

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ADOBE INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

SYNKLOUD TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-01392

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

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

IPR2020-01392

Exhibit 2014

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 the first wireless device” Is Flawed 7	
V. OPINIONS	13
A. Independent Claim 1 Is Not Obvious in View of Prust Alone or in Combination with Major or Kraft.....	14
a. Claim 1: Utilizing Download Information for the File Cached in the First Wireless Device Is Not Disclosed in Prust Alone and/or in Combination with Major and/or Kraft	14
i. Responses to PTAB Decision Regarding Utilizing Download Information for the File Cached in the Wireless Device.....	15
1. Response to Decision p. 29 First Paragraph: Prust Does Not Disclose Cache Storage.....	15
2. Response to Decision p. 29 Second Paragraph: Cache Storage Construction Is Flawed and Prust Does Not Disclose Cache Storage or Retrieving from Cache Storage	16
3. Response to Decision p. 29 Third Paragraph: Typing Does Not Disclose Retrieving from Cache Storage	20
4. Response to Decision p. 29 Fourth Paragraph: Email Does Not Disclose Retrieving from Cache Storage	21
5. Response to Decision p. 30 Second Paragraph: Major.....	22
6. Response to Decision p. 30 Third Paragraph: Cache Storage Construction Is Flawed and Kraft Does Not Disclose Cache Storage or Retrieving from Cache Storage	23
7. Additional Response to Decision.....	24

ii. Prust Does Not Disclose Storing Download Information in Cache Storage or Retrieving Download Information from Cache Storage.....	25
iii. Prust Does Not Disclose Where Download Information Is Obtained from 25	
iv. Petitioner’s Theory with Three Hypotheses Regarding Utilizing Download Information for the File Cached in the First Wireless Device.....	27
v. Petitioner’s First Hypothesis That Download Information Is Obtained from a Web Page is Flawed and Unsupported by Prust.....	27
vi. Petitioner’s Second Hypothesis That Download Information Is Cached Is Flawed and Unsupported by Prust.....	30
vii. 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	32
viii. Petitioner’s Third Hypothesis That the User’s Typing or Copying of Download Information Discloses Cached Download Information Is Flawed and Unsupported by Prust.....	33
ix. Petitioner’s Third Hypothesis (Typing Scenario) That the User’s Typing of Download Information Discloses Cached Download Information Is Flawed and Unsupported by Prust.....	34
x. Petitioner’s Third Hypothesis (Copying Scenario) That the User’s Copying of Download Information Discloses Cached Download Information Is Flawed and Unsupported by Prust.....	35
xi. Difference between Retrieving from Cache and Retrieving from Displayed Webpage	38
xii. Download Information for the File (Singular).....	41
xiii. Caching the Download Information in Prust Is Unnecessary and Wasteful	42
xiv. Prust and Major.....	45
xv. Prust and Kraft	47
xvi. Therefore, Claim 1 Is Not Obvious in View of Prust Alone or in Combination with Major or Kraft.....	48
b. Dependent Claims 3-8, 10, and 11 Are Not Obvious in View of Prust Alone or in Combination with Major and Kraft, and Dependent Claims 2 and 9 Are Not Obvious Further in View of McCown or Jewett Respectively.....	49

c.	Dependent Claim 9 Is Not Obvious in View of Prust or Prust and Jewett	49
B.	Independent Claim 1 Is Not Obvious in View of Nomoto Alone or in Combination with Major or Kraft.....	52
a.	Claim 1: Utilizing Download Information for the File Cached in the First Wireless Device Is Not Disclosed in Nomoto Alone and/or in Combination with Major and/or Kraft	53
i.	Responses to Board’s Decision Regarding Utilizing download Information for the File Cached in the Wireless Device Relying on Nomoto (with Major and Kraft).....	53
ii.	Nomoto Does Not Disclose Storing Download Information in Cache Storage or Retrieving Download Information from Cache Storage.....	54
iii.	Nomoto Does Not Disclose Where Download Information Is Obtained from	54
iv.	Petitioner’s Theory with Three Hypotheses Regarding Utilizing Download Information for the File Cached in the First Wireless Device.....	56
v.	Petitioner’s First Hypothesis That Download Information Is Obtained from a Web Page is Flawed and Unsupported by Nomoto	57
vi.	Petitioner’s Second Hypothesis That Download Information Is Cached Is Flawed and Unsupported by Nomoto	58
vii.	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	60
viii.	Petitioner’s Third Hypothesis That the User’s Typing or Copying of Download Information Discloses Cached Download Information Is Flawed and Unsupported by Nomoto.....	61
ix.	Petitioner’s Third Hypothesis (Typing Scenario) That the User’s Typing of Download Information Discloses Cached Download Information Is Flawed and Unsupported by Nomoto	62
x.	Petitioner’s Third Hypothesis (Copying Scenario) That the User’s Copying of Download Information Discloses Cached Download Information Is Flawed and Unsupported by Nomoto	64
xi.	Caching the Download Information in Nomoto Is Unnecessary and Wasteful.....	66
xii.	Nomoto and Major	70

...

xiii.	Nomoto and Kraft	71
xiv.	Therefore, Claim 1 Is Not Obvious in View of Nomoto Alone or in Combination with Major or Kraft.....	73
b.	Dependent Claims 3-8, 10, and 11 Are Not Obvious in View of Nomoto Alone or in Combination with Major and Kraft, and Dependent Claims 2 and 9 Are Not Obvious Further in View of McCown or Jewett Respectively.....	73
C.	Major’s Teachings Discourage Combining with Prust or Nomoto	74
a.	Major’s Teachings Discourage Wireless Device Access to External Storage.....	74
b.	Major Stores Data Objects in Cache, Negating the Need for External Storage.....	76
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	77

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.