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

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

IPR2020-01393
Exhibit 2001
Adobe 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 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. Predefined Capacity in the '686 Patent 15

ii. Prust's RAID Does Not Disclose '686 Predefined Capacity 18

iii. Prust's Billing Address Does Not Disclose '686 Predefined Capacity 23

iv. Prust Does Not Disclose Capacity 24

v. Prust Does Not Disclose Predefined Capacity 25

vi. Jewett Does Not Disclose Predefined Capacity 28

vii. The Combination of Prust and Jewett Does Not Disclose Predefined Capacity 32

viii. Claims 12-20 Are Not Obvious in View of Prust (Ex 1104) and Jewett (Ex 1109) 32

b. Claim 12: Prust's Email Does Not Disclose Establishing a Communication Link for the Wireless Device to Remotely Access the Storage Space 33

c. Claim 12: Prust's Email Does Not Disclose Retrieving 37

d. Claim 12: Prust's Email Does Not Disclose Storing and Retrieving 39

e. A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine Prust with Jewett 40

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 41

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 42

i. Prust Does Not Disclose Storing Download Information in Cache Storage or Retrieving Download Information from Cache Storage 42

ii. Prust Does Not Disclose Where Download Information Is Obtained from 43

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

iii. Petitioner's Theory with Three Hypotheses Regarding Utilizing Download Information for the File Cached in the First Wireless Device 44

iv. Petitioner's First Hypothesis That Download Information Is Obtained from a Web Page is Flawed and Unsupported by Prust 44

v. Petitioner's Second Hypothesis That Download Information Is Cached Is Flawed and Unsupported by Prust 47

vi. 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 49

vii. Petitioner's Third Hypothesis That the User's Typing or Copying of Download Information Discloses Cached Download Information Is Flawed and Unsupported by Prust 50

viii. Petitioner's Third Hypothesis (Typing Scenario) That the User's Typing of Download Information Discloses Cached Download Information Is Flawed and Unsupported by Prust 51

ix. Petitioner's Third Hypothesis (Copying Scenario) That the User's Copying of Download Information Discloses Cached Download Information Is Flawed and Unsupported by Prust 52

x. Caching the Download Information in Prust Is Unnecessary and Wasteful 55

xi. Prust and Major 59

xii. Prust and Kraft 60

xiii. Therefore, Claim 13 Is Not Obvious in View of Prust Alone or in Combination with Jewett and Major or Kraft 62

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 62

C. Independent Claim 12 Is Not Obvious in View of Nomoto Alone or in Combination with Jewett 63

a. Claim 12: Nomoto Does Not Disclose Predefined Capacity 63

b. Claim 12: Nomoto and Jewett Do Not Disclose Predefined Capacity 64

c. A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine Nomoto with Jewett 64

D. Dependent Claim 13 Is Not Obvious in View of Nomoto Alone or in Combination with Jewett and Major or Kraft 66

a. Claim 13: Utilizing Download Information for the File Cached in the First Wireless Device Is Not Disclosed in Nomoto Alone or in Combination with Jewett and Major or Kraft 66

i. Nomoto Does Not Disclose Storing Download Information in Cache Storage or Retrieving Download Information from Cache Storage 66

ii. Nomoto Does Not Disclose Where Download Information Is Obtained from 67

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

iii. Petitioner's Theory with Three Hypotheses Regarding Utilizing Download Information for the File Cached in a Cache Storage in the First Wireless Device 69

iv. Petitioner's First Hypothesis That Download Information Is Obtained from a Web Page is Flawed and Unsupported by Nomoto 69

v. Petitioner's Second Hypothesis That Download Information Is Cached Is Flawed and Unsupported by Nomoto 71

vi. 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 73

vii. Petitioner's Third Hypothesis That the User's Typing or Copying of Download Information Discloses Cached Download Information Is Flawed and Unsupported by Nomoto 74

viii. Petitioner's Third Hypothesis (Typing Scenario) That the User's Typing of Download Information Discloses Cached Download Information Is Flawed and Unsupported by Nomoto 75

ix. Petitioner's Third Hypothesis (Copying Scenario) That the User's Copying of Download Information Discloses Cached Download Information Is Flawed and Unsupported by Nomoto 76

x. Caching the Download Information in Nomoto Is Unnecessary and Wasteful 79

xi. Nomoto and Major 82

xii. Nomoto and Kraft 84

xiii. Therefore, Claim 13 Is Not Obvious in View of Nomoto Alone or in Combination with Jewett and Major or Kraft 86

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 86

E. Major's Teachings Discourage Combining with Prust or Nomoto 87

a. Major's Teachings Discourage Wireless Device Access to External Storage 87

b. Major Stores Data Objects in Cache, Negating the Need for External Storage 89

VI. CONCLUSION 90

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* Reviews (IPRs) 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.