

**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

FILED UNDER SEAL

OXYLABS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY

**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*

February 5, 2021

Data Co Exhibit 1061

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Statement Of Issues To Be Decided 1
- II. Undisputed Material Facts 1
 - A. Invalidity Facts 1
 - B. Eligibility Facts..... 2
- III. The Court Should Grant Summary Judgment That The Asserted Claims Of The '319 And '510 Patents Are Invalid In View Of Crowds 2
 - A. There Is No Genuine Dispute That Crowds Anticipates Claim 1 Of The '319 And '510 Patents. 2
 - 1. Crowds discloses every limitation of claim 1 3
 - a) The limitations of '319 Patent claim 1 are met 4
 - b) The limitations of '510 Patent claim 1 are met 6
 - 2. Luminati’s attempt to distinguish Crowds relies on a contradiction of the Court’s claim construction 8
 - a) The Court construed “first client device” and “second server”..... 8
 - b) The jondo “4” is a “second server” in the path discussed above..... 9
 - c) Crowds’ jondos perform the same steps that Dr. Rhyne assigns to the corresponding components of the Accused Systems for purposes of alleged infringement..... 10
 - d) Luminati and Dr. Rhyne flout the Court’s claim construction 11
 - e) Luminati’s and Dr. Rhyne’s flawed claim construction position is internally inconsistent..... 12
 - f) Even if Dr. Rhyne’s understanding of a server is accepted, Crowds expressly discloses such a server operating a jondo..... 15
 - B. There Is No Dispute That Crowds Anticipates The Dependent Claims Of The '319 Patent..... 16
 - 1. Claim 2 17
 - 2. Claims 14-15 18
 - 3. Claims 17-18 18
 - 4. Claims 21-22 and 24-25 19
 - 5. Claim 26 19
 - 6. Claim 27 20
 - C. There Is No Dispute That Crowds Anticipates The Dependent Claims Of The '510 Patent..... 20

1. Claim 2	20
2. Claims 8-9	21
3. Claims 10-11	21
4. Claim 13	22
5. Claim 15	22
6. Claim 16	22
7. Claims 18-19	23
8. Claim 20	23
9. Claim 22	23
10. Claim 23	23
IV. The Court Should Grant Summary Judgment of Invalidity Because The Asserted Claims Fail 35 U.S.C. § 101	24
V. Conclusion	28

..

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l</i> , 573 U.S. 208 (2014).....	1, 24, 25, 27
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Erie Indem. Co.</i> , 850 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	27
<i>Reese v. Sprint Nextel Corp.</i> , 774 Fed. App’x 656 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	27
<i>Specialized Monitoring Solutions, LLC v. ADT LLC</i> , 367 F. Supp. 3d 575 (E.D. Tex. 2019).....	27
<i>SRI Int’l, Inc. v. Cisco Systems, Inc.</i> , 930 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	26
<i>Voip-Pal.Com, Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 411 F. Supp. 3d 926 (N.D. Cal. 2019).....	27
STATUTES	
35 U.S.C. § 101.....	24, 27
35 U.S.C. § 102(b).....	2
OTHER AUTHORITIES	
Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(c)	24, 27

...

Defendants Teso LT, UAB, Oxysales, UAB, and Metacluster LT, UAB (collectively, “Oxylabs”) file this Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity:

I. STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED

This motion for summary judgment presents two issues for the Court to decide:

1. Whether the Crowds prior-art reference invalidates the ’510 and ’319 patents; and
2. Whether *Alice* renders the Patents-in-Suit invalid for impermissibly claiming an abstract idea.

II. UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS

A. Invalidity Facts

1. *Crowds: Anonymity for Web Transactions* Ex. 1 (“Crowds”) is an article authored by Michael K. Reiter of Bell Laboratories and Aviel D. Rubin of AT&T Labs, and published in 1998 in the ACM Transactions on Information and System Security, Vol. 1, No. 1, November 1998, Pages 66-92. Crowds states that it was published in November 1998. ACM confirms in a declaration that Crowds was published in the November 1998 journal. Ex. 2. Crowds was not before the Patent Office during prosecution of the patents.

2. For claim 1 of both the ’319 and ’510 patents, Luminati’s expert, Dr. Thomas Rhyne, contests only whether the jondo “4”—in the sample 5→4→6→server path discussed by Dr. Freedman—is the “second server” recited in the claim. Ex. 3 (Rhyne Tr.) at 230:14-22.

3. “*Like all network servers*, jondos are identified by their IP address and port number.” Ex. 1 (Crowds) at 90.¹ The jondos were tested on a 150-MHz Sparc 20 workstation running SunOS 4.1.4. *Id.* at 82. Crowds also discusses use of Unix platforms for jondos. *Id.* at 81.

¹ All emphases in quotations have been added, unless otherwise indicated.

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.