

Francisco A. Villegas (Bar No. 206997)
 Damir Cefo (*pro hac vice*)
 Mark W. Halderman (*pro hac vice*)
 Evan M. Rosenbaum (Bar No. 310414)
 fvillegas@villegascefo.com
 dcefo@villegascefo.com
 mhalderman@villegascefo.com
 erosenbaum@villegascefo.com
 VILLEGAS & CEFO, LLP
 1350 Avenue of the Americas, Floor 2
 New York, NY 10019
 Telephone: (646) 844-0679

John V. Picone III (Bar No. 187226)
 jpicone@spencerfane.com
 SPENCER FANE LLP
 225 West Santa Clara Street, Suite 1500
 San Jose, CA 95113
 Telephone: (408) 286-5100

Attorneys For Plaintiff
 B.S.D. CROWN, LTD.

NATHAN B. SABRI (Bar No. 252216)
 nsabri@perkinscoie.com
 STEFANI E. SHANBERG (Bar No. 206717)
 sshanberg@perkinscoie.com
 ROBIN L. BREWER (Bar No. 253686)
 rbrewer@perkinscoie.com
 MATHIEU A. SWIDERSKI (Bar No. 330333)
 mathieuswidorski@perkinscoie.com
 KARL M. JOHNSTON (Bar No. 327446)
 kjohnston@perkinscoie.com
 PERKINS COIE LLP
 505 Howard Street, Suite 1000
 San Francisco, California 94105-3204
 Telephone: (415) 344-7000
 Facsimile: (415) 344-7050

Attorneys for Defendants
 AMAZON.COM, INC.,
 AMAZON WEB SERVICES, INC. and
 AMAZON.COM SERVICES LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

BSD CROWN, LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMAZON.COM, INC.,
 AMAZON WEB SERVICES, INC. and
 AMAZON.COM SERVICES LLC,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:24-CV-03503-JD

**THE PARTIES' AMENDED JOINT
 CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND
 PREHEARING STATEMENT**

Hearing: May 29, 2025, 11:00 a.m.

Pursuant to Patent Local Rule (“P.L.R.”) 4-3 of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California and the Scheduling Order in this case (ECF No. 35), Plaintiff B.S.D. Crown, Ltd. (“Plaintiff” or “BSD”) and Defendants Amazon.com, Inc., Amazon Web Services, Inc., and Amazon.com Services LLC (collectively, “Defendants”) provide the following Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement concerning U.S. Patent No. 8,934,887 (the “’887 Patent”).

A. The Construction of Terms on Which the Parties Agree (P.L.R. 4-3(a))

The parties agreed to adopt the plain and ordinary meaning for several terms that were initially disclosed. The remaining terms on which the parties did not reach agreement are disclosed below. During their meet and confer pursuant to P.L.R. 4-2(c), the parties agreed to meet and confer again prior to the submission of the opening claim construction brief in an attempt to further narrow the issues by agreement.

B. Proposed Construction of Disputed Terms (P.L.R. 4-3(b))

The parties’ proposed constructions of disputed terms are provided in the chart below. The parties’ proposed constructions for the below disputed terms are also set forth in the accompanying Exhibit 1 along with the supporting evidence upon which the parties intend to rely. Both parties reserve the right to rely on the intrinsic record and any evidence cited by the other party to support its proposed construction.

No.	Claim Language	Plaintiff’s Proposed Constructions	Defendants’ Proposed Constructions
1	A method for emulating a mobile device at a server [Preamble claims 11 and 20]	PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION: This term need not be interpreted because the preamble is not limiting.	PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION: Preamble is limiting/ “A method for a server to imitate, i.e. act as if it is, a mobile device.”
2	a mobile device operating system (OS) [claims 11, 15, and 20]	PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION: an operating system capable of running on a mobile device	PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION: “An operating system that is specifically designed to be run on a mobile device (e.g., Google Android, Windows Phone or Mobile, Nokia

			Symbian, Apple iOS).” /
3	user interface information [claims 11 and 20] ¹	PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION: data that can be used to recreate or produce a display (e.g., video and/or image), audio, text, and/or other feedback (e.g., notifications, HW action data) without any processing thereof other than the decoding and playback or reproduction of the user interface information itself by the mobile device	PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION: Plain and ordinary meaning
4	to produce a stream of user interface information . . . based on a same instance of the mobile device OS [claims 11 and 20] instance [claims 11, 15, 20]	PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION: to produce, based on the same instance of the mobile device OS, a stream of user interface information occurrence	PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION: Plain and ordinary meaning
5	at least one of the display, the audio and the hardware (HW) action [claims 11 and 20]	PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION: at least one of each of the display, the audio and the hardware (HW) action	PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION: Plain and ordinary meaning

¹ The Parties agree that Claim 20 should be read to include “stream of” before this term. See 16:6-9, Claim 23 (“The method of claim 20, wherein the stream of user interface information comprises a plurality of different types of data and the server sends each different type of data to the mobile device in a separate data stream.”).

6	quality of service / quality of service different from a quality of service of another of said separate data streams [claims 16 and 24] ²	PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION: characteristics of a service that bear on its ability to satisfy stated and implied needs of the user of the service / Plain and ordinary meaning	PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION: Plain and ordinary meaning/ “Prioritizing certain data streams over others in limited bandwidth environments.”
---	--	--	--

C. Identification of Most Significant and Dispositive Terms (P.L.R. 4-3(c))

Of the terms for which the parties were not able to reach agreement, the Parties agree that “a mobile device operating system (OS)” will be significant and potentially dispositive.

BSD also identifies the following terms as most significant and potentially dispositive: claim terms 2 and 4.

BSD further identifies the following terms as most significant but not likely dispositive: claim term 6 and the issue of whether the preamble (“A method for emulating a mobile device at a server,”) is limiting.

Defendants further identify the issue of whether the preamble is limiting and, if so, its construction, as most significant and potentially dispositive.

D. Length of Time for Claim Construction Hearing (P.L.R. 4-3(d))

The Claim Construction Hearing is presently scheduled for May 29, 2025 at 11:00 a.m. The parties anticipate needing no more than two (2) hours for the Claim Construction Hearing. The parties agree that, unless the Court prescribes a format for the presentation at the Claim Construction Hearing, the parties shall meet and confer no later than thirty (30) days prior to the Claim Construction Hearing to discuss and finalize how they will make their presentations.

E. Witnesses to be Called at the Claim Construction Hearing (P.L.R. 4-3(e))

² Claim 24 appears to include a typographical error for this term. The Parties agree that the relevant portion should state “a quality of service different [from a] quality service of another of said separate data streams” to match the language in claim 16.

1 The parties agree that there will be no witnesses called at the Claim Construction Hearing.
2 The parties intend to have persons present a summary and explanation of the technology at issue
3 during the tutorial scheduled for May 22, 2025 at 11:00 a.m.

4 **F. Identification of Factual Findings Requested from the Court (P.L. R. 4-3(f))**

5 The parties do not request any factual findings related to claim construction from the Court.

6
7 Dated: April 4, 2025

VILLEGAS & CEFO LLP

8
9 By: /s/ Francisco A. Villegas

10
11 Francisco A. Villegas
12 Damir Cefo (*pro hac vice*)
13 Mark W. Halderman (*pro hac vice*)
14 Evan M. Rosenbaum

15 John V. Picone III
16 SPENCER FANE LLP

17 Attorneys for Plaintiff
18 B.S.D. CROWN, LTD.

19
20 Dated: April 4, 2025

PERKINS COIE LLP

21 By: /s/ Nathan Sabri

Nathan Sabri

22 Attorneys for Defendants
23 AMAZON.COM, INC.,
24 AMAZON WEB SERVICES, INC. and
25 AMAZON.COM SERVICES LLC
26
27
28