

TRIAL EX. 1760

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC,

Petitioner,

v.

FINJAN, INC.,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00159
Patent 8,677,494

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Trial Exhibit 1760

Case No. 3:17-cv-05659-WHA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Facts.....	1
A. The '494 Patent	1
B. Overview of Swimmer	4
C. Overview of Martin.....	6
D. Overview of Evidence Before the Board	6
1. Dr. Aviel Rubin.....	7
2. Mr. John Hawes	7
III. Claim Construction.....	8
A. “downloadable security profile data” (all claims).....	8
B. “database” (all claims).....	11
C. “Downloadable” (all claims).....	11
D. Other Terms.....	11
IV. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That The References Were Publicly Available.....	11
A. Swimmer Was Not Publicly Available	12
B. Martin Was Not Publicly Available	14
V. Swimmer Does Not Render Claims 1, 2, 6, 10, 11, and 15 Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).....	15
A. Swimmer Teaches Away from the Invention Claimed in the '494 Patent.....	16

B. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated That Swimmer Discloses “[a Downloadable scanner coupled with said receiver, for] deriving DSP data, including a list of suspicious computer operations that may be attempted by the Downloadable” (claims 1 and 10)17

1. Swimmer Does Not Disclose “a list of suspicious computer operations that may be attempted by the Downloadable” because Swimmer never deems any operations as suspicious19

2. Petitioner’s Argument That Swimmer Discloses A List of Suspicious Computer Operations Fails Because No Computer Operations Are *a priori* Suspicious23

3. Swimmer’s Audit Trail Does not Include a List of Suspicious Computer Operations Simply Because it can be Used to Detect Viruses24

4. The Claims Require Deriving a List of Suspicious Computer Operations25

5. Swimmer’s Activity Data Contained Within an Audit Record Cannot Correspond to DSP Data Because an Audit Record does not Include a List of Suspicious Computer Operations27

C. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Swimmer Discloses “storing the DSP data in a database” (claims 1 and 10).....28

1. Swimmer’s Audit Trail Is Not A Database Because Swimmer’s Audit Trail Is Undisputedly a Log File29

2. Swimmer Teaches that the Audit Trail Is Not A Database34

3. Swimmer’s Audit Trail does Not have a Schema and Does Not Describe a Flat-File Database35

a. “Canonical Format” is a Generic File Format, Not a “Database Schema”37

4. Converting Data Does Not Store the Data in a Database38

5.	The Claims of the '494 Patent Impose a Timing Requirement not Met by Swimmer's VIDES System	40
6.	There is No Motivation to Substitute Swimmer's Log File With a Database	41
D.	Swimmer does not Teach or Suggest "a database manager coupled with said Downloadable scanner, for storing the DSP data in a database" (claim 10)	43
E.	Swimmer does not Teach or Suggest storing "a date & time when the Downloadable Security profile data was derived" (claims 2 and 11)	46
VI.	Swimmer and Martin Do Not Render Claims 4-5 and 13-14 Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	47
A.	Swimmer is Not Prior Art and Teaches Away from the Invention Claimed in the '494 Patent.....	47
B.	Swimmer and Martin Do Not Disclose Wherein the Downloadable includes Program Script or Active Control	47
C.	Petitioner Provides Insufficient Motivation To Combine Swimmer And Martin.....	48
VII.	Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness	54
A.	Long-Felt But Unresolved Need and Recognition of a Problem	61
B.	Skepticism and Unexpected Results	61
C.	The Failure of Others	62
D.	Teaching Away By Others	62
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	63

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.