

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

PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC. §
AND LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC, §
§
Plaintiffs, §
§
v. §
§
NEC CORPORATION OF AMERICA, INC., §
§
Defendant. §


Civil Action No. 6:11-cv-00655 (LED)
JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC. §
AND LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC, §
§
Plaintiffs, §
§
v. §
§
GOOGLE INC. AND YOUTUBE, LLC. §
§
Defendants. §

Civil Action No. 6:11-cv-00656 (LED)
JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC. §
AND LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC, §
§
Plaintiffs, §
§
v. §
§
NETAPP, INC. §
§
Defendant. §

Civil Action No. 6:11-cv-00657 (LED)
JURY TRIAL DEMANDED



PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC.
AND LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,

Plaintiffs,

v.

AMAZON.COM, INC.; AMAZON WEB
SERVICES LLC; AND DROPBOX, INC.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No. 6:11-cv-00658 (LED)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC.
AND LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,

Plaintiffs,

v.

EMC CORPORATION AND VMWARE,
INC.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No. 6:11-cv-00660 (LED)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC.
AND LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,

Plaintiffs,

v.

AUTONOMY, INC., HEWLETT-PACKARD
COMPANY, AND HP ENTERPRISE
SERVICES, LLC,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No. 6:11-cv-00661 (LED)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC
AND LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

YAHOO! INC.

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No. 6:12-CV-00658-LED

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC
AND LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

APPLE INC.

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No. 6:12-CV-00660-LED

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC
AND LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

FACEBOOK INC.

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No. 6:12-CV-00662-LED

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC
AND LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

MICROSOFT CORPORATION

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No. 6:12-CV-00663-LED

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PersonalWeb Technologies, LLC's Opening Claim Construction Brief

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. OVERVIEW OF THE TRUE NAME PATENTS.....1

III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ANALYSIS2

A. Claim Construction Analysis of Terms Containing the Word “Identifier.”2

1. “Identifier” should be given its plain and ordinary meaning and construed as “something that identifies” or “a value that identifies.”3

 a) The term “identifier” does not require construction.3

 b) Defendants’ proposed construction for “identifier” contradicts the claim language.4

2. “Substantially Unique Identifier” should be construed as “an identity for a data item generated by processing all of the data in the data item, and only the data in the data item, through an algorithm.”5

3. “Digital identifier” should be given its plain and ordinary meaning and construed as “an identifier in digital form.”8

4. “Data item identifier” should be given its plain and ordinary meaning and construed to mean “an identifier for a data item.”10

5. “Data identifier” should be construed the same as “substantially unique identifier.”11

B. Claim Construction Analysis for Remaining Terms.....12

1. “True Name” should be construed as “the substantially unique identifier for a particular data item, calculated in accordance with the description at ’791 12:54 to 13:9.”12

 a) The specification provides a clear description of how to calculate a True Name.13

 b) Defendants’ proposed construction improperly limits the claims to a preferred embodiment.....13

2. “Data item(s)” should be construed as “sequence of bits.”14

 a) The specification defines “data item” as “sequence of bits.”14

 b) Defendants’ proposed constructions are wholly unsupported by the intrinsic evidence.15

c)	“Data item” does not render claim 30 ambiguous.	16
3.	“Data file(s)” should be construed as “a named data item having one or more data segments.”	17
a)	PersonalWeb’s construction looks to the guidance provided in the specification.	17
b)	Defendants’ proposed constructions import extraneous limitations into the term “data file.”	18
4.	“File system” should have its ordinary meaning.	18
a)	This term does not require construction.....	18
b)	Defendants’ proposed constructions run afoul of the claim language.	19
5.	“Sufficient number of copies” should be given its plain and ordinary meaning, or should be construed to mean “application-specific criteria regarding the number of copies required.”	19
6.	“Licensed/unlicensed” should be given its plain and ordinary meaning, or should be construed to mean “with license/without license.”	20
7.	“Distributing a set of data files across a network of servers” should be given its plain and ordinary meaning, or should be construed to mean “storing a set of data files on various servers in a network.”	21
C.	Construction Analysis for Means Plus Function Limitations.	22
1.	“Access means for accessing a particular data item using the identifier of the data item.”	22
2.	“Data associating means for making and maintaining, for a data item in the system, an association between the data item and the identifier of the data item.”	23
3.	“Existence means for determining whether a particular data item is present in the system, by examining the identifiers of the plurality of data items.”	25
4.	“Identity means for determining, for any of a plurality of data items present in the system, a substantially unique identifier, the identifier being determined using and depending on all of the data on the data item and only the data in the data item, whereby two identical data items in the system will have the same identifier.”	26

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.