

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ADOBE INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

SYNKLOUD TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-01393

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

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

IPR2020-01393

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 8	
V. OPINIONS.....	13
A. Independent Claim 12 Is Not Obvious in View of Prust Alone or in Combination with Jewett.....	14
a. Claim 12: Prust and Jewett Do Not Disclose Predefined Capacity	14
i. Responses to PTAB Decision Regarding Predefined Capacity	15
ii. Predefined Capacity in the ’686 Patent.....	19
iii. Prust’s RAID Does Not Disclose ’686 Predefined Capacity.....	22
iv. Prust’s Billing Address Does Not Disclose ’686 Predefined Capacity	27
v. Prust Does Not Disclose Capacity	28
vi. Prust Does Not Disclose Predefined Capacity.....	29
vii. Jewett Does Not Disclose Predefined Capacity.....	32
viii. The Combination of Prust and Jewett Does Not Disclose Predefined Capacity	36
ix. Claims 12-20 Are Not Obvious in View of Prust (Ex 1104) and Jewett (Ex 1109)	36
b. Claim 12: Prust’s Email Does Not Disclose Establishing a Communication Link for the Wireless Device to Remotely Access the Storage Space	36
c. Claim 12: Prust’s Email Does Not Disclose Retrieving	41
d. Claim 12: Prust’s Email Does Not Disclose Storing and Retrieving	43
e. A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine Prust with Jewett.....	44

B. Dependent Claim 13 Is Not Obvious in View of Prust Alone or in Combination with Jewett and Further in View of Major or Kraft	45
a. Claim 13: Utilizing Download Information for the File Cached in the First Wireless Device Is Not Disclosed in Prust Alone and/or in Combination with Jewett and Further in Combination with Major and/or Kraft.....	46
i. Responses to PTAB Decision Regarding Utilizing Download Information for the File Cached in the Wireless Device.....	46
1. Response to Decision p. 36 Third Paragraph: Prust Does Not Disclose Cache Storage.....	46
2. Response to Decision p. 37 Second Paragraph: Cache Storage Construction Is Flawed and Prust Does Not Disclose Cache Storage or Retrieving from Cache Storage	48
3. Response to Decision p. 37 Third Paragraph: Typing Does Not Disclose Retrieving from Cache Storage	52
4. Response to Decision p. 37 Fourth Paragraph: Email Does Not Disclose Retrieving from Cache Storage	53
5. Response to Decision p. 30 Second Paragraph: Major.....	53
6. Response to Decision p. 39 First Paragraph: Cache Storage Construction Is Flawed and Kraft Does Not Disclose Cache Storage or Retrieving from Cache Storage	54
7. Additional Response to Decision.....	56
ii. Prust Does Not Disclose Storing Download Information in Cache Storage or Retrieving Download Information from Cache Storage.....	56
iii. Prust Does Not Disclose Where Download Information Is Obtained from 56	
iv. Petitioner’s Theory with Three Hypotheses Regarding Utilizing Download Information for the File Cached in the Wireless Device	58
v. Petitioner’s First Hypothesis That Download Information Is Obtained from a Web Page is Flawed and Unsupported by Prust.....	58
vi. Petitioner’s Second Hypothesis That Download Information Is Cached Is Flawed and Unsupported by Prust.....	61

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	63
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.....	64
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	65
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.....	66
xi. Difference between Retrieving from Cache and Retrieving from Displayed Webpage	69
xii. Download Information for the File (Singular).....	72
xiii. Caching the Download Information in Prust Is Unnecessary and Wasteful	73
xiv. Prust and Major.....	76
xv. Prust and Kraft	78
xvi. Therefore, Claim 13 Is Not Obvious in View of Prust Alone or in Combination with Jewett and Major or Kraft.....	79
b. Dependent Claims 15-20 Are Not Obvious in View of Prust Alone or in Combination with Jewett, and Dependent Claim 14 Is Not Obvious Further in View of Major or Kraft and McCown	80
C. Independent Claim 12 Is Not Obvious in View of Nomoto Alone or in Combination with Jewett	80
a. Claim 12: Nomoto Does Not Disclose Predefined Capacity	80
b. Claim 12: Nomoto and Jewett Do Not Disclose Predefined Capacity	82
c. A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine Nomoto with Jewett.....	82
D. Dependent Claim 13 Is Not Obvious in View of Nomoto Alone or in Combination with Jewett and Major or Kraft	83
a. Claim 13: Utilizing Download Information for the File Cached in the Wireless Device Is Not Disclosed in Nomoto Alone or in Combination with Jewett and Major or Kraft.....	84

...

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).....	84
ii.	Nomoto Does Not Disclose Storing Download Information in Cache Storage or Retrieving Download Information from Cache Storage.....	85
iii.	Nomoto Does Not Disclose Where Download Information Is Obtained from	85
iv.	Petitioner’s Theory with Three Hypotheses Regarding Utilizing Download Information for the File Cached in the First Wireless Device.....	87
v.	Petitioner’s First Hypothesis That Download Information Is Obtained from a Web Page is Flawed and Unsupported by Nomoto	88
vi.	Petitioner’s Second Hypothesis That Download Information Is Cached Is Flawed and Unsupported by Nomoto	89
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	91
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.....	92
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	93
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	94
xi.	Caching the Download Information in Nomoto Is Unnecessary and Wasteful.....	97
xii.	Nomoto and Major	100
xiii.	Nomoto and Kraft	102
xiv.	Therefore, Claim 13 Is Not Obvious in View of Nomoto Alone or in Combination with Jewett and Major or Kraft.....	104
b.	Dependent Claims 15-20 Are Not Obvious in View of Nomoto Alone or in Combination with Jewett, and Dependent Claim 14 Is Not Obvious Further in View of Major or Kraft and McCown	104
E.	Major’s Teachings Discourage Combining with Prust or Nomoto	105

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.