

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION and HP INC.,
Petitioner

v.

SYNKLOUD TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2020-01031
U.S. Patent 10,015,254

Synkcloud Technologies, LLC.'s Patent Owner Response

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND 3

 A. Prior Art Storage Systems..... 3

 B. The '254 Patent: Mr. Sheng Tai Tsao Invents An Approach For Downloading Data From A Web Site To A Remote Storage Server Using Download Information Stored In The Cache Of A Wireless Device. 5

III. SUMMARY OF THE INSTITUTED GROUNDS FOR REVIEW 8

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION. 8

 a. download a file from a second server across a network into the remote storage space through utilizing information for the file cached in the cache storage in the wireless device (independent claims 1 and 16). 10

V. THE PETITIONERS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE BY A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE THAT ANY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS ON ANY INSTITUTED GROUND. 11

 A. Independent Claims 1 And 16 As Well As The Claims Dependent Therefrom Would Not Have Been Obvious Over McCown In Combination With The Secondary References (Proposed Grounds 1 and 2). 15

 1. The Combination Of McCown and Dutta (Ground 1) Would Not Have Taught “download[ing] a file from a second server across a network into the remote storage space through utilizing information for the file cached in a cache storage in the wireless device,” As Recited in Independent Claim 1, and As Similarly Recited In Independent Claim 16. 18

 i. McCown’s Web Page Display vs. '254 Cache Storage 21

 ii. Dutta’s Conventional Browser Cache vs. '254 Non-Conventional Cache Storage Usage 21

 iii. The Claimed Invention Of The '254 Patent Is An Improvement Beyond The Predictable Use Of Prior Art Elements. 23

 iv. The Results Generated By The Combination Of McCown and Dutta Differ From Those Of the Claimed Invention Of The '254 Patent. 23

 v. A PHOSITA Would Have Been Discouraged By The Challenges Of Combining McCown and Dutta. 24

vi.	Response To The First Part Of The PTAB’s Institution Decision at Page 17.....	24
vii.	Response To The Second Part Of The PTAB’s Institution Decision at Page 17.....	27
viii.	Response To The PTAB’s Institution Decision at Pages 23-24.	28
ix.	Response To The PTAB’s Institution Decision at Page 24.	29
2.	The Combination of McCown and Dutta (Ground 1) Would Not Have Taught “transmitting the information for the file cached in the wireless device to the first server to cause the first server, in accordance with the information for the file, to download the file from the second server into the remote storage space,” As Recited in Dependent Claim 2 And As Similarly Recited In Dependent Claim 17.	31
3.	The Petitioners Failed To Show That A POSITA Would Have Been Motivated To Modify McCown With Dutta To Achieve The Particular Device And Method Recited In Independent Claims 1 and 16 Of The ‘254 Patent Respectively With A Reasonable Expectation Of Success.....	37
B.	Objective Indicia Of Non-Obviousness Support The Patentability Of The Claims Of The ’254 Patent.	47
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	79

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
<u>CASES</u>	
<i>Arista Networks, Inc., v. Cisco Systems, Inc.</i> , 2016 WL 1083023 *5 (PTAB 2015)	41
<i>CCS Fitness Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.</i> , 288 F.3d 1366, 62 USPQ2d at 1662	9
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 809 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	12
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	13, 14, 20
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	14, 37
<i>Kolbe & Kolbe Millwork Co., Inc. v. Sierra Pacific Industries</i> , 2019 WL 5070454 *20 (PTAB 2019)	4, 17
<i>K/S Himpp v. Hear-Wear Techs., LLC</i> , 751 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	17, 35, 36
<i>Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. v. Boehringer Ingelheim International GMBH</i> , 2017 WL 1052517*1 (PTAB 2017)	13, 20
<i>Nautilus Hyosung Inc. v. Diebold Nixdorf, Inc.</i> , 2017 WL 3447870 *8 (PTAB 2017)	14
<i>SAS Institute v. Iancu</i> , 138 S.Ct 1348 (2018)	12
<i>Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficosa N Am. Corp.</i> , 299 F.3d 1313, 63 USPQ2d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	12, 37

<i>Texas Digital Systems, Inc. v. Telegenix, Inc.</i> , 308 F.3d 1193 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	8
<i>Zodiac Pool Systems, Inc. v. Aqua Products, Inc.</i> , 2018 WL 6604633 *1 (PTAB 2018)	12

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. §312(a)(3)	13
35 U.S.C. §314(a)	12
37 C.F.R. §42.107	81

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.