EXHIBIT 1

From:	Sandy Seth <sseth@stubbsalderton.com>
Sent:	Monday, July 1, 2019 4:43 PM
To:	Melanie Mayer; Ravi Ranganath; David Hadden; Amazon_PersonalWeb_Team
Cc:	Viviana Boero Hedrick; Ted Maceiko; Wesley Monroe; Jeffrey Gersh; Stanley H. Thompson Jr.; Michael Sherman
Subject:	RE: PersonalWeb Patent Litigation - Invalidity Contentions/Report

Melanie, following up on the email below please advise on some available times tomorrow when we can discuss.

Thank you.

Regards,

Sandy

From: Sandy Seth
Sent: Friday, June 28, 2019 4:55 PM
To: Melanie Mayer <mmayer@fenwick.com>; Ravi Ranganath <rranganath@fenwick.com>; David Hadden <DHadden@fenwick.com>; Amazon_PersonalWeb_Team <Amazon_PersonalWeb_Team@fenwick.com>
Cc: Viviana Boero Hedrick <vhedrick@stubbsalderton.com>; Ted Maceiko <ted@maceikoip.com>; Wesley Monroe <wmonroe@stubbsalderton.com>; Jeffrey Gersh <jgersh@stubbsalderton.com>; Stanley H. Thompson Jr. <sthompson@stubbsalderton.com>; Michael Sherman <masherman@stubbsalderton.com>
Subject: RE: PersonalWeb Patent Litigation - Invalidity Contentions/Report

Melanie:

Why do you believe Amazon would be entitled to rely upon any obviousness combinations? Rule 3-3(b) requires a disclosure of '[w]hether each item of prior art anticipates each asserted claim or renders it obvious,' and if 'obviousness is alleged, an explanation of why the prior art renders the asserted claim obvious, including an identification of any combinations of prior art showing obviousness.' Vague or 'catch-all phrases' of obviousness are insufficient." *Slot Speaker Technologies, Inc. v. Apple, Inc.* 2017 WL 235049 at *5 (N.D. Cal 2017).

Amazon and Twitch charted 24 references in their invalidity contentions. Amazon and Twitch did not chart even a single obviousness combination nor did they provide any explanation of why any given combination of references would render any given claim obvious. In the more than seven months since providing its invalidity contentions has Amazon ever provided any excuse for such failure or moved to supplement its invalidity contentions .

As we already stated in our email to Ravi, it is our position that Amazon and Twitch's expert report cannot include any obviousness combinations in light of the above. The report is limited to discussing why any of the 24 charted references anticipate or *individually* render each asserted claims obvious.

PersonalWeb therefore is not inclined to enter any stipulation that would allow the invalidity report to include any obviousness combinations without an agreed limit to a reasonable number of anticipation references and obviousness combinations.

We would welcome a discussion to see what, if any, stipulation can be reached. Are you and Ravi available Monday?

Regards,

Sandy

From: Melanie Mayer <mmayer@fenwick.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2019 3:24 PM
To: Sandy Seth <sseth@stubbsalderton.com>; Ravi Ranganath <rranganath@fenwick.com>; David Hadden <DHadden@fenwick.com>; Amazon_PersonalWeb_Team <Amazon_PersonalWeb_Team@fenwick.com>
Cc: Viviana Boero Hedrick <vhedrick@stubbsalderton.com>; Ted Maceiko <ted@maceikoip.com>; Wesley Monroe <wmonroe@stubbsalderton.com>; Jeffrey Gersh <jgersh@stubbsalderton.com>; Stanley H. Thompson Jr. <sthompson@stubbsalderton.com>; Michael Sherman <masherman@stubbsalderton.com>
Subject: RE: PersonalWeb Patent Litigation - Invalidity Contentions/Report

Sandy,

Under Amazon and Twitch's proposal, Amazon and Twitch will identify the specific prior art references and obviousness combinations they will rely on. The local rules of the Court do not require Amazon and Twitch to limit the number of prior art references or combinations and we are not proposing any such limits.

Regards,
Melanie

MELANIE MAYER

Partner | Fenwick & West LLP | +1 206-389-4569 | mmayer@fenwick.com
Admitted to practice in Washington.

From: Sandy Seth [mailto:sseth@stubbsalderton.com]
Sent: Friday, June 21, 2019 3:53 PM
To: Ravi Ranganath <rranganath@fenwick.com>; David Hadden <DHadden@fenwick.com>; Amazon_PersonalWeb_Team <Amazon_PersonalWeb_Team@fenwick.com>
Cc: Viviana Boero Hedrick <vhedrick@stubbsalderton.com>; Ted Maceiko <ted@maceikoip.com>; Wesley Monroe <wmonroe@stubbsalderton.com>; Jeffrey Gersh <jgersh@stubbsalderton.com>; Stanley H. Thompson Jr. <sthompson@stubbsalderton.com>; Michael Sherman <masherman@stubbsalderton.com>
Subject: RE: PersonalWeb Patent Litigation - Invalidity Contentions/Report

Ravi,

Thanks for your email.

Before we respond, how many anticipation references and how many obviousness combinations are you willing to limit your identification to three weeks before your expert reports are due? Also are you willing to limit the obviousness references to be selected only from the charted set?

Regards,

Sandy

From: Ravi Ranganath <rranganath@fenwick.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2019 5:15 PM
To: Sandy Seth <sseth@stubbsalderton.com>; David Hadden <DHadden@fenwick.com>; Amazon_PersonalWeb_Team <Amazon_PersonalWeb_Team@fenwick.com>
Cc: Viviana Boero Hedrick <vhedrick@stubbsalderton.com>; Ted Maceiko <ted@maceikoip.com>; Wesley Monroe <wmonroe@stubbsalderton.com>; Jeffrey Gersh <jgersh@stubbsalderton.com>; Stanley H. Thompson Jr. <sthompson@stubbsalderton.com>; Michael Sherman <masherman@stubbsalderton.com>
Subject: RE: PersonalWeb Patent Litigation - Invalidity Contentions/Report

Sandy:

While Amazon and Twitch's invalidity contentions fully complied with the patent local rules, we agree it is in the parties' interests to help narrow issues in advance of expert reports.

Along these lines, PersonalWeb's Patent L.R. 3-8 damages contentions provide no information about its actual damages theory. For example, the contentions do not identify specific licenses on which PersonalWeb and its expert will rely, do not describe how the claimed inventions drive Amazon or Twitch's revenue or success, or provide any analysis under the Georgia-Pacific factors. Instead, those contentions merely lay out basic principles of law and describe approaches and factors PersonalWeb "plans to consider" without any specific contentions related to damages or factual support for those contentions. Amazon and Twitch thus have no reasonable notice of PersonalWeb's damages theories.

To address both sides' concerns, we propose that 3 weeks before the opening expert report deadlines:

(1) Amazon and Twitch will identify the specific prior art references and obviousness combinations they will rely on, and to the extent not already disclosed in the invalidity contentions, will identify which elements are met by each prior art reference in an obviousness combination;

(2) PersonalWeb will supplement its Patent L.R. 3-8 damages contentions, identifying separately for Amazon and Twitch, at least the following: (i) the type of damages PersonalWeb will seek (*e.g.*, reasonable royalty, lump sum, etc.); (ii) the license agreements, if any, PersonalWeb will rely on to support their damages contentions; (iii) a description of the factual and legal bases for PersonalWeb's contention, if any, that the claimed inventions drive consumer demand and revenue for Amazon and Twitch's accused products; and (iv) a description of the relevant royalty base and how, if at all, PersonalWeb contends that base should be apportioned.

Let us know if PersonalWeb agrees.

Best regards,

RAVI RANGANATH
Associate | Fenwick & West LLP | +1 650-335-7614 | rranganath@fenwick.com
Admitted to practice in California.

From: Sandy Seth [mailto:sseth@stubbsalderton.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 1:40 PM
To: David Hadden <DHadden@fenwick.com>; Amazon_PersonalWeb_Team <Amazon_PersonalWeb_Team@fenwick.com>
Cc: Viviana Boero Hedrick <vhedrick@stubbsalderton.com>; Ted Maceiko <ted@maceikoip.com>; Wesley Monroe <wmonroe@stubbsalderton.com>; Jeffrey Gersh <jgersh@stubbsalderton.com>; Stanley H. Thompson Jr. <sthompson@stubbsalderton.com>; Michael Sherman <masherman@stubbsalderton.com>
Subject: RE: PersonalWeb Patent Litigation - Invalidity Contentions/Report

Dear David,

We write concerning Amazon's and Twitch's invalidity contentions.

The respective invalidity charts are just shy of 6,000 pages each and chart anticipation/obviousness for 24 references and cite to a total 19 patents, 26 non-patent publications and 8 systems/services. Moreover, in these invalidity contentions, Amazon and Twitch take the position that (at least) any one of these 24 charted references may be used in combination with any other of the 53 total references in uncharted obviousness combinations. That would include thousands of potential obvious combinations. We do not believe in their current form these invalidity contentions give us reasonable notice of the actual obviousness combinations you will be relying upon since there is no accompanying analysis as to which specific combinations you allege to disclose which specific elements.

Consequently, we believe your expert report cannot get into specific element-by-element combinations that are not disclosed in your contentions, and therefore there would be no obviousness combinations your expert could make in the report. In other words, our position is that your expert report could only include the 24 charted references used by themselves (and not in combination with any other reference) to opine that a given claim is obvious.

Our goal is always to come up with a stipulated solution before troubling Magistrate Van Keulen or the Court with any matter. To that end we propose two possible solutions:

1. You can inform us six weeks ahead of time (so three weeks before your invalidity expert report is due) what precise anticipation references and obviousness combinations the expert report will include and include an element-by-element disclosure for obviousness combinations as well as the motivation to combine each specific prior art combinations; or

2. We will have an additional month to submit our rebuttal report after receiving your invalidity expert report.

We are happy to discuss further details of either of these solutions in the hopes we can stipulate to one.   Please let us know a time in the next couple of days that you (or any colleague of yours) can discuss and resolve this with one of us.

Thank you.

Regards,

Sandy

V-card	Website

Sandeep "Sandy" Seth
Of Counsel
sseth@stubbsalderton.com

STUBBS ALDERTON & MARKILES, LLP
S A&M LLP

Stubbs Alderton & Markiles, LLP
15260 Ventura Blvd., 20th Floor
Sherman Oaks, CA 91403

Bus/Fax/Text: 818.444.9273
Mobile: 832.875.1470

1453 3rd Street Promenade, Suite 300
Santa Monica, CA 90401

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.