

DKT. 125-4

(REDACTED)

UNREDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<u>Page</u>
1		
2		
3	I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
4	II. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND	2
5	A. Malware Detection	2
6	B. '494 Patent.....	2
7	C. Operation of SRX & Sky ATP	4
8	III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	5
9	A. Legal Standard.....	5
10	B. Agreed Constructions.....	6
11	C. Additional Terms For Construction	7
12	IV. FINJAN IS NOT ENTITLED TO SUMMARY JUDGEMENT	13
13	A. Legal Standard.....	13
14	B. Finjan Is Not Entitled To Summary Judgment Because It Has Not Met Its Burden To Establish Compliance With 35 U.S.C. § 287	13
15	1. The Undisputed Facts Show That Finjan And Its Licensees Failed To Mark.....	14
16	2. There Is No Evidence That Finjan Provided Juniper With Actual Notice Prior To Filing Its Complaint.....	19
17	C. Finjan Is Not Entitled To Summary Judgment Because It Has Not Met Its Burden To Demonstrate No Factual Disputes Regarding Infringement	22
18	1. Finjan Presents No Evidence That SRX Infringes Claim 10	22
19	2. Sky ATP Does Not Infringe, Or At A Minimum There Are Disputed Factual Issues.....	22
20	(a) Finjan offers no evidence that Sky ATP includes a "scanner"	22
21	(b) Sky ATP does not derive a "list of suspicious computer operations that may be attempted by the Downloadable"	23
22	(c) Finjan Has Not Established That Sky ATP Meets Element 10(b) Under Doctrine of Equivalents.....	25
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

UNREDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Page

- (d) Finjan Has Not Established That Sky ATP Stores A List Of Suspicious Computer Operations In A “Database”26
- (e) Finjan Has Not Established That Sky ATP Meets Element 10(c) Under Doctrine of Equivalents30
- (f) Finjan Has Not Established That Sky ATP Has A “Database Manager”32
- (g) Finjan Has Not Established That Sky ATP Derives The Downloadable Security Profile Before Storing It33
- 3. Finjan Is Not Entitled To Summary Judgment That The Combination of SRX & Sky ATP Infringe Claim 1035
- D. Finjan Is Not Entitled To Summary Judgment Because Claim 10 Is Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 10135
 - 1. Claim 10 Is Directed Towards An Abstract Idea36
 - 2. Claim 10 Does Not Have A Transformative Inventive Concept.....38
- V. CONCLUSION40

UNREDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

1				Page(s)
2				
3	Cases			
4	<i>Acantha LLC v. Depuy Orthopedics Inc.,</i>			
5	No. 15-C-1257, 2018 WL 1951231 (E.D. Wis. Apr. 25, 2018).....			18
6	<i>Accent Packaging, Inc. v. Leggett & Platt, Inc.,</i>			
7	707 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....			12
8	<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l,</i>			
9	134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014)			<i>passim</i>
10	<i>Amsted Indus. Inc. v. Buckeye Steel Castings Co.,</i>			
11	24 F.3d 178 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....			15, 19, 21
12	<i>Apple, Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.,</i>			
13	842 F.3d 1229 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....			37
14	<i>Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.,</i>			
15	926 F. Supp. 2d 1100 (N.D. Cal. 2013)			19
16	<i>Arctic Cat, Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prods. Inc.,</i>			
17	876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....			14
18	<i>Asylus Networks, Inc. v. Apple, Inc.,</i>			
19	856 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. May 11, 2017).....			6
20	<i>Bascom Glob. Internet Servs., Inc. v. AT&T Mobility LLC,</i>			
21	827 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....			38
22	<i>Bilski v. Kappos,</i>			
23	561 U.S. 593 (2010)			36
24	<i>Cal. Inst. of Tech. v. Hughes Commc’ns Inc.,</i>			
25	59 F. Supp. 3d 974 (C.D. Cal. 2014).....			36
26	<i>Calmar, Inc. v. Emson Research, Inc.,</i>			
27	850 F. Supp. 861 (C.D. Cal. 1994).....			18
28	<i>Clancy Sys. Int’l, Inc. v. Symbol Techs., Inc.,</i>			
	953 F. Supp. 1170 (D. Colo. 1997)			15
	<i>Commil USA, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.,</i>			
	135 S. Ct. 1920 (2015)			35
	<i>Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, Nat’l Ass’n,</i>			
	776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....			40

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.