

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

FRIENDLIAI INC.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	C.A. No. 23-816 (MN)
	)	
HUGGING FACE, INC.,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**DEFENDANT HUGGING FACE, INC.’S DISCLOSURE OF
PROPOSED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS**

Pursuant to the Court’s scheduling order, as modified by the Court’s order dated April 11, 2024 and the stipulation entered May 24, 2024, Hugging Face, Inc. (Defendant) discloses its proposed constructions and indefinite positions for the claim terms/phrases previously disclosed and identified on May 15, 204 as follows:

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTIONS

No	Claim Term/Phrase	Proposed Construction
1	<i>“a new request”</i> ’775 patent, independent claims 1, 10; ’520 patent, independent claims 1, 11, 21, 28, 35, 43, 51, 59	a request different from each of the one or more requests of the [first] batch of requests
2	<i>“second batch of requests”</i> ’775 patent, independent claims 1, 10; ’520 patent, independent claims 1, 11, 21, 28, 35, 43, 51, 59	a batch that includes at least one request from the [first] batch of requests
3	<i>“dedicated cache memory” / “cache memory dedicated”</i> ’775 patent, independent claims 3, 5, 12, 14; ’520 patent, independent claims 4, 6, 14, 16, 23, 24, 30, 31, 37, 39, 45, 47, 53, 55, 61, 63	physical memory in, or that is a component part of, the execution engine
4	<i>“a length of the sequence of input tokens for the new request is different from a length of an input for [the] at least one request [other than the new request]”</i> ’775 patent, independent claims 1, 10; ’520 patent, independent claims 1, 11, 51, 59 <i>“a length of the sequence of input tokens for the new request is different from a length of another sequence of input tokens for the at least one request”</i> ’520 patent, independent claims 21, 28 <i>“a [the] length of an internal state for the new request is different from a length of another internal state for the at least one request”</i> ’520 patent, independent claims 35, 43 <i>“a length of the sequence of input tokens for the new request is different</i>	“length” refers to a “number or quantity of discrete <units>” for a given context— e.g., the number of “tokens” in a sequence, such as “a [number or quantity of discrete tokens] of the sequence of input tokens for the new request is different from a [number or quantity of discrete tokens] of an input for at least one request”

No	Claim Term/Phrase	Proposed Construction
	<i>from a length of the output token for the at least one request”</i> ’775 patent, dependent claims 4, 13; ’520 patent, dependent claims 5, 15, 54, 62 <i>“a length of the key cache tensor for the at least one request is different from a length of a key cache tensor for the new request, and a length of the value cache tensor for the at least one request is different from a length of a value cache tensor for the new request”</i> ’775 patent, dependent claims 6, 15; ’520 patent, dependent claims 7, 17, 25, 32, 40, 48, 56, 64	

INDEFINITE TERMS

No	Claim Term/Phrase	Proposed Construction
1	<i>“scheduler”</i> '775 patent, claims 1, 7, 10, 16; '520 patent, claims 1, 8, 11, 18, 21, 28, 35, 43, 51, 59	indefinite
2	<i>“at least one batch operation”</i> '775 patent, independent claims 1, 10; '520 patent, independent claims 1, 11, 21, 28, 35, 43, 51, 59	indefinite
3	<i>“receiving, by the serving system, a new request from a client device”</i> '775 patent, independent claims 1, 10; '520 Patent, independent claims 1, 11, 21, 28, 35, 43, 51, 59	indefinite
4	<i>“[scheduled responsive to] determining that the execution engine has memory available”</i> '775 patent, independent claims 1, 10; '520 patent, dependent claims 2, 12, 22, 29, 36, 44, 52, 60	indefinite
5	<i>“second set of inputs”</i> '775 patent, independent claims 1, 10; '520 patent, independent claims 1, 11, 21, 28, 35, 43, 51, 59	indefinite

The above tables are not intended as an indication that any disclosed/identified claim term/phrase should have a construction that differs from a plain and ordinary meaning. By not listing certain claim terms/phrases, Defendant does not concede that any alleged construction or dictionary definition, if any, proposed by Plaintiff, constitutes or includes the proper construction of the language as used in the claims. Although Defendant has made a good faith effort to parse the identified claim terms/phrases in a manner that most efficiently facilitates claim construction, additional and alternative parsing may be necessary.

Defendant's proposed claim constructions are based on the limited information and discovery currently available to it, including Plaintiff's disclosures to date. Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw, supplement, modify, expand or amend its proposed claim

constructions should the Court subsequently allow Plaintiff to amend its asserted claims to assert different or additional claims, or to invoke different or additional statutory subsections of 35 U.S.C. § 271.

In addition, fact discovery is in its initial stages and expert discovery has not yet begun. Accordingly, Defendant reserves the right to withdraw, supplement, modify, expand or amend its proposed claim constructions based on further investigation, fact or expert discovery, or as a result of any information disclosed by Plaintiff or any third party, including the disclosure of any claim construction, infringement, and/or validity position not previously disclosed.

POLSINELLI PC

/s/ Stephen J. Kraftschik

Stephen J. Kraftschik (#5623)

222 Delaware Avenue, Suite 1101

Wilmington, DE 19801

(302) 252-0920

skraftschik@polsinelli.com

Attorneys for Defendant Hugging Face, Inc.

OF COUNSEL:

Jason A. Wietjes

POLSINELLI PC

2950 N. Harwood St., Ste. 2100

Dallas, TX 75201

Tel.: (214) 661-5519

jwietjes@polsinelli.com

May 28, 2024

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I caused copies of the foregoing to be served on May 28, 2024, upon the following in the manner indicated:

David E. Moore
Bindu A. Palapura
Andrew L. Brown
POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP
Hercules Plaza, 6th Fl.
1313 N. Market St.
Wilmington, DE 19801
Tel.: (302) 984-6000
Attorneys for Plaintiff FriendlyAI Inc.

BY ELECTRONIC MAIL

Michael J. Sacksteder
Shreyas A. Kale
Samantha Ong
FENWICK & WEST LLP
555 California St., 12th Fl.
San Francisco, CA 94104
Tel.: (415) 875-2300
Attorneys for Plaintiff FriendlyAI Inc.

BY ELECTRONIC MAIL

Jessica Kaempf
FENWICK & WEST LLP
401 Union St., 5th Fl.
Seattle, WA 98101
Tel.: (206) 389-4550
Attorneys for Plaintiff FriendlyAI Inc.

BY ELECTRONIC MAIL

/s/ Stephen J. Kraftschik

Stephen J. Kraftschik (#5623)