

EXHIBIT 13

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SYMANTEC CORP.
Petitioner,

v.

FINJAN, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-01894
Patent 6,154,844

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE ‘844 PATENT	3
A. Overview	3
B. Challenged Claims	4
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	5
A. “means for receiving a Downloadable” (claim 43).....	5
B. “means for generating a first Downloadable security profile that identifies suspicious code in the received Downloadable” (claim 43)	6
C. “means for linking” (claim 43).....	8
IV. SPECIFIC REASONS WHY THE CITED REFERENCES DO NOT INVALIDATE THE CLAIMS, AND WHY <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED.....	11
A. Ground 1: Dan Does Not Render the Challenged Claims Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	12
1. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Dan Discloses “[means for] generating [by the inspector] a first Downloadable security profile that identifies suspicious code in the received Downloadable” (claims 1, 15, 41, and 43).....	12
(a) Access Control Lists Are Not DSP	13
(b) Dan’s ACL Does Not Identify Suspicious Code in the Received Downloadable.....	14
(c) Dan’s Certification Agency Does Not Generate a Downloadable Security Profile	16

(d)	Dan’s ACL Enforcer Does not Generate a Downloadable Security Profile	17
2.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Dan Discloses Using a Rule Set to Generate a Downloadable Security Profile (claim 15)	19
3.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Dan Discloses [means for] linking the first Downloadable security profile to the Downloadable before a web server makes the Downloadable available to web clients” (claims 1, 15, 41, and 43).....	20
4.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Dan Discloses “wherein the Downloadable includes a JavaScript™ script” (claim 7)	20
5.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Dan Discloses “wherein the first Downloadable security profile includes a list of operations deemed suspicious by the inspector” (claim 11)	21
6.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Dan Discloses “wherein the first rule set includes a list of suspicious operations” (claim 16).....	21
B.	Ground 2: Apperson in view of Ji and Further in view of Cline Does not Render the Challenged Claims Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103	22
1.	Cline is not Analogous Art	24
2.	Petitioner’s Proposed Combination of Apperson, Ji, and Cline is a Product of Impermissible Hindsight Bias.....	27
(a)	Petitioner Provides Insufficient Motivation to Modify Apperson with Ji	28
(b)	Petitioner Provides Insufficient Motivation to Modify Apperson with Cline	31
3.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Apperson in view of Ji and Cline Discloses “[means for] generating [by the	

inspector] a first Downloadable security profile that identifies suspicious code in the received Downloadable” (claims 1, 15, 41, and 43).....32

4. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Apperson in view of Ji and Cline Discloses “a content inspection engine for using the first rule set to generate a DSP” (claim 15).....34

5. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Apperson in view of Ji and Cline Discloses [means for] linking the first Downloadable security profile to the Downloadable before a web server makes the Downloadable available to web clients” (claims 1, 15, 41, and 43).....36

6. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Apperson in view of Ji and Cline Discloses “wherein the first Downloadable security profile includes a list of operations deemed suspicious by the inspector” (claim 11)37

7. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Apperson in view of Ji and Cline Discloses “wherein the first rule set includes a list of suspicious operations” (claim 16)38

C. Ground 3: Anand in View of Cline Does not Render the Challenged Claims Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)38

1. Cline is not Analogous Art39

2. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Anand in view of Cline Discloses “[means for] receiving [by an inspector] a Downloadable” (claims 1, 41, and 43).....39

3. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Anand in view of Cline Discloses “[means for] generating [by the inspector] a first Downloadable security profile that identifies suspicious code in the received Downloadable” (claims 1, 15, 41, and 43).....40

4. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Anand in view of Cline Discloses “a content inspection engine for using the first rule set to generate a DSP” (claim 15)43

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.