

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ADOBE INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

SYNKLOUD TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,

Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2020-01235

U.S. Patent No. 10,015,254

---

**DECLARATION OF ZAYDOON (“JAY”) JAWADI  
IN SUPPORT OF PATENT OWNER’S RESPONSE**

IPR2020-01235

Exhibit 2001

Adobe Inc. v. SynKloud Technologies, LLC

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS .....	1
II. MATERIALS REVIEWED .....	6
III. LEGAL UNDERSTANDING .....	7
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	7
A. Petitioner’s Construction of “Cached in Cache Storage in the First Wireless Device” Is Flawed.....	8
V. OPINIONS.....	13
A. Independent Claim 9 Is Not Obvious in View of Prust Alone or in Combination with Major or Kraft.....	14
a. Claim 9: Utilizing Information for the File Cached in a Cache Storage in the First Wireless Device Is Not Disclosed in Prust Alone and/or in Combination with Major and/or Kraft.....	14
i. Prust Does Not Disclose Storing Download Information in Cache Storage or Retrieving Download Information from Cache Storage.....	15
ii. Prust Does Not Disclose Where Download Information Is Obtained from.....	15
iii. Petitioner’s Theory with Three Hypotheses Regarding Utilizing Information for the File Cached in a Cache Storage in the First Wireless Device.....	16
iv. Petitioner’s First Hypothesis That Download Information Is Obtained from a Web Page is Flawed and Unsupported by Prust.....	17
v. Petitioner’s Second Hypothesis That Download Information Is Cached Is Flawed and Unsupported by Prust.....	20
vi. It Would Not Have Been Obvious to a POSITA That The Download Information in Prust’s Email Is from a Web Page Cached in the Wireless Device.....	22
vii. Petitioner’s Third Hypothesis That the User’s Typing or Copying of Download Information Discloses Cached Download Information Is Flawed and Unsupported by Prust	23
viii. Petitioner’s Third Hypothesis (Typing Scenario) That the User’s Typing of Download Information Discloses Cached Download Information Is Flawed and Unsupported by Prust.....	24
ix. Petitioner’s Third Hypothesis (Copying Scenario) That the User’s Copying of Download Information Discloses Cached Download Information Is Flawed and Unsupported by Prust.....	25
x. Caching the Download Information in Prust Is Unnecessary and Wasteful.....	28
xi. Prust and Major.....	32

xii.	Prust and Kraft .....	33
xiii.	Therefore, Claim 9 Is Not Obvious in View of Prust Alone or in Combination with Major or Kraft .....	35
b.	Dependent Claims 10-15 Are Not Obvious in View of Prust Alone or in Combination with Major, Kraft, and/or Reuter .....	35
B.	Independent Claim 9 Is Not Obvious in View of Nomoto Alone or in Combination with Major or Kraft .....	36
a.	Claim 9: Utilizing Information for the File Cached in a Cache Storage in the First Wireless Device Is Not Disclosed in Nomoto Alone and/or in Combination with Major and/or Kraft .....	36
i.	Nomoto Does Not Disclose Storing Download Information in Cache Storage or Retrieving Download Information from Cache Storage .....	36
ii.	Nomoto Does Not Disclose Where Download Information Is Obtained from .....	37
iii.	Petitioner’s Theory with Three Hypotheses Regarding Utilizing Information for the File Cached in a Cache Storage in the First Wireless Device .....	39
iv.	Petitioner’s First Hypothesis That Download Information Is Obtained from a Web Page is Flawed and Unsupported by Nomoto .....	39
v.	Petitioner’s Second Hypothesis That Download Information Is Cached Is Flawed and Unsupported by Nomoto .....	41
vi.	It Would Not Have Been Obvious to a POSITA That The Download Information in Nomoto Is from a Web Page Cached in the Wireless Device .....	43
vii.	Petitioner’s Third Hypothesis That the User’s Typing or Copying of Download Information Discloses Cached Download Information Is Flawed and Unsupported by Nomoto .....	44
viii.	Petitioner’s Third Hypothesis (Typing Scenario) That the User’s Typing of Download Information Discloses Cached Download Information Is Flawed and Unsupported by Nomoto .....	45
ix.	Petitioner’s Third Hypothesis (Copying Scenario) That the User’s Copying of Download Information Discloses Cached Download Information Is Flawed and Unsupported by Nomoto .....	46
x.	Caching the Download Information in Nomoto Is Unnecessary and Wasteful .....	49
xi.	Nomoto and Major .....	52
xii.	Nomoto and Kraft .....	54
xiii.	Therefore, Claim 9 Is Not Obvious in View of Nomoto Alone or in Combination with Major or Kraft .....	56
xiv.	Dependent Claims 10-15 Are Not Obvious in View of Nomoto Alone or in Combination with Major, Kraft, and/or Reuter .....	56
C.	Major’s Teachings Discourage Combining with Prust or Nomoto .....	57
a.	Major’s Teachings Discourage Wireless Device Access to External Storage .....	57

b. Major Stores Data Objects in Cache, Negating the Need for External Storage ..... 59

VI. CONCLUSION.....60

I, Zaydoon (“Jay”) Jawadi, declare as follows:

**I. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS**

1. My name is Zaydoon (“Jay”) Jawadi.
2. I am an independent expert and consultant. I have been retained as an expert witness on behalf of SynKloud Technologies, LLC (“SynKloud”) for the above-captioned *Inter Partes* Review (IPR) regarding U.S. Patent No. 10,015,254 (“254 Patent”).
3. As shown in my curriculum vitae (attached as Exhibit 2002), I have a Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering from Mosul University, a Master of Science in Computer Science from Columbia University with a Citation for Outstanding Achievement – Dean’s Honor Student, and over 40 years of experience in software and product design and development, engineering, consulting, and management in the fields of data storage, Internet, software, data networking, computing systems, and telecommunication.
4. I have worked with and possess expertise in numerous technologies, including data storage technologies and interfaces, Internet and website technologies, databases, data networking technologies and protocols, and telephony.
5. From 1978 to 1980, I worked as a telecommunication/electrical engineer for Emirtel (formerly Cable and Wireless, now Etisalat). During my

# 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.