UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION and HP INC.,

Petitioners,

v.

SYNKLOUD TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-01271

U.S. Patent No. 9,239,686

DECLARATION OF ZAYDOON ("JAY") JAWADI
IN SUPPORT OF PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

IPR2020-01271
Exhibit 2001
Microsoft Corporation and HP Inc. v. SynKloud Technologies, LLC

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS 1

II. MATERIALS REVIEWED 6

III. LEGAL UNDERSTANDING 6

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 7

V. OPINIONS 7

A. Independent Claim 1 Is Not Obvious in View of McCown and Dutta 8

a. Independent Claim 1: Utilizing Download Information for the File Cached in the Wireless Device 8

i. Summary of Why McCown in View of Dutta Does Not Disclose Utilizing Download Information for the File Cached in the Wireless Device 8

ii. Petitioners' Interpretation of Utilizing Download Information for the File Cached in the Wireless Device in the '686 Patent 13

iii. Steps of Utilizing Download Information for the File Cached in the Wireless Device in the '686 Patent 14

iv. McCown Does Not Disclose, Suggest, or Imply Storing Download Information in Cache or Retrieving Download Information from Cache 15

v. Dutta Does Not Disclose How Any Data in Its Cache Is Used 16

vi. Dutta Does Not Disclose, Suggest, or Imply Storing Download Information in Cache or Retrieving Download Information from Cache 18

vii. The Combination of McCown and Dutta Does Not Disclose, Suggest, or Imply Storing Download Information in Cache or Retrieving Download Information from Cache19

viii. Petitioners Rely Solely on Expert's Opinion That It Would Have Been Obvious to Store the Download Information in Cache and to Retrieve the Download Information from Cache 20

ix. Petitioners' Readily Accessible Theory for the Motivation for Storing the Download Information in Cache 20

x. McCown Contradicts Petitioners' Theory for the Motivation for Storing the Download Information in Cache 21

xi. Petitioners' Description of McCown's Steps Contradicts Petitioners' Theory for the Motivation for Storing the Download Information in Cache 24

xii. McCown Stores the Files in the Storage Site, Further Negating the Need to Store the Download Information in Cache 27

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

xiii. ’686 Patent vs. McCown’s Steps of Utilizing Download Information for the File Cached in the Wireless Device 29

xiv. Difference between Retrieving from Cache and Retrieving from Displayed Web Page 32

xv. Download Information for the File (Singular) 34

xvi. Dutta Does Not Cure McCown’s Deficiencies in Storing Download Information in Cache and Retrieving Download Information from Cache 35

xvii. Petitioners’ Second Purported Reason (Re-Opening the Webpage) to Store Download Information in Cache 36

xviii. Storing McCown’s URLs in Cache Is Unnecessary, Wasteful, Counterintuitive, and Not Obvious 39

xix. Coates Does Not Cure McCown’s and Dutta’s Deficiencies in Storing Download Information in Cache and Retrieving Download Information from Cache 40

xx. Utilizing Download Information Cached in the Wireless Device: Independent Claim 1 Is Not Obvious in View of McCown and Dutta 40

b. Dependent Claim 2: Cached Downloading Information 41

c. Dependent Claim 9: Predefined Capacity 41

d. Dependent Claims 2-11 Are Not Obvious in View of McCown and Dutta and Are Not Obvious in View of McCown, Dutta, and Coates 42

B. Independent Claims 1 and 12 Are Not Obvious in View of McCown, Dutta, and Coates 42

a. Independent Claim 1: Utilizing Download Information for the File Cached in the Wireless Device 42

b. Dependent Claim 2: Cached Downloading Information 43

c. Dependent Claim 9: Predefined Capacity 43

d. Dependent Claims 2-11 Are Not Obvious in View of McCown and Dutta and Are Not Obvious in View of McCown, Dutta, and Coates 44

e. Independent Claim 12: Allocating Exclusively a Storage Space of a Predefined Capacity to a User of a Wireless Device 44

i. Predefined Capacity 44

ii. McCown Does Not Disclose Predefined Capacity Allocated Exclusively to a User of a Wireless Device 45

iii. Petitioners’ Memory Partitioning and Allocation Techniques Do Not Disclose Predefined Capacity Allocated Exclusively to a User of a Wireless Device 47

iv. Dutta Does Not Disclose Predefined Capacity Allocated Exclusively to a User of a Wireless Device 54

v. Coates Does Not Disclose Predefined Capacity Allocated Exclusively to a User of a Wireless Device 56

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

vi. The Combination of McCown, Dutta, and Coates Does Not Disclose Predefined Capacity Allocated Exclusively to a User of a Wireless Device 56

f. Dependent Claim 13: Utilizing Download Information for the File Cached in the Wireless Device 56

g. Dependent Claim 14: Cached Download Information 57

h. Dependent Claims 13-20 Are Not Obvious in View of McCown, Dutta, and Coates 57

VI. CONCLUSION.....58

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

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. 9,239,686 ("'686 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

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.