TRUE NAME FOR EACH PART OR SEGMENT
4 BY HASHING IT. THAT'S WHAT WE DO.

5 AND THAT'S WHAT THE CLAIM DESCRIBES, RIGHT? YOU HAVE A
6 PART VALUE OF EACH SPECIFIC PART AND IT IS BEING BASED ON THE
7 FIRST FUNCTION OF THE CONTENTS OF THE SPECIFIC PART. THAT'S
8 CLAIM 46 ON CLAIM -- ON SLIDE 95.

9 THERE IS -- IT IS VERY CLEAR IN THE PATENT THAT WHAT YOU
10 HAVE TO DO IS TAKE THE SEQUENCE OF BITS TO MAKE UP THE PART AND
11 HASH THEM. YOU DON'T HASH PART OF THEM. YOU DON'T HASH THEM
12 PLUS SOME OTHER JUNK THAT YOU ARBITRARILY THROW IN. OTHERWISE
13 YOU DO NOT GET A CONTENT-BASED NAME AT THE END OF THE PROCESS.
14 RIGHT?

15 A FUNCTION OF X MEANS X IS THE INPUT TO THE FUNCTION.
16 RIGHT? A FUNCTION OF X DOES NOT MEAN A FUNCTION OF X AND Y OR
17 A FUNCTION OF X AND ANY ARBITRARY OTHER THING THAT YOU WANT TO
18 THROW IN. THAT IS JUST -- THAT'S NOT WHAT THE WORDS MEAN AND
19 THAT'S CLEARLY NOT WHAT THE PATENT DESCRIBES.

20 THE COURT: UM-HUM.

21 MR. HADDEN: THIS PROCESS ONLY WORKS IF YOU FOLLOW
22 THE SPECIFIC STEPS OF DIVIDING THINGS INTO PARTS, CREATING
23 SOMETHING FROM THOSE PARTS AND NOTHING ELSE, CREATING SOMETHING
24 FROM THE RESULT OF THE STEPS. THAT'S HOW YOU GET A
25 CONTENT-BASED IDENTIFIER THAT IS TIED TO THE CONTENT OF THE

1 FILE AND ONLY THE CONTENT OF THE FILE AT THE END OF THE DAY.

2 THE COURT: SO YOU ACTUALLY WOULD LIKE A FURTHER
3 CLARIFICATION TO MAKE SURE THAT --

4 MR. HADDEN: YEAH. IF IT WASN'T CLEAR FROM OUR
5 CONSTRUCTION --

6 THE COURT: SO WHERE --

7 MR. HADDEN: -- THE FUNCTION OF X SHOULD BE THE
8 FUNCTION OF ONLY THE SEQUENCE OF BITS THAT MAKE UP THE PART.

9 THE COURT: IT IS ONLY ALL OF THE DATA?

10 MR. HADDEN: YES.

11 THE COURT: AND THE SAME WOULD BE FOR "PART VALUE,"
12 YOU WOULD MAKE THAT SIMILAR CHANGE?

13 MR. HADDEN: CORRECT, YOUR HONOR.

14 THE COURT: A VALUE CREATED BY A COMPUTATION ONLY ON
15 THE SEQUENCE?

16 MR. HADDEN: YES.

17 AND, AGAIN, THIS IS ON SLIDE 96, THIS IS EXACTLY HOW
18 PERSONALWEB EXPLAINED THEIR INVENTION IN THE '544 PATENT TO THE
19 FEDERAL CIRCUIT, "APPLYING A HASH FUNCTION TO EACH PART TO
20 OBTAIN A 'VALUE' FOR EACH PART."

21 THEY'RE NOT TALKING ABOUT APPLYING A HASH FUNCTION TO A
22 PART OF THE PART AND OTHER JUNK.

23 AGAIN, JUDGE GILSTRAP UNDERSTOOD THIS. THERE WAS A
24 SIMILAR DISPUTE IN THE PRIOR CASE, RIGHT? AND IT'S KIND OF --
25 YOU KNOW, THE SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION, AGAIN, ALL OF THE DATA