UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ADOBE INC. Petitioner

v.

SYNKLOUD TECHNOLOGIES, LLC Patent Owner

Patent No. 9,239,686

DECLARATION OF JON WEISSMAN, PH.D.

REGARDING U.S. PATENT NO. 9,239,686 (CLAIMS 1-11)



| I. | Back | ground and Qualifications1 | | | | |
|-------|--|--|---|----|--|--|
| II. | Mate | erials Considered | | | | |
| III. | Lega | l Standards for Patentability | | | | |
| IV. | The '686 Patent | | | | | |
| | A. | Effective Filing Date of the '686 Patent | | | | |
| | B. | Overview of the '686 Patent | | | | |
| | C. | Prosecution History of the '686 Patent | | | | |
| | D. | Claims of the '686 Patent2 | | | | |
| 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 | 31 | | |
| | | 3. | Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) | 33 | | |
| | | 4. | Remote Storage Systems for Wireless Devices | 35 | | |
| | | 5. | Wireless Application Protocol (WAP) and Wireless Markup Language (WML) for Mobile Browsers | | | |
| VI. | Claim Construction. | | | 41 | | |
| | A. | "cach | ned in the first wireless device" | 42 | | |
| VII. | Overview of Prior Art References | | | | | |
| | A. | Overview of Prust4 | | | | |
| | B. | Overview of Nomoto53 | | | | |
| | C. | Overview of Major60 | | | | |
| | D. | Overview of Kraft6 | | | | |
| | E. | Overview of McCown6 | | | | |
| | F. | Overview of Jewett6 | | | | |
| VIII. | The Challenged Claims Are Rendered Obvious by Prust As the Primary Prior Art Reference | | | | | |
| | A | Claim 1 | | | | |



(continued)

| В. | Claim 2 | | | | | |
|----|--|---------|---|-----|--|--|
| C. | Claim 3 | | | | | |
| D. | Claim 4 | | | | | |
| E. | Claim 5 | | | | | |
| F. | Claim 61 | | | | | |
| G. | Clair | Claim 7 | | | | |
| H. | Claim 8 | | | | | |
| I. | Clair | n 9 | | 113 | | |
| J. | Claim 10 | | | | | |
| K. | Clair | n 11 | | 121 | | |
| L. | Motivation to Combine Prior Art References | | | | | |
| | 1. | | '686 Patent, Prust, Major, Kraft, McCown, and Jewett Analogous References | 122 | | |
| | 2. | Moti | vation to Combine Prust with Major | 125 | | |
| | | a) | Prust and Major Address Similar Technology and Functionality | 125 | | |
| | | b) | A POSITA Would Have Recognized the Benefits of Combining Prust with Major | 127 | | |
| | | c) | A POSITA Would Have Recognized That Prust Could Be Modified to Employ Major's Caching Browser | 128 | | |
| | 3. | Moti | ivation to Combine Prust with Kraft | 129 | | |
| | | a) | Prust and Kraft Address Similar Technology and Functionality | 130 | | |
| | | b) | A POSITA Would Have Recognized the Benefits of Combining Prust with Kraft | 132 | | |
| | | c) | A POSITA Would Have Recognized That Prust Could Be Modified to Employ Kraft's Copy-and- Paste Functionality | 133 | | |
| | 4. | Moti | ivation to Combine Prust with McCown | | | |



(continued)

| | | | a) | Prust and McCown Address Similar Technology and Functionality | | |
|-----|---|------------|--------|---|-----|--|
| | | | b) | A POSITA Would Have Recognized the Benefits of Combining Prust with McCown | 136 | |
| | | | c) | A POSITA Would Have Recognized That Prust Could Be Combined with the Teachings of McCown | 138 | |
| | | 5. | Moti | vation to Combine Prust with Jewett | 139 | |
| | | | a) | Prust and Jewett Address Similar Technology and Functionality | 139 | |
| | | | b) | A POSITA Would Have Recognized the Benefits of Combining Prust with Jewett | 140 | |
| | | | c) | A POSITA Would Have Recognized That Prust Could Be Combined with the Teachings of Jewett | 141 | |
| IX. | The Challenged Claims Are Rendered Obvious by NOMOTO As the | | | | | |
| | Prim | ary Pri | or Art | Reference | 143 | |
| | A. | Clain | n 1 | | 145 | |
| | B. | | | | | |
| | C. | Clain | n 3 | | 174 | |
| | D. | Clain | n 4 | | 176 | |
| | E. | Clain | n 5 | | 177 | |
| | F. | Clain | n 6 | | 177 | |
| | G. | Clain | n 7 | | 178 | |
| | H. | Claim 8 | | | | |
| | I. | Claim 9 | | | | |
| | J. | Claim 10 | | | | |
| | K. | Clain | n 11 | | 186 | |
| | L. | Moti | vation | to Combine Prior Art References | 187 | |
| | | 1. | | 7686 Patent, Nomoto, Major, Kraft, McCown, and tt Are Analogous References | 187 | |
| | | 2. | | vation to Combine Nomoto with Major | | |
| | | - · | 1,1011 | · ···································· | | |



(continued)

| | | a) | Nomoto and Major Address Similar Technology and Functionality |
|----|------------|-------|--|
| | | b) | A POSITA Would Have Recognized the Benefits of Combining Nomoto with Major192 |
| | | c) | A POSITA Would Have Recognized That Nomoto Could Be Modified to Employ Major's Web Caching Functionality |
| | 3. | Motiv | vation to Combine Nomoto with Kraft196 |
| | | a) | Nomoto and Kraft Address Similar Technology and Functionality |
| | | b) | A POSITA Would Have Recognized the Benefits of Combining Nomoto with Kraft |
| | | c) | A POSITA Would Have Recognized That Nomoto Could Be Modified to Employ Kraft's Copy-and- Paste Functionality |
| | 4. | Motiv | vation to Combine Nomoto with McCown201 |
| | | a) | Nomoto and McCown Address Similar Technology and Functionality |
| | | b) | A POSITA Would Have Recognized the Benefits of Combining Nomoto with McCown203 |
| | | c) | A POSITA Would Have Recognized That Nomoto Could Be Combined with the Teachings of McCown205 |
| | 5. | Motiv | vation to Combine Nomoto with Jewett205 |
| | | a) | Nomoto and Jewett Address Similar Technology and Functionality |
| | | b) | A POSITA Would Have Recognized the Benefits of Combining Nomoto with Jewett207 |
| | | c) | A POSITA Would Have Recognized That Nomoto Could Be Combined with the Teachings of Jewett208 |
| X. | Conclusion | ••••• | 210 |
| | | | |



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.

