

NON-INFRINGEMENT CLAIM CHART

Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 9,817,562

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[1.pre] A computer-implemented method, in which at least one computer initiates execution of software instructions to perform computer processes, the method being for interacting with at least one data item obtained from at least one source and rendering the at least one data item accessible from a database system, wherein the at least one source is external to the database system, the computer processes comprising:	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this preamble is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant through its provision of Facebook application and/or website, practices the claimed computer implemented method.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the remaining claim elements does not show each of those elements is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. In other words, there is no complete mapping of the Facebook application nor Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “at least one computer [that] initiates execution of software instructions to perform computer processes.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “method being for interacting [] and rendering.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “at least one data item.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “database system.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “at least one source” and how the “at least one data item” is “obtained from” that “at least source” is “external to the database system.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is “accessible from a database system.” There are no citations to the Facebook website at all. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows:

Exhibit 1 - Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 9,817,562

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “at least one computer initiates execution of software instructions” or the “interacting with at least one data item obtained from at least one source, the at least one source and rendering the at least one data item accessible from a database system, wherein the at least one source is external to the database system” limitations. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “at least one computer initiates execution of software instructions” or the “interacting with at least one data item obtained from at least one source and rendering the at least one data item accessible from a database system, wherein the at least one source is external to the database system” limitations. Furthermore, the elements are not met in any of the identified products for the reasons further explained below.
[1.a] configuring each of the data items into a distinct information object by extracting, from each data item, extracted data including a picture, a heading, and a link to the data item;	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant configures data items into distinct information objects by extracting, from each data item, extracted data including a picture, a heading, and a link to the data item.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “information object.” Cogmedia states “[i]n the second image, the distinct information object and its corresponding picture, heading, and link are shown.” However the green box on pages 4-6 (Image 2) of Exhibit B captures several items and Cogmedia has not explained which corresponds to at least “the distinct information object,” and “a picture, a heading, and a link” to the data item associated with the information object. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook website, and merely provides the an end result on pages 4-6 (Image 2) of Exhibit B. Cogmedia also alleges without explanation

Exhibit 1 - Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 9,817,562

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	“Defendant’s software resident on the user’s device works in concert with Defendant’s backend network,” and “Facebook backend servers do all of the processing and simply communicates the results to the browser application for display.”
[1.b] storing data corresponding to each of the information objects in the database system;	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging are the “information objects.” Cogmedia states “[i]n the first image, the distinct information object and its corresponding picture and heading are shown.” However the red box on page 7 (Image 1) of Exhibit B captures several items that have been previously designated in connection with element [1.a] and thus Cogmedia has not explained which corresponds to “the information [object].” Cogmedia also states “[i]n the second image, Defendant further causes storage of data corresponding to each information object in the database system of the Facebook platform.” However Image 2 on page 7 of Exhibit B shows an end result. Cogmedia has failed to explain how Image 2 is representative of “storing data corresponding to each of the information objects in the database system.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what specific “data” it alleges is stored in the “database system.” Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “storing data corresponding to each of the information objects in the database system” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “storing data corresponding to each of the information objects in the database system” limitation.

Exhibit 1 - Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 9,817,562

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[1.c] using the extracted data from a plurality of the data items to make available for display a representation of each of at least two of the information objects in the database system, the at least two information objects being selected for display, the representation being in a uniform format, wherein the format includes a card, and, within the card, in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a function mechanism giving graphical access to a set of functions:	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant uses extracted data from a plurality of data items to make available for display a representation of each of at least two of the information objects in the database system, the at least two information objects being selected for display, the representation being in a uniform format, wherein the format includes a card, and within the card, in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a function mechanism giving graphical access to a set of functions.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “representation being in a uniform format.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging are “uniform locations” “within the card.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. All images shown on pages 8-10 of Exhibit B are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “using the extracted data from a plurality of the data items to make available for display a representation of each of at least two of the information objects in the database system, the at least two information objects being selected for display, the representation being in a uniform format, wherein the format includes a card, and, within the card, in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a function mechanism giving graphical access to a set of functions” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “using the extracted data from a plurality of the data items to make available for display a representation of each of at least two of the information objects in the database system, the at least two information

Exhibit 1 - Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 9,817,562

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	objects being selected for display, the representation being in a uniform format, wherein the format includes a card, and, within the card, in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a function mechanism giving graphical access to a set of functions” limitation. Furthermore, the elements are not met in any of the identified products for the reasons further explained below in relation to elements [1.c.i]-[1.c.vi].
[1.c.i] wherein the functions include: an instant messaging function, by which users having access to the card can exchange author- and time-stamped messages relating to the information object, such messages being associated with the information object and accessible to users who view the information object;	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. Only the second image on page 11 of Exhibit B shows comments in relation to the Facebook website. Cogmedia has also failed to explain how a comment function corresponds to “an instant messaging function.” Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim.
[1.c.ii] a vote function, by which each user having access to the card can provide one vote for the information object;	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “[o]ne of Defendant’s graphical functions is a vote function by which each user having access to the card can provide one vote for the information object.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the

Exhibit 1 - Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 9,817,562

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “vote function” in each identified product. Cogmedia alleges without explanation “Defendant practices this limitation by providing its “Like” button which facilitates users’ ability to provide one vote for an information object.” But Cogmedia has not explained how a “Like” is a vote. Cogmedia also alleges that “Defendant further provides users with access to a given card the ability to react to that card thereby providing each user with one vote for the information object.” Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of a “Like” function and/or reactions to a card is representative of a “vote function.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on pages 12-13 of Exhibit B are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “vote function, by which users having access to the card vote function can vote for the information object” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “vote function, by which users having access to the card vote function can vote for the information object” limitation.
[1.c.iii] a replicate function, by which each user having access to the card in a first collection of cards can cause the card to be replicated in a second collection of cards; and	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “[o]ne of Defendant’s functions is a replicate function, by which each user having access to the card in a first collection of cards can cause the card to be replicated in a second collection of cards.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website.

Exhibit 1 - Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 9,817,562

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “replicate function” in each identified product. Cogmedia alleges without explanation “Defendant practices this limitation by providing its “Share” button which allows a user having access to the card in a first collection of cards to cause the card to be replicated in a second collection of cards.” Cogmedia simply has not shown how the use of a “Share” function is representative of a “replicate function.” Notably, as claimed, “the card [includes], in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a function mechanism giving graphical access to a set of functions.” Cogmedia has therefore failed to identify what it is alleging is the “first collection of cards” and the “second collection of cards.” Cogmedia has also failed to identify what it is alleging “cause[s] the card to be replicated” in the “second collection of cards.” While a purple box surrounds the “Share” button on page 14 of Exhibit B, Cogmedia has not shown any replication. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 14 of Exhibit B is taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “a replicate function, by which each user having access to the card in a first collection of cards can cause the card to be replicated in a second collection of cards” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “a replicate function, by which each user having access to the card in a first collection of cards can cause the card to be replicated in a second collection of cards” limitation.

Exhibit 1 - Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 9,817,562

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[1.c.iv] a link function, by which each user having access to the card can invoke the link to the data item; and	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “[o]ne of Defendant’s functions is a link function, by which each user having access to the card can invoke the link to the data item.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The image shown on page 15 of Exhibit B is taken from the Facebook website.
[1.c.v] wherein the indicators include: a message indicator that displays a number of instant messages associated with the information object; and	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant’s set of indicators includes a message indicator that displays a number of instant messages associated with the information object.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The image shown on page 16 of Exhibit B is taken from the Facebook website. Cogmedia has also failed to explain how comment activity corresponds to “number of instant messages associated with the information object.”
[1.c.vi] a vote indicator that displays a number of votes associated with the information object; and	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant’s set of indicators includes [] a vote indicator that displays a number of votes associated with the information object.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website.

Exhibit 1 - Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 9,817,562

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The image shown on page 16 of Exhibit B is taken from the Facebook website. Cogmedia has also failed to explain how “Like” and/or reaction activity corresponds to “number of instant votes associated with the information object.” Cogmedia simply has not explained how a “Like” is a vote. Cogmedia has also not explained how the use of a “Like” function and/or reactions to a card is representative of a “vote function.” The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “vote indicator that displays a number of votes associated with the information object” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “vote indicator that displays a number of votes associated with the information object” limitation.
[1.d] wherein the database system is configured to allow (i) each user to have at least one user-selected collection of cards in the database system and (ii) each card in the database system, with any associated picture and heading, and other associated data, regardless of the collection in which it may have first appeared, to be accessible and replicable across card collections of users.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant configures its database system to allow each user to have at least one user-selected collection of cards representing information objects in the database system and cards, regardless of the collections in which they have first appeared, to be made accessible and copyable across card collections of different users.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “user-selected collection of cards in the database system.” Cogmedia cites to the New York Times collection of cards, but fails to explain

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	how that is representative of a “collection of cards.” No “collection” of cards is shown on page 17 of Exhibit B. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is providing “accessible and replicable” cards “across card collections of users.” Cogmedia states “Defendant’s Share button [] ensures that each card in the database system, regardless of the collection in which it may have first appeared, is accessible and replicable across the card collections of users.” However, as mentioned above, Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of a “Share” function is representative of a “replicate function.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 17 of Exhibit B are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “configured to allow (i) each user to have at least one user-selected collection of cards in the database system” and “(ii) each card in the database system, with any associated picture and heading, and other associated data, regardless of the collection in which it may have first appeared, to be accessible and replicable across card collections of users” limitations. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “configured to allow (i) each user to have at least one user-selected collection of cards in the database system” and “(ii) each card in the database system, with any associated picture and heading, and other associated data, regardless of the collection in which it may have first appeared, to be accessible and replicable across card collections of users” limitations.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
2. A method according to claim 1, the computer processes further comprising: providing a user interface having a graphical button, which, when invoked while content is being displayed, causes the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, namely, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this claim is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant provides a user interface having a graphical button which when invoked while content is being displayed causes the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. <i>See also</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “graphical button” with the claimed functionality of “[causing] the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items” “by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format.” Specifically, Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of a “Share” or “Share now” button results in the claimed actions of “[causing] the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, namely, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 18 of Exhibit B are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “causes the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, namely, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format” limitation.

Exhibit 1 - Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 9,817,562

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “causes the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, namely, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
3. A method according to claim 1, wherein the format includes within the card an indication of a date of creation of the card.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this claim is met. <i>See also</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant’s computer-implemented method further comprises a format which includes within the card an indication of a date of creation.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 19 of Exhibit B are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “wherein the format includes within the card an indication of a date of creation of the card” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a

Exhibit 1 - Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 9,817,562

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	browser does not practice, at least the “wherein the format includes within the card an indication of a date of creation of the card” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
5. A method according to claim 1, wherein the format includes a user-accessible report relating to users who replicated the information object.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this claim is met. <i>See also</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant’s computer-implemented method further comprises a format which includes a user-accessible report relating to users who replicated the information object.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. As discussed above, Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of a “Share” function is representative of “[replicating] the information object.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 20 of Exhibit B are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “wherein the format includes a user-accessible report relating to users who replicated the information object” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “wherein the format includes a user-accessible report relating to users who replicated the information object” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
7. A method according to claim 1, wherein the one of the indicators indicates the presence of a geographic location, associated with the information object.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1. Cogmedia states that “Defendant’s set of indicators includes an indicator that indicates the presence of a geographic location associated with the information object.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The image shown on page 21 of Exhibit B is taken from the Facebook website. Additionally, as claimed, “the representation [of each of at least two of the information objects] being in a uniform format, wherein the <i>format includes a card, and, within the card, in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a function mechanism giving graphical access to a set of functions.</i>” Cogmedia provides an image on page 21 of Exhibit B that shows a ‘check-in’ location and an associated location map. However the image does not depict a representation of an information object with its required elements (italicized above) as claimed. Cogmedia has therefore failed to identify what it is alleging is the “[indicator that] indicates the presence of a geographic location, associated with the information object.” Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “wherein the one of the indicators indicates the presence of a geographic location, associated with the information object” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a

Exhibit 1 - Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 9,817,562

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	browser does not practice, at least the “wherein the one of the indicators indicates the presence of a geographic location, associated with the information object” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
8. A method according to claim 1, further comprising: further causing to be displayed, at the same time as the representation, a map including a location, marked on the map, associated with at least one of the information objects.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claims 1, 7. Cogmedia states that “Defendant causes to be displayed at the same time as the representation a map including a location, marked on the map, associated with at least one of the information objects.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The image shown on page 22 of Exhibit B is taken from the Facebook website. Additionally, as claimed, “the representation [of each of at least two of the information objects] being in a uniform format, wherein the <i>format includes a card, and, within the card, in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a function mechanism giving graphical access to a set of functions.</i>” Cogmedia provides an image on page 22 of Exhibit B that shows a ‘check-in’ location and an associated location map. However the image does not depict a representation of an information object with its required elements (italicized above) as claimed. Cogmedia has therefore failed to identify what it is alleging is the “a map including a location, marked on the map, associated with at least one of the information objects” that is “displayed, <i>at the same time as the representation.</i>” Cogmedia has not shown the display of the claimed representation of the information object “at the same time as” the map including the location. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows:

Exhibit 1 - Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 9,817,562

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “causing to be displayed, at the same time as the representation, a map including a location, marked on the map, associated with at least one of the information objects” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “causing to be displayed, at the same time as the representation, a map including a location, marked on the map, associated with at least one of the information objects” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[11.pre] A method according to claim 1, further comprising:	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1 above.
[11.a] serving, to a client computing device of a first user, a first view of a first set of information objects that constitute a first collection of the first user;	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See also</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant serves to a client computing device of a first user, a first view of a first set of information objects that constitute a first collection of the first user.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. As discussed above, Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “first set of information objects that constitute a first collection of the first user” because, as claimed, “the card [includes], in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of

Exhibit 1 - Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 9,817,562

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	graphically accessible functions.” Cogmedia simply has not shown “a first set of information objects” on page 23 of Exhibit B. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 23 of Exhibit B are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “a first view of a first set of information objects that constitute a first collection of the first user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “a first view of a first set of information objects that constitute a first collection of the first user” limitation.
[11.b] also serving, to the client computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of information objects, that constitute a collection of a second user.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant also serves to the client computing device of the first user, a second view of the second set of information objects that constitute a collection of a second user.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. <i>See also</i> claim 1 above. As discussed above, Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “a second set of cards that constitute a collection of a second user” because, as claimed, “the card [includes], in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” Cogmedia simply has not shown “a second set of cards” on page 23 of Exhibit B.

Exhibit 1 - Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 9,817,562

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 23 of Exhibit B are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “also displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of information objects, that constitute a collection of a second user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “also displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of information objects, that constitute a collection of a second user” limitations.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
12. A method according to claim 11, further comprising: responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of an information object in the second view and (ii) a copy command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected information object to be copied from the second view to the	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 5 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant, responsive to a graphical selection, by the first user, of an information object in the second view and a copy command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causes the selected information object to be copied from the second view to the first view, so that the selected information object in the collection of the second user has been copied to the first collection of the first user.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website.

Exhibit 1 - Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 9,817,562

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
first view, so that the selected information object in the collection of the second user has been copied to the first collection of the first user.	Cogmedia states “responsive to a first user’s graphical selection and copy command, a Wall Street Journal article is able to be copied from the Wall Street Journal’s card collection to a first user’s card collection. In other words, the first user will now have in its card collection, a card from the Wall Street Journal’s collection.” However, Cogmedia has failed to show “the selected card in the collection of the second user appears in the first collection of the first user” on page 24 of Exhibit B. Cogmedia has also failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 24 of Exhibit B are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of an information object in the second view and (ii) a copy command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected information object to be copied from the second view to the first view, so that the selected information object in the collection of the second user has been copied to the first collection of the first user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of an information object in the second view and (ii) a copy command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected information object to be copied from the second view to the first view, so that the selected information object in the collection of the second user has been copied to the first collection of the first user” limitation.

Exhibit 1 - Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 9,817,562

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
13. A method according to claim 11, further comprising: responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of an information object in the first view and (ii) a send command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected information object to be sent to the second user, so that the selected information object in the collection of the first user is made available to the second user to be included in the collection of the second user.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 5 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant responds to a first user’s graphical selection of a card in the first view and sends a command that has been graphically entered by the first user which causes the selected card to be sent to the second user, so that the selected card in the collection of the first user is made available to the second user to be included in the collection of the second user.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “the selected card in the collection of the first user [that] is made available to the second user <i>to be included in the collection of the second user.</i>” Cogmedia has also failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook website. The images shown on page 24 of Exhibit B are taken from the Facebook application. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of an information object in the first view and (ii) a send command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected information object to be sent to the second user, so that the selected information object in the collection of the first user is made available to the second user to be included in the collection of the second user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of an information object in the first view and (ii) a send command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected information object to be sent to the second user, so that the

Exhibit 1 - Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 9,817,562

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	selected information object in the collection of the first user is made available to the second user to be included in the collection of the second user” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
14. A method according to claim 1, further comprising: on a user-entered command, causing an information object to be shared with another user when the information object and the other user have been graphically selected.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook website. The images shown on page 26 of Exhibit B are taken from the Facebook application. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
15. A method according to claim 1, further comprising: on a user-entered command, causing an information object to be shared with another user via an	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to

Exhibit 1 - Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 9,817,562

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
instant message sent through an integrated instant messaging system as a result of graphical selection by a first user.	provide any mapping to the Facebook website. The images shown on page 27 of Exhibit B are taken from the Facebook application. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[17.pre] A method according to claim 1, further comprising:	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1 above.
[17.a] serving, to a client computing device of a first user, a first view of a first set of information objects that constitute a first collection of the first user;	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 29 of Exhibit B are taken from the Facebook website. As discussed above, Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “first set of information objects that constitute a first collection of the first user” because, as claimed, the information object includes, “in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of

Exhibit 1 - Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 9,817,562

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” Cogmedia simply has not shown “a first <i>set of information objects</i>” on page 29 of Exhibit B. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “a first view of a first set of information objects that constitute a first collection of the first user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “a first view of a first set of information objects that constitute a first collection of the first user” limitation.
[17.b] also serving, to the client computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of information objects, outside of the first collection, wherein any given member of the second set of information objects is both included in a collection of another user and the other user has been selected by the first user; and wherein each of the information objects in the second view can, on a user-entered command, be caused to be copied to the first view.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 29 of Exhibit B are taken from the Facebook website. Similarly, Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “second set of information objects [] in a collection of another user” because, as claimed, the information object includes, “in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” Cogmedia simply has not shown “a second <i>set of cards</i>” on page 29 of Exhibit B. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows:

Exhibit 1 - Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 9,817,562

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “serving, to the client computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of information objects, outside of the first collection, wherein any given member of the second set of information objects is both included in a collection of another user and the other user has been selected by the first user; and wherein each of the information objects in the second view can, on a user-entered command, be caused to be copied to the first view” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “serving, to the client computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of information objects, outside of the first collection, wherein any given member of the second set of information objects is both included in a collection of another user and the other user has been selected by the first user; and wherein each of the information objects in the second view can, on a user-entered command, be caused to be copied to the first view” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
18. A method according to claim 17, wherein each of the information objects in the second view is displayed in an order determined by a criterion selected from the group consisting of the	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 17 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 30 of Exhibit B are taken from the Facebook website.

Exhibit 1 - Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 9,817,562

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
information object's creation time, its access time, and combinations thereof.	Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “each of the information objects in the second view is displayed in an order determined by a criterion selected from the group consisting of the information object's creation time, its access time, and combinations thereof” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “each of the information objects in the second view is displayed in an order determined by a criterion selected from the group consisting of the information object's creation time, its access time, and combinations thereof” limitation.

NON-INFRINGEMENT CLAIM CHART

Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[1.pre] A computer-implemented method, in which at least one computer initiates execution of software instructions to perform computer processes, the method being for interacting with at least one data item obtained from at least one source, the computer processes comprising:	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this preamble is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant through its provision of Facebook application and/or website, practices the claimed computer implemented method.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the remaining claim elements does not show each of those elements is met as to each identified service—namely, the Facebook application and accessing the Facebook website through a browser. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “at least one computer [that] initiates execution of software instructions to perform computer processes.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “method being for interacting.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “at least one data item.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “at least one source” and how the “at least one data item” is “obtained from” that “at least source.” Cogmedia has failed to map this limitation in any way to the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “at least one computer initiates execution of software instructions” or the “interacting with at least one data item obtained from at least one source, the at least one source” limitations.

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “at least one computer initiates execution of software instructions” or the “interacting with at least one data item obtained from at least one source, the at least one source” limitations. Furthermore, the elements are not met in any of the identified products for the reasons further explained below.
[1.a] responsive to a user selection of the at least one data item:	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant performs a series of steps in response to the user selection of the at least one data item.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook website. Furthermore, the elements are not met in any of the identified products for the reasons further explained below in relation to elements [1.a.i]-[1.a.ii].
[1.a.i] causing configuring of each of the data items into a distinct information object by extracting, from each data item, extracted data including a picture, a heading, and a link to the data item, and causing storing of data corresponding to each of the information objects in a database system;	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant causes configuring of each data item into a distinct information object by extracting from each data item extracted data including a picture and a heading, and a link to the data item, and causes storing of data corresponding to each information object in its database system.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “information object.” Cogmedia states “[i]n the second image, the distinct information object and its corresponding picture and heading are shown.” However the red box on pages 5-7 (Images 2, 3) of Exhibit C captures several items

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	and Cogmedia has not explained which corresponds to “a distinct information object,” “a picture,” “a heading,” and “a link” Cogmedia has failed to explain what it is alleging is the “storing of data” “in a database system.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook website, and merely provides the an end result on pages 5-7 (Image 3) of Exhibit C. Cogmedia also alleges without explanation “Defendant’s software resident on the user’s device works in concert with Defendant’s Facebook platform,” and “Facebook backend does all of the processing and simply communicates the results to the browser application for display.” Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “causing configuring of each of the data items into a distinct information object by extracting, from each data item, extracted data including a picture, a heading, and a link to the data item” or “causing storing of data corresponding to each of the information objects in a database system” limitations. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “causing configuring of each of the data items into a distinct information object by extracting, from each data item, extracted data including a picture, a heading, and a link to the data item” or “causing storing of data corresponding to each of the information objects in a database system” limitations.
[1.a.ii] displaying a representation of each of at least two of the information objects in the database system, the representation being in a uniform format, wherein the format includes a card, and, within the card, in uniform locations	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant displays a representation of each of at least two of the information objects in the database system, the representation being in a uniform format, wherein the format includes a card, and, within the card, in uniform locations thereof the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions including:	show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “representation being in a uniform format.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging are “uniform locations” “within the card.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. All images shown on pages 8-10 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “the representation being in a uniform format”, “wherein the format includes a card,” and the “within the card, in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions” limitations. The Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “the representation being in a uniform format”, “wherein the format includes a card,” and the “within the card, in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions” limitations. Furthermore, the elements are not met in any of the identified products for the reasons further explained below in relation to elements [1b]-[1.e].
[1.b] a comment function, by which users having access to the card comment function can exchange comments relating to the card, such comments	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “[o]ne of Defendant’s graphical functions of is a comment function by which users having access to the card comment function can exchange comments relating to the card, such comments being associated with the information object represented by the card.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
being associated with the information object represented by the card;	the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “information object” that is “represented by the card.” Cogmedia has also failed to identify what it is alleging are the “comments being associated with the information object represented by the card.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The image shown on page 11 of Exhibit C is taken from the Facebook website.
[1.c] a vote function, by which users having access to the card vote function can vote for the card, such votes being associated with the information object represented by the card;	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “[o]ne of Defendant’s graphical functions is a vote function, by which users having access to the card vote function can vote for the card, such votes being associated with the information object represented by the card.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “information object” that is “represented by the card.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “vote function” in each identified product. Cogmedia alleges without explanation “Defendant practices this limitation by providing its “Like” button which facilitates users’ voting.” But Cogmedia has not explained how a “Like” is a vote. Cogmedia also alleges that “Defendant further provides users with the opportunity to react to cards which facilitates users’ voting.” Cogmedia simply has not explained how a “Like” is a vote.

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Cogmedia has also not explained how the use of a “Like” function and/or reactions to a card is representative of a “vote function.” Cogmedia has also failed to identify what it is alleging are the “votes being associated with the information object represented by the card.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on pages 12-13 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “vote function, by which users having access to the card vote function can vote for the card” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “vote function, by which users having access to the card vote function can vote for the card” limitation.
[1.d] a copy function, by which users having access to the card copy function in a first collection of cards can cause the card to appear in a second collection of cards; and	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “[o]ne of Defendant’s graphical functions is a copy function, in this example a “Share” button, by which users having access to the card copy function in a first collection of cards of a first user can cause the card to appear in a second collection of cards of a second user.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “copy function” in each identified product. Cogmedia alleges without explanation “Defendant’s Share button is a copy function.” Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of a “Share” function is representative of a “copy function.”

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Notably, as claimed, “the card [includes], in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” Cogmedia has therefore failed to identify what it is alleging is the “first collection of cards of a first user.” Cogmedia has also failed to identify what it is alleging is the “second collection of cards of a second user.” Cogmedia has also failed to identify what it is alleging “cause[s] the card to appear” in the “second collection of cards of a second user.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 14 of Exhibit C is taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “copy function, by which users having access to the card copy function in a first collection of cards of a first user can cause the card to appear in a second collection of cards of a second user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “copy function, by which users having access to the card copy function in a first collection of cards of a first user can cause the card to appear in a second collection of cards of a second user” limitation.
[1.e] a link function, by which users having access to the card link function can invoke the link to the data item; and	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “[o]ne of Defendant’s graphical functions is a link function, by which users having access to the card link function can invoke the link to the data item.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The image shown on page 15 of Exhibit C is taken from the Facebook website.

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[1.f] wherein the set of indicators includes: an indicator reflecting commenting activity associated with the card; and	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant’s set of indicators includes an indicator reflecting commenting activity associated with the card.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The image shown on page 16 of Exhibit C is taken from the Facebook website.
[1.g] wherein the database system has been configured to allow (i) each user to have at least one user-selected collection of cards representing information objects in the database system and (ii) at least some content of cards, including any associated picture and heading, regardless of the collections in which they may have first appeared, to be made accessible and copyable across card collections of users.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant configures its database system to allow each user to have at least one user-selected collection of cards representing information objects in the database system and cards, regardless of the collections in which they have first appeared, to be made accessible and copyable across card collections of different users.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “user-selected collection of cards representing information objects in the database system.” Cogmedia cites to the New York Times collection of cards, fails to explain how that is representative of a “collection of cards.” No “collection” of cards is shown on page 17 of Exhibit C. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is providing “accessible and copyable” cards “across card collections of different users.” Cogmedia states “Defendant’s Share button [] allows for the cards to be copyable across collections of different users.” However, as mentioned above,

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of a “Share” function is representative of a “copy function.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 17 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “configured to allow (i) each user to have at least one user-selected collection of cards representing information objects in the database system” and “(ii) cards, regardless of the collections in which they may have first appeared, to be made accessible and copyable across card collections of different users” limitations. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “configured to allow (i) each user to have at least one user-selected collection of cards representing information objects in the database system” and “(ii) cards, regardless of the collections in which they may have first appeared, to be made accessible and copyable across card collections of different users” limitations.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
2. A method according to claim 1, the computer processes further comprising: displaying a graphical button, which, when invoked while content is being displayed, causes the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items,	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this claim is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant provides a user interface having a graphical button which when invoked while content is being displayed causes the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
namely, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format.	the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. <i>See also</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “graphical button” with the claimed functionality of “[causing] the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items” “by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format.” Specifically, Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of a “Share” or “Share now” button results in the claimed actions of “[causing] the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, namely, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 18 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “causes the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, namely, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “causes the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, namely, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
3. A method according to claim 1, wherein the format includes within the card an indication of a date of creation.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this claim is met. <i>See also</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant’s computer-implemented method further comprises a format which includes within the card an indication of a date of creation.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 19 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “wherein the format includes within the card an indication of a date of creation” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “wherein the format includes within the card an indication of a date of creation” limitation.

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
4. A method according to claim 1, wherein the format includes a user-accessible report relating to users who copied the information object.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this claim is met. <i>See also</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant practices this limitation in part by displaying within the format of the card an indicator showing the number of users who have copied or shared the information object.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. As discussed above, Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of a “Share” function is representative of “[copying] the information object.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 20 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “wherein the format includes a user-accessible report relating to users who copied the information object” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “wherein the format includes a user-accessible report relating to users who copied the information object” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[5.pre] A method according to claim 1, further comprising:	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim.
[5.a] displaying in a computing device of a first user, a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user;	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See also</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant displays in a computing device a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. As discussed above, Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user” because, as claimed, “the card [includes], in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” Cogmedia simply has not shown “a first set of cards” on page 21 of Exhibit C. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 21 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[5.b] also displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of cards that constitute a collection of a second user.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant also displays in the computing device of the first user a second view of a second set of cards that constitutes a collection of a second user.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. <i>See also</i> claim 1 above. As discussed above, Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “a second set of cards that constitute a collection of a second user” because, as claimed, “the card [includes], in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” Cogmedia simply has not shown “a second set of cards” on page 21 of Exhibit C. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 21 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “also displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of cards that constitute a collection of a second user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “also displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of cards that constitute a collection of a second user” limitations.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
6. A method according to claim 5, further comprising: responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of a card in the second view and (ii) a copy command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected card to be copied from the second view to the first view, so that the selected card in the collection of the second user appears in the first collection of the first user.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 5 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant responds to a first user’s graphical selection of a card in the second view and a copy command by that user by causing the selected card to be copied from the second view to the first view, so that the selected card in the collection of the second user appears in the first collection of the first user.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia states “responsive to a first user’s graphical selection and copy command, a Wall Street Journal article is able to be copied from the Wall Street Journal’s card collection to a first user’s card collection. In other words, the first user will now have in its card collection, a card from the Wall Street Journal’s collection.” However, Cogmedia has failed to show “the selected card in the collection of the second user appears in the first collection of the first user” on page 22 of Exhibit C; the images provided here are similar to those provided for claim 5. Cogmedia has also failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 22 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of a card in the second view and (ii) a copy command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected card to be copied from the second view to the first view, so that the selected card in the collection of the second user appears in the first collection of the first user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	browser does not practice, at least the “responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of a card in the second view and (ii) a copy command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected card to be copied from the second view to the first view, so that the selected card in the collection of the second user appears in the first collection of the first user” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
7. A method according to claim 5, further comprising: responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of a card in the first view and (ii) a send command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected card to be sent to the second user, so that the selected card in the collection of the first user is made available to the second user to be included in the collection of the second user.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 5 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant responds to a first user’s graphical selection of a card in the first view and sends a command that has been graphically entered by the first user which causes the selected card to be sent to the second user, so that the selected card in the collection of the first user is made available to the second user to be included in the collection of the second user.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “the selected card in the collection of the first user [that] is made available to the second user <i>to be included in the collection of the second user.</i>” Cogmedia has also failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook website. The images shown on page 23 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook application. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of a card in the first view and (ii) a send command that has been

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected card to be sent to the second user, so that the selected card in the collection of the first user is made available to the second user to be included in the collection of the second user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of a card in the first view and (ii) a send command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected card to be sent to the second user, so that the selected card in the collection of the first user is made available to the second user to be included in the collection of the second user” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
8. A method according to claim 1, further comprising: on a user-entered command, causing a card to be shared with another user when the card and the other user have been graphically selected.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook website. The images shown on page 24 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook application.

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
9. A method according to claim 1, further comprising: on a user-entered command, causing a card to be shared with another user via an instant message sent through an integrated instant messaging system as a result of graphical selection by a first user.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook website. The images shown on page 26 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook application. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[10.pre] A method according to claim 1, further comprising:	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1.
[10.a] displaying in a computing device of a first user, a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user;	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 27 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website.

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	As discussed above, Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user” because, as claimed, “the card [includes], in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” Cogmedia simply has not shown “a first <i>set of cards</i>” on page 27 of Exhibit C. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user” limitation.
[10.b] also displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of cards, outside of the first collection, wherein any given member of the second set of cards is both included in a collection of another user and the other user has been selected by the first user; and	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 27 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Similarly, Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “second set of cards [] in a collection of another user” because, as claimed, “the card [includes], in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” Cogmedia simply has not shown “a second <i>set of cards</i>” on page 27 of Exhibit C. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows:

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of cards, outside of the first collection” and “wherein any given member of the second set of cards is both included in a collection of another user and the other user has been selected by the first user” limitations. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of cards, outside of the first collection” and “wherein any given member of the second set of cards is both included in a collection of another user and the other user has been selected by the first user” limitations.
[10.c] wherein each of the cards in the second view can, on a user-entered command, be caused to be copied to the first view.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 27 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Cogmedia alleges without explanation that the ““Share” button [] allows any of the cards in the second view to be copied to the first view.” Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of the “Share” button is representative of a copying “each of the cards in the second view” “to the first view.” Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “wherein each of the cards in

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	the second view can, on a user-entered command, be caused to be copied to the first view” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “wherein each of the cards in the second view can, on a user-entered command, be caused to be copied to the first view” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
11. A method according to claim 10, wherein each of the cards in the second view is displayed in an order determined by a criterion selected from the group consisting of the information object's creation time, its access time, and combinations thereof.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 10 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 28 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “wherein each of the cards in the second view is displayed in an order determined by a criterion selected from the group consisting of the information object's creation time, its access time, and combinations thereof” limitations. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	browser does not practice, at least the “wherein each of the cards in the second view is displayed in an order determined by a criterion selected from the group consisting of the information object's creation time, its access time, and combinations thereof” limitations.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
12. A method according to claim 1, wherein the set of indicators includes: an indicator reflecting voting activity associated with the card.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 29 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. As discussed above, Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is a vote in each identified product. Cogmedia alleges without explanation “Defendant practices this limitation by providing an indicator reflecting the number of people who have liked, reacted, or otherwise voted on information associated with the card.” However, Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of a “Like” function and/or reactions to a card is representative of a “vote” or “voting activity.” Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “an indicator reflecting voting activity associated with the card” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	browser does not practice, at least the “an indicator reflecting voting activity associated with the card” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
13. A method according to claim 12, wherein the indicator reflecting voting activity associated with the card provides a numeric count of the voting activity.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 12 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 30 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “wherein the indicator reflecting voting activity associated with the card provides a numeric count of the voting activity” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “wherein the indicator reflecting voting activity associated with the card provides a numeric count of the voting activity” limitation.

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
15. A method according to claim 1, wherein the indicator reflecting commenting activity associated with the card provides a numeric count of the commenting activity.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 31 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[17.pre] A computer-implemented method, in which at least one computer initiates execution of software instructions to perform computer processes, the method being for interacting with at least one data item obtained from at least one source, the computer processes comprising:	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this preamble is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant through its provision of Facebook application and/or website, practices the claimed computer implemented method.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the remaining claim elements does not show each of those elements is met as to each identified service—namely, the Facebook application and accessing the Facebook website through a browser. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “at least one computer [that] initiates execution of software instructions to perform computer processes.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “method being for interacting.”

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “at least one data item.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “at least one source” and how the “at least one data item” is “obtained from” that “at least one source.” Cogmedia has failed to map this limitation in any way to the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “at least one computer initiates execution of software instructions” or the “interacting with at least one data item obtained from at least one source, the at least one source” limitations. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “at least one computer initiates execution of software instructions” or the “interacting with at least one data item obtained from at least one source” limitations. Furthermore, the elements are not met in any of the identified products for the reasons further explained below.
[17.a] responsive to a user selection of the at least one data item:	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant performs a series of steps in response to the user selection of the at least one data item.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook website. Furthermore, the elements are not met in any of the identified products for the reasons further explained below in relation to elements [17.a.i]-[17.a.ii].

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[17.a.i] causing configuring of each of the data items into a distinct information object by extracting, from each data item, extracted data including a picture, a heading, and a link to the data item, and causing storing of data corresponding to each of the information objects in a database system;	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant causes configuring of each data item into a distinct information object by extracting from each data item extracted data including a picture and a heading, and causes storing of data corresponding to each information object, including a link to the at least one data item in a database.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “information object.” Cogmedia states “[i]n the second image, the distinct information object and its corresponding picture and heading are shown.” However the red box on pages 35-37 (Images 2, 3) of Exhibit C captures several items and Cogmedia has not explained which corresponds to “distinct information object,” “a picture, a heading, and a link to the data item.” Cogmedia has failed to explain what it is alleging is the “storing of data” “in a database system.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook website, and merely provides the an end result on pages 35-37 (Image 3) of Exhibit C. Cogmedia also alleges without explanation “Defendant’s software resident on the user’s device works in concert with Defendant’s Facebook platform,” and “Facebook backend does all of the processing and simply communicates the results to the browser application for display.” Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “causing configuring of each of the data items into a distinct information object by extracting, from each data item, extracted data including a picture, a heading, and a link to the data item” or “causing storing of data corresponding to each of the information objects in a database system” limitations.

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “causing configuring of each of the data items into a distinct information object by extracting, from each data item, extracted data including a picture, a heading, and a link to the data item” or “causing storing of data corresponding to each of the information objects in a database system” limitations.
[17.a.ii] displaying a representation of each of at least two of the information objects in the database system, the representation being in a uniform format, wherein the format includes a card, and, within the card, in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions including:	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant displays a representation of each of at least two of the information objects in the database system, the representation being in a uniform format, wherein the format includes a card, and, within the card, in uniform locations thereof the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “representation being in a uniform format.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging are “uniform locations” “within the card.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. All images shown on pages 38-40 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “the representation being in a uniform format”, “wherein the format includes a card,” and the “within the card, in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions” limitations. The Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “the representation being in a uniform format”, “wherein the format includes a card,” and the “within the card, in uniform

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions” limitations. Furthermore, the elements are not met in any of the identified products for the reasons further explained below in relation to elements [1b]-[1.e].
[17.b] a comment function, by which users having access to the card comment function can exchange comments relating to the card, such comments being associated with the information object represented by the card;	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “[o]ne of Defendant’s graphical functions of is a comment function by which users having access to the card comment function can exchange comments relating to the card, such comments being associated with the information object represented by the card.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “information object” that is “represented by the card.” Cogmedia has also failed to identify what it is alleging are the “comments being associated with the information object represented by the card.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The image shown on page 41 of Exhibit C is taken from the Facebook website.
[17.c] a vote function, by which users having access to the card vote function can vote for the card, such votes being	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “[o]ne of Defendant’s graphical functions is a vote function, by which users having access to the card vote function can vote for the card, such votes being associated with the information object represented by the card.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
associated with the information object represented by the card;	element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “information object” that is “represented by the card.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “vote function” in each identified product. Cogmedia alleges without explanation “Defendant practices this limitation by providing its “Like” button which facilitates users’ voting.” Cogmedia also alleges that “Defendant further provides users with the opportunity to react to cards which facilitates users’ voting.” Cogmedia simply has not explained how a “Like” is a vote. Cogmedia has also not explained how the use of a “Like” function and/or reactions to a card is representative of a “vote function.” Cogmedia has also failed to identify what it is alleging are the “votes being associated with the information object represented by the card.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on pages 42-43 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “vote function, by which users having access to the card vote function can vote for the card” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “vote function, by which users having access to the card vote function can vote for the card” limitation.
[17.d] a copy function, by which users having access to the card copy function in a first collection of cards can cause the	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “[o]ne of Defendant’s graphical functions is a copy function, in this example a “Share” button, by which users having access to the card copy function in a first collection of cards of a first user

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
card to appear in a second collection of cards; and	can cause the card to appear in a second collection of cards of a second user.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “copy function” in each identified product. Cogmedia alleges without explanation “Defendant’s Share button is a copy function.” Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of a “Share” function is representative of a “copy function.” Notably, as claimed, “the card [includes], in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” Cogmedia has therefore failed to identify what it is alleging is the “first collection of cards.” Cogmedia has also failed to identify what it is alleging is the “second collection of cards.” Cogmedia has also failed to identify what it is alleging “cause[s] the card to appear” in the “second collection of cards.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 44 of Exhibit C is taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “a copy function, by which users having access to the card copy function in a first collection of cards can cause the card to appear in a second collection of cards” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “a copy function, by which users having access to the card copy function in a first collection of cards can cause the card to appear in a second collection of cards” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[17.e] wherein the set of indicators includes: an indicator reflecting commenting activity associated with the card; and	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant’s set of indicators includes an indicator reflecting commenting activity associated with the card.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The image shown on page 45 of Exhibit C is taken from the Facebook website.
[17.f] wherein the database system has been configured to allow (i) each user to have at least one user-selected collection of cards representing information objects in the database system and (ii) at least some content of cards, including any associated picture and heading, regardless of the collections in which they may have first appeared, to be made accessible and copyable across card collections of users.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant configures its database system to allow each user to have at least one user-selected collection of cards representing information objects in the database system and cards, regardless of the collections in which they have first appeared, to be made accessible and copyable across card collections of different users.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “user-selected collection of cards representing information objects in the database system.” Cogmedia cites to the New York Times collection of cards, fails to explain how that is representative of a “collection of cards.” No “collection” of cards is shown on page 46 of Exhibit C. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is providing “accessible and copyable” cards “across card collections of different users.” Cogmedia states “Defendant’s Share button [] allows for the cards to be copyable across collections of different users.” However, as mentioned above, Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of a “Share” function is representative of a “copy function.”

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 46 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “configured to allow (i) each user to have at least one user-selected collection of cards representing information objects in the database system and (ii) at least some content of cards, including any associated picture and heading, regardless of the collections in which they may have first appeared, to be made accessible and copyable across card collections of users” limitations. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “configured to allow (i) each user to have at least one user-selected collection of cards representing information objects in the database system and (ii) at least some content of cards, including any associated picture and heading, regardless of the collections in which they may have first appeared, to be made accessible and copyable across card collections of users” limitations.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
18. A method according to claim 17, wherein the extracted data from each data item includes at least the picture and the heading and wherein the heading is included within the card.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant extracts data from each data item including at least a picture and heading, the heading being included in Defendant’s card format.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is “within the card.”

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. All images shown on page 47 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “wherein the extracted data from each data item includes at least the picture and the heading and wherein the heading is included within the card” limitations. The Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “wherein the extracted data from each data item includes at least the picture and the heading and wherein the heading is included within the card” limitations.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
19. A method according to claim 17, the computer processes further comprising: displaying a graphical button, which, when invoked while content is being displayed, causes the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, namely, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this claim is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant provides a user interface having a graphical button which when invoked while content is being displayed causes the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. <i>See also</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “graphical button” with the claimed functionality of “[causing] the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items” “by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format.” Specifically, Cogmedia

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	simply has not explained how the use of a “Share” or “Share now” button results in the claimed actions of “[causing] the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, namely, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 48 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “causes the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, namely, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “causes the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, namely, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
20. A method according to claim 17, wherein the format includes within the card an indication of a date of creation.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this claim is met. <i>See also</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant’s computer-implemented method further comprises a format which includes within the card an indication of a date of creation.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 49 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “wherein the format includes within the card an indication of a date of creation” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “wherein the format includes within the card an indication of a date of creation” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
21. A method according to claim 17, wherein the format includes a user-accessible report relating to users who copied the information object.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this claim is met. <i>See also</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant’s uniform format includes a user-accessible report relating to the number of users who have copied or shared the information object.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website.

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	As discussed above, Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of a “Share” function is representative of “[copying] the information object.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 50 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “wherein the format includes a user-accessible report relating to users who copied the information object” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “wherein the format includes a user-accessible report relating to users who copied the information object” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[22.pre] A method according to claim 17, further comprising:	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this preamble is met. <i>See</i> claim 1.
[22.a] displaying in a computing device of a first user, a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user;	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See also</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant displays in a computing device a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. As discussed above, Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user” because, as claimed, “the card [includes], in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” Cogmedia simply has not shown “a first set of cards” on page 51 of Exhibit C. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 51 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user” limitation.
[22.b] also displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of cards that constitute a collection of a second user.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant also displays in the computing device of the first user a second view of a second set of cards that constitutes a collection of a second user.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. <i>See also</i> claim 1 above.

Exhibit 2 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 10,664,141

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	As discussed above, Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “a second set of cards that constitute a collection of a second user” because, as claimed, “the card [includes], in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” Cogmedia simply has not shown “a second set of cards” on page 51 of Exhibit C. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 51 of Exhibit C are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “also displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of cards that constitute a collection of a second user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “also displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of cards that constitute a collection of a second user” limitations.

NON-INFRINGEMENT CLAIM CHART

Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[1.pre] A computer-implemented method, in which at least one computer initiates execution of software instructions to perform computer processes, the method being for interacting with at least one data item obtained from at least one source, the at least one source being external to the at least one computer, the computer processes comprising:	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this preamble is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant through its provision of Facebook application and/or website, practices the claimed computer implemented method.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the remaining claim elements does not show each of those elements is met as to each identified service—namely, the Facebook application and accessing the Facebook website through a browser. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “at least one computer [that] initiates execution of software instructions to perform computer processes.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “method being for interacting.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “at least one data item.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “at least one source” and how the “at least one data item” is “obtained from” that “at least source” is “external to that at least one computer” Cogmedia has failed to map this limitation in any way to the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “at least one computer initiates execution of software instructions” or the “interacting with at least one data item obtained from at least one source, the at least one source being external to the at least one computer” limitations. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “at least one computer initiates execution of software instructions” or the “interacting with at least one data item

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	obtained from at least one source, the at least one source being external to the at least one computer” limitations. Furthermore, the elements are not met in any of the identified products for the reasons further explained below.
[1.a] responsive to a user selection of the at least one data item:	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant performs a series of steps in response to the user selection of the at least one data item.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook website. Furthermore, the elements are not met in any of the identified products for the reasons further explained below in relation to elements [1.a.i]-[1.a.ii].
[1.a.i] causing configuring of each of the data items into a distinct information object by extracting, from each data item, extracted data including a picture and a heading, and causing storing of data corresponding to each of the information objects, including a link to the at least one data item, in a database system;	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant causes configuring of each data item into a distinct information object by extracting from each data item extracted data including a picture and a heading, and causes storing of data corresponding to each information object, including a link to the at least one data item in a database.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “information object.” Cogmedia states “[i]n the second image, the distinct information object and its corresponding picture and heading are shown.” However the red box on pages 5-7 (Images 2, 3) of Exhibit A captures several items and Cogmedia has not explained which corresponds to “the distinct information object,” “its corresponding picture,” and “heading.”

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Cogmedia has failed to explain what it is alleging is the “storing of data” “in a database system.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook website, and merely provides the an end result on pages 5-7 (Image 3) of Exhibit A. Cogmedia also alleges without explanation “Defendant’s software resident on the user’s device works in concert with Defendant’s Facebook platform,” and “Facebook backend does all of the processing and simply communicates the results to the browser application for display.” Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “causing configuring of each of the data items into a distinct information object by extracting, from each data item, extracted data including a picture and a heading” or “causing storing of data corresponding to each of the information objects, including a link to the at least one data item, in a database system” limitations. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “causing configuring of each of the data items into a distinct information object by extracting, from each data item, extracted data including a picture and a heading” or “causing storing of data corresponding to each of the information objects, including a link to the at least one data item, in a database system” limitations.
[1.a.ii] displaying a representation of each of at least two of the information objects in the database system, the representation being in a uniform format, wherein the format includes a card, and, within the card, in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant displays a representation of each of at least two of the information objects in the database system, the representation being in a uniform format, wherein the format includes a card, and, within the card, in uniform locations thereof the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website.

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions including:	Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “representation being in a uniform format.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging are “uniform locations” “within the card.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. All images shown on pages 8-10 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “the representation being in a uniform format”, “wherein the format includes a card,” and the “within the card, in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions” limitations. The Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “the representation being in a uniform format”, “wherein the format includes a card,” and the “within the card, in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions” limitations. Furthermore, the elements are not met in any of the identified products for the reasons further explained below in relation to elements [1b]-[1.e].
[1.b] a comment function, by which users having access to the card comment function can exchange comments relating to the card, such comments being associated with the information object represented by the card;	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “[o]ne of Defendant’s graphical functions of is a comment function by which users having access to the card comment function can exchange comments relating to the card, such comments being associated with the information object represented by the card.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website.

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “information object” that is “represented by the card.” Cogmedia has also failed to identify what it is alleging are the “comments being associated with the information object represented by the card.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The image shown on page 11 of Exhibit A is taken from the Facebook website.
[1.c] a vote function, by which users having access to the card vote function can vote for the card, such votes being associated with the information object represented by the card;	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “[o]ne of Defendant’s graphical functions is a vote function, by which users having access to the card vote function can vote for the card, such votes being associated with the information object represented by the card.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “information object” that is “represented by the card.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “vote function” in each identified product. Cogmedia alleges without explanation “Defendant practices this limitation by providing its “Like” button which facilitates users’ voting.” Cogmedia also alleges that “Defendant further provides users with the opportunity to react to cards which facilitates users’ voting.” Cogmedia simply has not explained how a “Like” is a vote. Cogmedia has also not explained how the use of a “Like” function and/or reactions to a card is representative of a “vote function.” Cogmedia has also failed to identify what it is alleging are the “votes being associated with the information object represented by the card.”

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on pages 12-13 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “vote function, by which users having access to the card vote function can vote for the card” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “vote function, by which users having access to the card vote function can vote for the card” limitation.
[1.d] a copy function, by which users having access to the card copy function in a first collection of cards of a first user can cause the card to appear in a second collection of cards of a second user; and	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “[o]ne of Defendant’s graphical functions is a copy function, in this example a “Share” button, by which users having access to the card copy function in a first collection of cards of a first user can cause the card to appear in a second collection of cards of a second user.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “copy function” in each identified product. Cogmedia alleges without explanation “Defendant’s Share button is a copy function.” Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of a “Share” function is representative of a “copy function.” Notably, as claimed, “the card [includes], in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” Cogmedia has therefore failed to identify what it is alleging is the “first collection of cards of a first user.” Cogmedia has also failed to identify what it is alleging is the “second collection of cards of a second user.” Cogmedia has also failed to identify what it is alleging “cause[s] the card to appear” in the “second collection of cards of a second user.”

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 14 of Exhibit A is taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “a copy function, by which users having access to the card copy function in a first collection of cards of a first user can cause the card to appear in a second collection of cards of a second user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “a copy function, by which users having access to the card copy function in a first collection of cards of a first user can cause the card to appear in a second collection of cards of a second user” limitation.
[1.e] a link function, by which users having access to the card link function can invoke the link to the data item; and	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “[o]ne of Defendant’s graphical functions is a link function, by which users having access to the card link function can invoke the link to the data item.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The image shown on page 15 of Exhibit A is taken from the Facebook website.
[1.f] wherein the set of indicators includes: an indicator reflecting commenting activity associated with the card; and	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant’s set of indicators includes an indicator reflecting commenting activity associated with the card.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website.

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The image shown on page 16 of Exhibit A is taken from the Facebook website.
[1.g] wherein the database system has been configured to allow (i) each user to have at least one user-selected collection of cards representing information objects in the database system and (ii) cards, regardless of the collections in which they may have first appeared, to be made accessible and copyable across card collections of different users.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant configures its database system to allow each user to have at least one user-selected collection of cards representing information objects in the database system and cards, regardless of the collections in which they have first appeared, to be made accessible and copyable across card collections of different users.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “user-selected collection of cards representing information objects in the database system.” Cogmedia cites to the New York Times collection of cards, fails to explain how that is representative of a “collection of cards.” No “collection” of cards is shown on page 17 of Exhibit A. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is providing “accessible and copyable” cards “across card collections of different users.” Cogmedia states “Defendant’s Share button [] allows for the cards to be copyable across collections of different users.” However, as mentioned above, Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of a “Share” function is representative of a “copy function.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 17 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “configured to allow (i) each user to have at least one user-selected collection of cards representing information objects in the database system” and

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	“(ii) cards, regardless of the collections in which they may have first appeared, to be made accessible and copyable across card collections of different users” limitations. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “configured to allow (i) each user to have at least one user-selected collection of cards representing information objects in the database system” and “(ii) cards, regardless of the collections in which they may have first appeared, to be made accessible and copyable across card collections of different users” limitations.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
2. A method according to claim 1, the computer processes further comprising: displaying a graphical button, which, when invoked while content is being displayed, causes the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, namely, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this claim is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant provides a user interface having a graphical button which when invoked while content is being displayed causes the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. <i>See also</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “graphical button” with the claimed functionality of “[causing] the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items” “by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format.” Specifically, Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of a “Share” or “Share now” button results in the claimed actions of “[causing] the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, namely, by

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 18 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “causes the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, namely, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “causes the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, namely, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
3. A method according to claim 1, wherein the format includes within the card an indication of a date of creation.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this claim is met. <i>See also</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant’s computer-implemented method further comprises a format which includes within the card an indication of a date of creation.” But Cogmedia’s

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 19 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “wherein the format includes within the card an indication of a date of creation” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “wherein the format includes within the card an indication of a date of creation” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
4. A method according to claim 1, wherein the format includes a user-accessible report relating to users who copied the information object.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this claim is met. <i>See also</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant practices this limitation in part by displaying within the format of the card an indicator showing the number of users who have copied or shared the information object.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. As discussed above, Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of a “Share” function is representative of “[copying] the information object.”

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 20 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “wherein the format includes a user-accessible report relating to users who copied the information object” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “wherein the format includes a user-accessible report relating to users who copied the information object” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[5.pre] A method according to claim 1, further comprising:	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1 above. The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim.
[5.a] displaying in a computing device of a first user, a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user; and	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See also</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant displays in a computing device a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website.

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	As discussed above, Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user” because, as claimed, “the card [includes], in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” Cogmedia simply has not shown “a first set of cards” on page 21 of Exhibit A. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 21 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user” limitation.
[5.b] also displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of cards that constitute a collection of a second user.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant also displays in the computing device of the first user a second view of a second set of cards that constitutes a collection of a second user.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. <i>See also</i> claim 1 above. As discussed above, Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “a second set of cards that constitute a collection of a second user” because, as claimed, “the card [includes], in uniform

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” Cogmedia simply has not shown “a second set of cards” on page 21 of Exhibit A. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 21 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “also displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of cards that constitute a collection of a second user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “also displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of cards that constitute a collection of a second user” limitations.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
6. A method according to claim 5, further comprising: responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of a card in the second view and (ii) a copy command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected card to be copied from the	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 5 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant responds to a first user’s graphical selection of a card in the second view and a copy command by that user by causing the selected card to be copied from the second view to the first view, so that the selected card in the collection of the second user appears in the first collection of the first user.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
second view to the first view, so that the selected card in the collection of the second user appears in the first collection of the first user.	Cogmedia states “responsive to a first user’s graphical selection and copy command, a Wall Street Journal article is able to be copied from the Wall Street Journal’s card collection to a first user’s card collection. In other words, the first user will now have in its card collection, a card from the Wall Street Journal’s collection.” However, Cogmedia has failed to show “the selected card in the collection of the second user appears in the first collection of the first user” on page 22 of Exhibit A; the images provided here are similar to those provided for claim 5. Cogmedia has also failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 22 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of a card in the second view and (ii) a copy command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected card to be copied from the second view to the first view, so that the selected card in the collection of the second user appears in the first collection of the first user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of a card in the second view and (ii) a copy command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected card to be copied from the second view to the first view, so that the selected card in the collection of the second user appears in the first collection of the first user” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
7. A method according to claim 5, further comprising: responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of a card in the first view and (ii) a send command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected card to be sent to the second user, so that the selected card in the collection of the first user is made available to the second user to be included in the collection of the second user.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 5 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant responds to a first user’s graphical selection of a card in the first view and sends a command that has been graphically entered by the first user which causes the selected card to be sent to the second user, so that the selected card in the collection of the first user is made available to the second user to be included in the collection of the second user.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “the selected card in the collection of the first user [that] is made available to the second user <i>to be included in the collection of the second user.</i>” Cogmedia has also failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook website. The images shown on page 23 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook application. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of a card in the first view and (ii) a send command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected card to be sent to the second user, so that the selected card in the collection of the first user is made available to the second user to be included in the collection of the second user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of a card in the first view and (ii) a send command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected card to be sent to the second user, so that the selected card in the collection of

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	the first user is made available to the second user to be included in the collection of the second user” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
8. A method according to claim 1, further comprising: on a user-entered command, causing a card to be shared with another user when the card and the other user have been graphically selected.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook website. The images shown on page 24 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook application.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
9. A method according to claim 1, further comprising: on a user-entered command, causing a card to be shared with another user via an instant message sent through an integrated instant messaging system as a result of graphical selection by a first user.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook website. The images shown on page 26 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook application. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim.

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “on a user-entered command, causing a card to be shared with another user via an instant message sent through an integrated instant messaging system as a result of graphical selection by a first user” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[10.pre] A method according to claim 1, further comprising:	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1 above.
[10.a] displaying in a computing device of a first user, a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user;	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 27 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. As discussed above, Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user” because, as claimed, “the card [includes], in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” Cogmedia simply has not shown “a first <i>set of cards</i>” on page 27 of Exhibit A. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows:

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user” limitation.
[10.b] also displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of cards, outside of the first collection, wherein any given member of the second set of cards is both included in a collection of another user and the other user has been selected by the first user; and	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 27 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Similarly, Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “second set of cards [] in a collection of another user” because, as claimed, “the card [includes], in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” Cogmedia simply has not shown “a second <i>set of cards</i>” on page 27 of Exhibit A. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of cards, outside of the first collection” and “wherein any given member of the second set of cards is both included in a collection of another user and the other user has been selected by the first user” limitation.

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of cards, outside of the first collection” and “wherein any given member of the second set of cards is both included in a collection of another user and the other user has been selected by the first user” limitation.
[10.c] wherein each of the cards in the second view can, on a user-entered command, be caused to be copied to the first view.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 27 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Cogmedia alleges without explanation that the ““Share” button [] allows any of the cards in the second view to be copied to the first view.” Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of the “Share” button is representative of a copying “each of the cards in the second view” “to the first view.” Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “wherein each of the cards in the second view can, on a user-entered command, be caused to be copied to the first view” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	browser does not practice, at least the “wherein each of the cards in the second view can, on a user-entered command, be caused to be copied to the first view” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
11. A method according to claim 10, wherein each of the cards in the second view is displayed in an order determined by a criterion selected from the group consisting of the information object’s creation time, its access time, and combinations thereof.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 10 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 28 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “each of the cards in the second view is displayed in an order determined by a criterion selected from the group consisting of the information object's creation time, its access time, and combinations thereof” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “each of the cards in the second view is displayed in an order determined by a criterion selected from the group consisting of the information object's creation time, its access time, and combinations thereof” limitation.

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
12. A method according to claim 1, wherein the set of indicators includes: an indicator reflecting voting activity associated with the card.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 29 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. As discussed above, Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is a vote in each identified product. Cogmedia alleges without explanation “Defendant practices this limitation by providing an indicator reflecting the number of people who have liked, reacted, or otherwise voted on information associated with the card.” However, Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of a “Like” function and/or reactions to a card is representative of “voting activity.” Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “an indicator reflecting voting activity associated with the card” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “an indicator reflecting voting activity associated with the card” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
13. A method according to claim 12, wherein the indicator reflecting voting	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 12 above.

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
activity associated with the card provides a numeric count of the voting activity.	Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 30 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “wherein the indicator reflecting voting activity associated with the card provides a numeric count of the voting activity” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “wherein the indicator reflecting voting activity associated with the card provides a numeric count of the voting activity” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
14. A method according to claim 1, wherein the indicator reflecting commenting activity associated with the card provides a numeric count of the commenting activity.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 1 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 31 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows:

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[15.pre] A computer-implemented method, in which at least one computer initiates execution of software instructions to perform computer processes, the method being for interacting with at least one data item obtained from at least one source, the at least one source being external to the at least one computer, the computer processes comprising:	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this preamble is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant through its provision of Facebook application and/or website, practices the claimed computer implemented method.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the remaining claim elements does not show each of those elements is met as to each identified service—namely, the Facebook application and accessing the Facebook website through a browser. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “at least one computer [that] initiates execution of software instructions to perform computer processes.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “method being for interacting.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “at least one data item.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “at least one source” and how the “at least one data item” is “obtained from” that “at least source” is “external to that at least one computer” Cogmedia has failed to map this limitation in any way to the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows:

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “at least one computer initiates execution of software instructions” or the “interacting with at least one data item obtained from at least one source, the at least one source being external to the at least one computer” limitations. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “at least one computer initiates execution of software instructions” or the “interacting with at least one data item obtained from at least one source, the at least one source being external to the at least one computer” limitations. Furthermore, the elements are not met in any of the identified products for the reasons further explained below.
[15.a] responsive to a user selection of the at least one data item:	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant performs a series of steps in response to the user selection of the at least one data item.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook website. Furthermore, the elements are not met in any of the identified products for the reasons further explained below in relation to elements [15.a.i]-[15.a.ii].
[15.a.i] causing configuring of each of the data items into a distinct information object by extracting, from each data item, extracted data including a picture and a heading, and causing storing of	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant causes configuring of each data item into a distinct information object by extracting from each data item extracted data including a picture and a heading, and causes storing of data corresponding to each information object, including a link to the at least one data item in a database.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website.

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
data corresponding to each of the information objects in a database system;	Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “information object.” Cogmedia states “[i]n the second image, the distinct information object and its corresponding picture and heading are shown.” However the red box on pages 35-37 (Images 2, 3) of Exhibit A captures several items and Cogmedia has not explained which corresponds to “the distinct information object,” “its corresponding picture,” and “heading.” Cogmedia has failed to explain what it is alleging is the “storing of data” “in a database system.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook website, and merely provides the an end result on pages 35-37 (Image 3) of Exhibit A. Cogmedia also alleges without explanation “Defendant’s software resident on the user’s device works in concert with Defendant’s Facebook platform,” and “Facebook backend does all of the processing and simply communicates the results to the browser application for display.” Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “causing configuring of each of the data items into a distinct information object by extracting, from each data item, extracted data including a picture and a heading” or “causing storing of data corresponding to each of the information objects, including a link to the at least one data item, in a database system” limitations. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “causing configuring of each of the data items into a distinct information object by extracting, from each data item, extracted data including a picture and a heading” or “causing storing of data corresponding to each of the information objects, including a link to the at least one data item, in a database system” limitations.
[15.a.ii] displaying a representation of each of at least two of the information	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant displays a representation of each of at least two of the information objects in the

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
objects in the database system, the representation being in a uniform format, wherein the format includes a card, and, within the card, in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions including:	database system, the representation being in a uniform format, wherein the format includes a card, and, within the card, in uniform locations thereof the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “representation being in a uniform format.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging are “uniform locations” “within the card.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. All images shown on pages 38-40 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “the representation being in a uniform format”, “wherein the format includes a card,” and the “within the card, in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions” limitations. The Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “the representation being in a uniform format”, “wherein the format includes a card,” and the “within the card, in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions” limitations. Furthermore, the elements are not met in any of the identified products for the reasons further explained below in relation to elements [15.b]-[15.e].
[15.b] a comment function, by which users having access to the card comment	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “[o]ne of Defendant’s graphical functions of is a comment function by which users having

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
function can exchange comments relating to the card, such comments being associated with the information object represented by the card;	access to the card comment function can exchange comments relating to the card, such comments being associated with the information object represented by the card.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “information object” that is “represented by the card.” Cogmedia has also failed to identify what it is alleging are the “comments being associated with the information object represented by the card.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The image shown on page 41 of Exhibit A is taken from the Facebook website.
[15.c] a vote function, by which users having access to the card vote function can vote for the card, such votes being associated with the information object represented by the card;	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “[o]ne of Defendant’s graphical functions is a vote function, by which users having access to the card vote function can vote for the card, such votes being associated with the information object represented by the card.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “information object” that is “represented by the card.” Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “vote function” in each identified product. Cogmedia alleges without explanation “Defendant practices this limitation by providing its “Like” button which facilitates users’ voting.” Cogmedia also alleges that “Defendant further provides users with the opportunity to react to cards which facilitates users’ voting.” Cogmedia simply has

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	not explained how a “Like” is a vote. Cogmedia has also not explained how the use of a “Like” function and/or reactions to a card is representative of a “vote function.” Cogmedia has also failed to identify what it is alleging are the “votes being associated with the information object represented by the card.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on pages 42-43 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “vote function, by which users having access to the card vote function can vote for the card” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “vote function, by which users having access to the card vote function can vote for the card” limitation.
[15.d] a copy function, by which users having access to the card copy function in a first collection of cards of a first user can cause the card to appear in a second collection of cards of a second user; and	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “[o]ne of Defendant’s graphical functions is a copy function, in this example a “Share” button, by which users having access to the card copy function in a first collection of cards of a first user can cause the card to appear in a second collection of cards of a second user.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “copy function” in each identified product. Cogmedia alleges without explanation “Defendant’s Share button is a copy function.” Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of a “Share” function is representative of a “copy function.”

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Notably, as claimed, “the card [includes], in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” Cogmedia has therefore failed to identify what it is alleging is the “first collection of cards of a first user.” Cogmedia has also failed to identify what it is alleging is the “second collection of cards of a second user.” Cogmedia has also failed to identify what it is alleging “cause[s] the card to appear” in the “second collection of cards of a second user.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 44 of Exhibit A is taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “a copy function, by which users having access to the card copy function in a first collection of cards of a first user can cause the card to appear in a second collection of cards of a second user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “a copy function, by which users having access to the card copy function in a first collection of cards of a first user can cause the card to appear in a second collection of cards of a second user” limitation.
[15.e] wherein the set of indicators includes: an indicator reflecting commenting activity associated with the card; and	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant’s set of indicators includes an indicator reflecting commenting activity associated with the card.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The image shown on page 45 of Exhibit A is taken from the Facebook website.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[15.f] wherein the database system has been configured to allow (i) each user to have at least one user-selected collection of cards representing information objects in the database system and (ii) cards, regardless of the collections in which they may have first appeared, to be made accessible and copyable across card collections of different users.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant configures its database system to allow each user to have at least one user-selected collection of cards representing information objects in the database system and cards, regardless of the collections in which they have first appeared, to be made accessible and copyable across card collections of different users.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “user-selected collection of cards representing information objects in the database system.” Cogmedia cites to the New York Times collection of cards, fails to explain how that is representative of a “collection of cards.” No “collection” of cards is shown on page 46 of Exhibit A. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is providing “accessible and copyable” cards “across card collections of different users.” Cogmedia states “Defendant’s Share button [] allows for the cards to be copyable across collections of different users.” However, as mentioned above, Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of a “Share” function is representative of a “copy function.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 46 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “configured to allow (i) each user to have at least one user-selected collection of cards representing information objects in the database system” and “(ii) cards, regardless of the collections in which they may have first appeared, to be made accessible and copyable across card collections of different users” limitations.

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “configured to allow (i) each user to have at least one user-selected collection of cards representing information objects in the database system” and “(ii) cards, regardless of the collections in which they may have first appeared, to be made accessible and copyable across card collections of different users” limitations.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
16. A method according to claim 15, wherein the extracted data from each data item includes at least the picture and the heading and wherein the heading is included within the card.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant routinely configures data items to include at least an extracted picture and heading wherein the heading is included within the card.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is “within the card.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. All images shown on page 47 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice, at least the “wherein the extracted data from each data item includes at least the picture and the heading,” and the “wherein the heading is included within the card” limitations.

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	The Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “wherein the extracted data from each data item includes at least the picture and the heading,” and the “wherein the heading is included within the card” limitations.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
17. A method according to claim 15, the computer processes further comprising: displaying a graphical button, which, when invoked while content is being displayed, causes the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, namely, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this claim is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant provides a user interface having a graphical button which when invoked while content is being displayed causes the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. <i>See also</i> claim 15 above. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “graphical button” with the claimed functionality of “[causing] the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items” “by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format.” Specifically, Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of a “Share” or “Share now” button results in the claimed actions of “[causing] the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, namely, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 48 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website.

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “causes the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, namely, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “causes the displayed content to be handled as one of the data items, namely, by configuring the displayed content as a new information object and making a representation of the new information object available for display in the uniform format” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
18. A method according to claim 15, wherein the format includes within the card an indication of a date of creation.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this claim is met. <i>See also</i> claim 15 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant’s computer-implemented method further comprises a format which includes within the card an indication of a date of creation.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 49 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows:

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “wherein the format includes within the card an indication of a date of creation” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “wherein the format includes within the card an indication of a date of creation” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
19. A method according to claim 15, wherein the format includes a user-accessible report relating to users who copied the information object.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this claim is met. <i>See also</i> claim 15 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant practices this limitation in part by displaying within the format of the card an indicator showing the number of users who have copied or shared the information object.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. As discussed above, Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of a “Share” function is representative of “[copying] the information object.” Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 50 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows:

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “wherein the format includes a user-accessible report relating to users who copied the information object” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “wherein the format includes a user-accessible report relating to users who copied the information object” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[20.pre] A method according to claim 15, further comprising:	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 15.
[20.a] displaying in a computing device of a first user, a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user; and	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See also</i> claim 15 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant displays in a computing device a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. As discussed above, Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user” because, as claimed, “the card [includes], in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” Cogmedia simply has not shown “a first set of cards” on page 51 of Exhibit A.

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 51 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user” limitation.
[20.b] also displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of cards that constitute a collection of a second user.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. Cogmedia states that “Defendant also displays in the computing device of the first user a second view of a second set of cards that constitutes a collection of a second user.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. <i>See also</i> claim 15 above. As discussed above, Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “a second set of cards that constitute a collection of a second user” because, as claimed, “the card [includes], in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” Cogmedia simply has not shown “a second set of cards” on page 51 of Exhibit A. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 51 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows:

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “also displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of cards that constitute a collection of a second user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “also displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of cards that constitute a collection of a second user” limitations.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
21. A method according to claim 20, further comprising: responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of a card in the second view and (ii) a copy command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected card to be copied from the second view to the first view, so that the selected card in the collection of the second user appears in the first collection of the first user.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 20 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant responds to a first user’s graphical selection of a card in the second view and a copy command by that user by causing the selected card to be copied from the second view to the first view, so that the selected card in the collection of the second user appears in the first collection of the first user.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia states “responsive to a first user’s graphical selection and copy command, a Wall Street Journal article is able to be copied from the Wall Street Journal’s card collection to a first user’s card collection. In other words, the first user will now have in its card collection, a card from the Wall Street Journal’s collection.” However, Cogmedia has failed to show “the selected card in the

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	collection of the second user appears in the first collection of the first user” on page 52 of Exhibit A; the images provided here are similar to those provided for claim 5. Cogmedia has also failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 52 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of a card in the second view and (ii) a copy command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected card to be copied from the second view to the first view, so that the selected card in the collection of the second user appears in the first collection of the first user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of a card in the second view and (ii) a copy command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected card to be copied from the second view to the first view, so that the selected card in the collection of the second user appears in the first collection of the first user” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
22. A method according to claim 20, further comprising: responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of a	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 20 above. Cogmedia states that “Defendant responds to a first user’s graphical selection of a card in the first view and sends a command that has been graphically entered by the first user which causes the

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
card in the first view and (ii) a send command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected card to be sent to the second user, so that the selected card in the collection of the first user is made available to the second user to be included in the collection of the second user.	selected card to be sent to the second user, so that the selected card in the collection of the first user is made available to the second user to be included in the collection of the second user.” But Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “the selected card in the collection of the first user [that] is made available to the second user <i>to be included in the collection of the second user.</i>” Cogmedia has also failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook website. The images shown on page 53 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook application. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of a card in the first view and (ii) a send command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected card to be sent to the second user, so that the selected card in the collection of the first user is made available to the second user to be included in the collection of the second user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “responsive to (i) a graphical selection, by the first user, of a card in the first view and (ii) a send command that has been graphically entered by the first user, causing the selected card to be sent to the second user, so that the selected card in the collection of the first user is made available to the second user to be included in the collection of the second user” limitation.

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
23. A method according to claim 15, further comprising: on a user-entered command, causing a card to be shared with another user when the card and the other user have been graphically selected.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 15 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook website. The images shown on page 54 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook application.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
24. A method according to claim 15, further comprising: on a user-entered command, causing a card to be shared with another user via an instant message sent through an integrated instant messaging system as a result of graphical selection by a first user.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 15 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook website. The images shown on page 26 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook application. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim.

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[25.pre] A method according to claim 15, further comprising:	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 15.
[25.a] displaying in a computing device of a first user, a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user;	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 15 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 57 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. As discussed above, Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user” because, as claimed, “the card [includes], in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” Cogmedia simply has not shown “a first <i>set of cards</i>” on page 57 of Exhibit A. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “a first view of a first set of cards that constitute a first collection of the first user” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[25.b] also displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of cards, outside of the first collection, wherein any given member of the second set of cards is both included in a collection of another user and the other user has been selected by the first user; and	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 15 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 57 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Similarly, Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is the “second set of cards [] in a collection of another user” because, as claimed, “the card [includes], in uniform locations thereof, the picture, the heading, a set of indicators, and a set of graphically accessible functions.” Cogmedia simply has not shown “a second <i>set of cards</i>” on page 57 of Exhibit A. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of cards, outside of the first collection” and “wherein any given member of the second set of cards is both included in a collection of another user and the other user has been selected by the first user” limitations. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “displaying in the computing device of the first user, a second view of a second set of cards, outside of the first collection” and “wherein any given member of the second set of cards is both included in a collection of another user and the other user has been selected by the first user” limitations.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
[25.c] wherein each of the cards in the second view can, on a user-entered command, be caused to be copied to the first view.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 15 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 57 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Cogmedia alleges without explanation that the ““Share” button [] allows any of the cards in the second view to be copied to the first view.” Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of the “Share” button is representative of a copying “each of the cards in the second view” “to the first view.” Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “wherein each of the cards in the second view can, on a user-entered command, be caused to be copied to the first view” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “wherein each of the cards in the second view can, on a user-entered command, be caused to be copied to the first view” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
26. A method according to claim 25, wherein each of the cards in the second view is displayed in an order determined by a criterion selected from the group consisting of the information object's creation time, its access time, and combinations thereof.	Cogmedia's infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 25 above. Cogmedia's mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 58 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “wherein each of the cards in the second view is displayed in an order determined by a criterion selected from the group consisting of the information object's creation time, its access time, and combinations thereof” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “wherein each of the cards in the second view is displayed in an order determined by a criterion selected from the group consisting of the information object's creation time, its access time, and combinations thereof” limitation.

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
27. A method according to claim 15, wherein the set of indicators includes: an indicator reflecting voting activity associated with the card.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 15 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 59 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. As discussed above, Cogmedia has failed to identify what it is alleging is a vote in each identified product. Cogmedia alleges without explanation “Defendant practices this limitation by providing an indicator reflecting the number of people who have liked, reacted, or otherwise voted on information associated with the card.” However, Cogmedia simply has not explained how the use of a “Like” function and/or reactions to a card is representative of “voting activity.” Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “an indicator reflecting voting activity associated with the card” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “an indicator reflecting voting activity associated with the card” limitation.

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
28. A method according to claim 27, wherein the indicator reflecting voting activity associated with the card provides a numeric count of the voting activity.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 27 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 60 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website. Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further, the Facebook App does not practice at least the “wherein the indicator reflecting voting activity associated with the card provides a numeric count of the voting activity” limitation. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Further utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice, at least the “wherein the indicator reflecting voting activity associated with the card provides a numeric count of the voting activity” limitation.

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
29. A method according to claim 15, wherein the indicator reflecting commenting activity associated with the card provides a numeric count of the commenting activity.	Cogmedia’s infringement contentions have not shown that this element is met. <i>See</i> claim 15 above. Cogmedia’s mapping of the claim element does not show the element is met as to each identified product—namely, the Facebook application and the Facebook website. Cogmedia has failed to provide any mapping to the Facebook application. The images shown on page 61 of Exhibit A are taken from the Facebook website.

Exhibit 3 – Response to Infringement Contentions for U.S. Patent No. 11,036,371

Claim Limitation	Response to Infringement Contentions
	Nevertheless, as understood, Meta responds as follows: The Facebook App does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim. Utilizing the Facebook website through a browser does not practice the claim from which this claim depends, so it cannot practice this claim.