UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ADOBE INC. Petitioner

v.

SYNKLOUD TECHNOLOGIES, LLC Patent Owner

Patent No. 9,219,780

DECLARATION OF JON WEISSMAN, PH.D.

REGARDING U.S. PATENT NO. 9,219,780



I.	Back	ground and Qualifications1				
II.	Mate	rials Considered				
III.	Lega	l Standards for Patentability				
IV.	The '780 Patent					
	A.	Effective Filing Date of the '780 Patent				
	B.	Overview of the '780 Patent				
	C.	Prosecution History of the '780 Patent				
	D.	Claims of the '780 Patent				
V.	State of the Art in 2003					
	A.	Leve	l of Ordinary Skill in the Art	23		
	B.	General Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art				
		1.	Network Communication Protocols	26		
		2.	Caching on Wireless Devices	30		
		3.	Uniform Resource Locators (URLs)	33		
		4.	Remote Storage Systems for Wireless Devices	34		
		5.	Wireless Application Protocol (WAP) and Wireless Markup Language (WML) for Mobile Browsers	39		
VI.	Claim Construction.			40		
	A.	"cached in a cache storage of the first wireless device"				
VII.	Overview of Prior Art References					
	A.	Overview of Prust4				
	B.	Overview of Nomoto53				
	C.	Overview of Major6				
	D.	Overview of Kraft				
	E.	Overview of McCown				
VIII.	The Challenged Claims Are Rendered Obvious by Prust As the Primary Prior Art Reference					
	A.	Claim 9				
	В.	Claim 10				



(continued)

C.	Clair	m 11					
D.	Clair	m 12					
E.	Clair	m 13					
F.	Clair	m 14					
G.	Claim 15						
Н.	Motivation to Combine Prior Art References1						
	1.	1. The '780 Patent, Prust, Major, Kraft, and McCown Are Analogous References					
	2.	Moti	Motivation to Combine Prust with Major113				
		a)	Prust And Major Address Similar Technology and Functionality				
		b)	A POSITA Would Have Recognized The Benefits Of Combining Prust With Major114				
		c)	A POSITA Would Have Recognized That Prust Could Be Modified to Employ Major's Caching Browser				
	3.	Motivation to Combine Prust with Kraft117					
		a)	Prust and Kraft Address Similar Technology And Functionality				
		b)	A POSITA Would Have Recognized the Benefits of Combining Prust with Kraft119				
		c)	A POSITA Would Have Recognized That Prust Could Be Modified to Employ Kraft's Copy-and- Paste Functionality				
	4.	Motivation to Combine Prust with McCown12					
		a)	Prust and McCown Address Similar Technology and Functionality				
		b)	A POSITA Would Have Recognized the Benefits of Combining Prust with McCown				
		c)	A POSITA Would Have Recognized That Prust Could Be Combined with the Teaching of McCown125				



(continued)

IX.	The Challenged Claims Are Rendered Obvious by NOMOTO As the Primary Prior Art Reference						
	A.	Clain	n 9		127		
	B.	Clain	n 10		151		
	C.	Claim 11					
	D.	Clain	Claim 12				
	E.	Clain	Claim 13				
	F.	Clain	aim 14				
	G.	Clain	aim 15				
	H.	Motivation to Combine Prior Art References					
		1.		780 Patent, Nomoto, Major, Kraft, and McCown Are ogous References	161		
		2.	Motiv	vation to Combine Nomoto with Major	164		
			a)	Nomoto and Major Address Similar Technology and Functionality	164		
			b)	A POSITA Would Have Recognized The Benefits Of Combining Nomoto With Major	166		
			c)	A POSITA Would Have Recognized That Nomoto Could Be Modified to Employ Major's Web Caching Functionality	168		
		3.	Motiv	vation to Combine Nomoto with Kraft	170		
			a)	Nomoto and Kraft Address Similar Technology and Functionality	170		
			b)	A POSITA Would Have Recognized the Benefits of Combining Nomoto with Kraft	171		
			c)	A POSITA Would Have Recognized That Nomoto Could Be Modified to Employ Kraft's Copy-and- Paste Functionality	172		
		4.	Moti	vation to Combine Nomoto with McCown	174		
			a)	Nomoto and McCown Address Similar Technology and Functionality	175		



(continued)

		b)	A POSITA Would Have Recognized the Benefits of Combining Nomoto with McCown	176
		c)	A POSITA Would Have Recognized That Nomoto Could Be Combined with the Teaching of McCown	178
X	Conclusion			178



DOCKET A L A R M

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.

