

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

**Luminati Networks Ltd.,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**Teso LT, UAB, Oxysales, UAB, and  
Metacluster LT, UAB,**

**Defendants.**

**Civil Action No.  
2:19-cv-00395-JRG**

**Lead Case**

**OXYLABS' RESPONSIVE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

**SIEBMAN, FORREST,  
BURG & SMITH LLP**

MICHAEL C. SMITH

**CHARHON CALLAHAN  
ROBSON & GARZA, PLLC**

STEVEN CALLAHAN  
CRAIG TOLLIVER  
GEORGE T. "JORDE" SCOTT  
MITCHELL SIBLEY

*Counsel for Teso LT, UAB, Oxysales, UAB,  
and Metacluster LT, UAB*

October 13, 2020

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. DISPUTED CLAIM CONSTRUCTION TERMS ..... 1

    A. Client Device ('319 and '510 Patents)..... 1

    B. First Server ('319 Patent)..... 8

    C. Second Server ('319 and '510 Patents)..... 8

    D. Client Device ('614 Patent) ..... 9

    E. First Server ('614 Patent)..... 13

III. INDEFINITENESS..... 13

    A. Indefiniteness of “the first IP address” / “the first client IP address” ..... 14

    B. Indefiniteness of “determining, by the first client device, that the received first content, is valid” ..... 17

    C. Indefiniteness of “the determining is based on the received HTTP header according to, or based on, IETF RFC 2616” ..... 20

    D. Indefiniteness of “periodically communicating” ..... 21

    E. Indefiniteness of “in response to the receiving of the first content identifier” ..... 23

    F. Indefiniteness of claim 13 of the '510 patent..... 26

    G. Indefiniteness of “the steps are sequentially executed” ..... 29

IV. CONCLUSION..... 30

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Andersen Corp. v. Fiber Composites</i> , 474 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	10
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1229 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	8
<i>Chef Am., Inc. v. Lamb-Weston, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	17
<i>Dow Chem. Co. v. Nova Chemicals Corp. (Canada)</i> , 803 F.3d 620 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	14
<i>Energizer Holdings, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 435 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	13
<i>GE Lighting Sols., LLC v. AgiLight, Inc.</i> , 750 F.3d 1304 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	6, 12
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. 898 (2014).....	1, 13-14, 17, 21, 25
<i>Schindler Elevator Corp. v. Otis Elevator Co.</i> , 593 F.3d 1275 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	11
<i>Teva Pharm. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	19

Defendants Teso LT, UAB, Oxysales, UAB, and Metacluster LT, UAB (collectively, “Oxylabs”) file this Responsive Claim Construction Brief:

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Luminati’s patents-in-suit are plagued by sloppy claim drafting. As discussed below in Section III concerning indefiniteness, Luminati asserts multiple patent claims that purport to rely on antecedent support that simply does not exist. Luminati now asks the Court to redraft the claims to avoid its prosecution mistakes. But these are not errors that the Court can fix—the errors instead preclude a POSA from understanding the claim scope with reasonable certainty. Luminati must bear the burden of its claim drafting, and the Court should not allow Luminati to rush its claims through prosecution, file suit and then hope that the Court will rewrite the claims to save them from indefiniteness. As the Supreme Court has stated, “a patent must be precise enough to afford clear notice of what is claimed, thereby ‘appris[ing] the public of what is still open to them.’” *Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.*, 572 U.S. 898, 909 (2014) (quotations omitted). “The patent drafter”—not the Court and not the defendant—“is in the best position to resolve the ambiguity” in the patent claims. *Id.* at 910 (quotations omitted).

Luminati also improperly attempts to redefine “client” to allegedly require specialized “consumer” device equipment. As Oxylabs explains below in Section II, Luminati’s attempted redefinitions are at odds with the patent specification, Luminati’s admissions, a POSA’s general knowledge, and a prior claim construction order by this Court interpreting “client device” in another Luminati patent. Instead, “client” and “server” are used in their plain and ordinary sense, and therefore refer to computer equipment serving in a standard “client” or “server” role.

## **II. DISPUTED CLAIM CONSTRUCTION TERMS**

### **A. Client Device (’319 and ’510 Patents)**

Luminati concocts a new definition of “client device”—a “consumer computer”—that

stands in contrast with (i) the specification of the '319 and '510 patents, (ii) Luminati's earlier admissions in this case, (iii) the common understanding of a "client device," and (iv) the Court's construction of "client device" in a prior case between the parties. A POSA<sup>1</sup> would understand, as confirmed by the patent specification, that a "client device" has a plain and ordinary meaning of a device operating in the role of a "client" (as in the client-server context). "Client device" does not refer to any specialized equipment, whether a "consumer computer" or otherwise. And as discussed below, it is not even clear what Luminati means by "consumer" in this context or how Luminati would use that term to alter the disclosure in the patent specification.

**First**, the patents<sup>2</sup> confirm that "*each communication device may serve as a client, peer, or agent*" in a portion of the specification quoted and emphasized by Luminati on page 11 of its brief.<sup>3</sup> '319 pat. at 4:48-50; Lum. Claim Constr. Brief ("Br.") at 11. Luminati, however, did not emphasize the next sentence of the specification stating that "*a detailed description of a communication device is provided with regard to the description of FIG. 4.*" *Id.* at 4:51-53. The corresponding description of Figure 4 describes the "communication device" in detail and confirms that the "communication device" "*contains general components of a computer*" and "*may serve as a client, agent, or peer.*" *Id.* at 5:52-57.

"[T]he communication device 200 includes a processor 202, memory 210, [and] at least one storage device 208 . . ." *Id.* at 5:59-60. The specification also confirms other standard features of the "communication device," including that its memory may include "ROM, hard drive,

---

<sup>1</sup> A person of ordinary skill (POSA) would have at least a bachelor's degree in Computer Science or related field (or equivalent experience), as well as two or more years of experience working with and programming networked computer systems. Freedman Decl., ¶ 18.

<sup>2</sup> The '319 patent and '510 patent share a common specification. Citations herein are to the '319 patent unless otherwise noted.

<sup>3</sup> Unless otherwise noted, all emphases in quotations herein have been added.

# 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.