

# Petition's Representation o

Over

Clients 30 connected with server 36 read an  
numbered slices and request or pull the sequential slice  
over the network. EX1005, 10:25-48, FIG. 6A, 7:39-8.

¶ 68.

Petition at 14 (emphasis added).

13 Q. Looking at the second paragraph of  
14 to Question 114, you state that Carmel does n  
15 storing requested files in a buffer at a clie  
16 assessing the amount of contiguously availabl  
17 therein.

18 Do you see that?

19 A. I do.

24 A. Just focused on this portion of  
25 Question 114, I think this is a more straig

1 disagreement about disclosure in Carmel of  
2 requested files in a buffer.

3 I disagree that Carmel disclose  
4 files, and I disagree that it discloses st  
5 buffer and -- and assessing the amount of  
6 available files stored in the buffer.

7 Q. Why do you disagree that Carmel  
8 disclose storing files in the client's buf

9 A. I -- I don't know how to say it  
10 there is no disclosure of that in Carmel.

24 Q. So even in -- in view of the mu  
25 stream embodiment, your opinion is that Ca

1 disclose its slices being independently r  
2 playable by the apparatus?

3 A. Certainly in the context of the  
4 stream embodiment, it's also my opinion t  
5 disclosed in terms of the single level em  
6 particular sentence that your pointing to  
7 believe, really a reference to the multi-  
8 4, as we can see at the beginning of the  
9 the first line that's not highlighted.

6 Q. Do you have any further response  
7 Dr. Richardson's testimony regarding claim 5  
8 patent and whether Carmel discloses it?

9 A. Unfortunately, I don't remember i  
10 sufficient clarity to comment further. I me  
11 think my -- my bottom line opinion here is,  
12 back to one of the very, very key disputes i  
13 is there's no -- there's no -- excuse me, th  
14 disclosure of requesting individual files in

22 Q. Why do you -- can you explain your  
23 in your view, Carmel does not disclose that e  
24 streamlets of each of the different copies is  
25 requestable by the client in -- as disclosed

1 A. Well, again, it's sort of like --  
2 to explain a negative. I mean, there is no  
3 so, first and foremost, there is no disclosure  
4 as I'm speaking in the answer to 118, of using  
5 requests to request separate files. There --  
6 disclosures of requesting separate files by a  
7 let alone by HTTP.

# 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.