

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

BRIGHT DATA LTD.,	§	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>	§	
	§	
v.	§	Civil Action No. 2:19-CV-00414-JRG
	§	
TEFINCOM S.A. D/B/A NORDVPN,	§	[REDACTED]
<i>Defendant.</i>	§	

**DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF
INVALIDITY OF THE ’319, ’510, AND ’511 PATENTS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. STATEMENT OF ISSUE TO BE DECIDED..... 2

III. STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS 2

 A. The Court’s “Server” Claim Scope Orders 2

 B. Undisputed Criteria for “Operating in the Role of a Server” 4

 C. Crowds and Dr. Freedman’s Mapping of the Second/First Server 5

 D. It is Undisputed that Jondo “4” Meets Both Prongs of the Court’s Clarified “Second Server” and “First Server” Constructions 7

 E. Dr. Rhyne’s Rebuttals are Irrelevant to the Court’s Clarified Constructions or Dr. Freedman’s Mappings Presented in This Motion 8

IV. CROWDS ANTICIPATES THE ASSERTED CLAIMS OF THE ’319, ’510 AND ’511 PATENTS 9

 A. Plaintiff Does Not Dispute Much of the Anticipation Mappings..... 9

 B. There is No Fact Dispute That Jondo “4” Meets Both Prongs of the Court’s Clarified “Second Server” (’319, ’510 Patents) and “First Server” (’511 Patent) Constructions..... 10

 C. Plaintiff Cannot Avoid Summary Judgment by Raising Arguments Contrary to the Court’s Clarified Claim Constructions 12

 D. Plaintiff’s Criticisms of Dr. Freedman’s Prior Art Mapping of Dependent Claims are Contradicted by Plaintiff’s Infringement Mapping..... 13

 1. ’319 Patent Claim 2 and ’510 Patent Claim 2 13

 2. ’319 Patent Claim 17 and ’510 Patent Claims 8-9 14

 3. ’511 Patent Claim 28 15

V. CONCLUSION..... 15

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Shorthand	Description
A	<i>Tefincom</i> CC Order	Order that claim construction orders from related cases shall apply in this case (ECF 63)
B	<i>O2 Micro</i> Request	Defendant's Motion for Hearing Regarding <i>O2 Micro</i> Issue (ECF 444 in <i>Bright Data Ltd. v. Teso It, UAB et al.</i> , Case No. 2:19-cv-395 (" <i>Teso</i> "))
C	Supplemental CC Order	Supplemental Claim Construction Order (ECF 453 in <i>Teso</i>)
D	Rhyne <i>Daubert</i> Order	Excerpt of Order on Pretrial Motions and Motions <i>in Limine</i> in <i>Teso</i> (ECF 476 in <i>Teso</i>)
E	Crowds	Reiter and Rubin, Crowds: Anonymity for Web Transactions, ACM Transactions on Information and System Security, Vol. 1, No. 1, November 1998 (NORDPA0002553)
F	ACM Dec.	June 4, 2020 Declaration of Scott Delman of Association for Computing Machinery (ACM) regarding publication status of Crowds (NORDPA0002552)
G	'319 Patent	U.S. Patent No. 10,257,319
H	'510 Patent	U.S. Patent No. 10,484,510
I	'511 Patent	U.S. Patent No. 10,484,511
J	Freedman Rep.	Excerpts of August 19, 2021 Expert Report of Dr. Michael J. Freedman on behalf of Defendant
K	Freedman Rep. App'x A	Excerpts of Appendix A of the August 19, 2021 Expert Report of Dr. Michael J. Freedman on behalf of Defendant
L	Freedman Rep. App'x E	Excerpts of Appendix E of the August 19, 2021 Expert Report of Dr. Michael J. Freedman on behalf of Defendant
M	Freedman Rep. App'x M	Excerpts of Appendix M of the August 19, 2021 Expert Report of Dr. Michael J. Freedman on behalf of Defendant
N	Rhyne Rebuttal Rep.	Excerpts of September 12, 2021 Rebuttal Expert Report of Dr. V. Thomas Rhyne on behalf of Plaintiff
O	Rhyne Tr.	Excerpts of rough draft of September 20, 2021 Deposition of Dr. V. Thomas Rhyne
P	RFC 2616	Excerpts of RFC 2616 Hypertext Transfer Protocol -- HTTP/1.1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Little v. Liquid Air Corp.,
37 F.3d, 1069, 1075 (5th Cir. 1994)10

I. INTRODUCTION

Dr. Rhyne, Plaintiff’s rebuttal expert, disputes one—and only one—aspect of Defendant’s expert, Dr. Freedman’s, mappings of the sole independent claim of each of the ’319, ’510 and ’511 Patents to the prior art reference, Crowds. Ex. N (Rhyne Rebuttal Rep.) at ¶¶ 173-185, 576-588. Dr. Rhyne asserts only that jondo “4” cannot be a “server.” *Id.* As discussed in the concurrently-filed Motion to Strike Dr. Rhyne, the Court’s prior claim construction orders have addressed and rejected the bases for Dr. Rhyne’s contention—that “a server cannot be a client device” and a user computer cannot be “interchangeable” with a server. Setting those arguments aside, summary judgment of invalidity follows directly.

There is no fact issue that Crowds’ jondo “4” is “operating in the role of a server,” which the Court held is the “correct” criteria for determining if a device is a server. Ex. C (Supplemental CC Order) at 7-11. Dr. Rhyne’s report does not dispute Dr. Freedman’s analysis on this point. And Dr. Rhyne provided matching testimony as to: (1) his view on what functionality is “sufficient” to be a server and (2) the functionality of jondo “4” that he agrees Crowds discloses:

<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>Functionality of jondo “4” that Dr. Rhyne agrees Crowds discloses</p>
<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] Ex. O (Rhyne Tr.) at 117:4-17, 152:12-153:19.¹</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] <i>Id.</i> at 152:12-153:19.</p>

¹ All emphasis 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.