

EXHIBIT A

NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

**United States Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit**

PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.,
Appellant

v.

FINJAN, INC.,
Cross-Appellant

2017-2543, 2017-2623

Appeals from the United States Patent and Trademark
Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board in Nos. IPR2016-
00159, IPR2016-01174.

FINJAN, INC.,
Appellant

v.

**ANDREI IANCU, UNDER SECRETARY OF
COMMERCE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
AND DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE,**
Intervenor

2017-2047

Appeal from the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board in Nos. IPR2015-01892, IPR2016-00890.

Decided: July 2, 2019

ORION ARMON, Cooley LLP, Broomfield, CO, argued for appellant Palo Alto Networks, Inc.

PAUL J. ANDRE, Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP, Menlo Park, CA, argued for cross-appellant and appellant Finjan, Inc. Also represented by JAMES R. HANNAH.

ROBERT MCBRIDE, Office of the Solicitor, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Alexandria, VA, argued for intervenor. Also represented by THOMAS W. KRAUSE, MAI-TRANG DUC DANG, FARHEENA YASMEEN RASHEED.

Before WALLACH, LINN, and HUGHES, *Circuit Judges*.

HUGHES, *Circuit Judge*.

This decision arises from the consolidated appeals of three *inter partes* reviews of a computer security patent. Symantec Corp., Blue Coat Systems LLC, and Palo Alto Networks, Inc., petitioned for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 8,677,494 B2. The Patent Trial and Appeal Board instituted partial review of the challenged claims. The Board found claims 3–5 and 10–15 to be not unpatentable but determined that claims 1, 2, and 6 of the '494 patent are unpatentable as obvious over Swimmer. Palo Alto Networks appeals the Board's decision on the '494 patent's priority date and the patentability of claims 10, 11, and 15.

Finjan, Inc. cross-appeals the Board's finding that claims 1, 2, and 6 are unpatentable. For the following reasons, we affirm the Board's final decision.

I

A.

Finjan, Inc., owns the '494 patent, which expired on January 29, 2017, and is directed to "protection systems and methods capable of protecting a personal computer [] or other" devices from "malicious' operations." '494 patent col. 2 ll. 51–56. The '494 patent addresses issues in virus detection. Internet browsers allow individuals to attach executable programs to their websites, some of which may contain malicious code that runs automatically upon opening a website. Early antivirus software systems had trouble processing these programs, called Downloadables. The '494 patent describes a method to detect viruses within Downloadables using a two phased approach comprised of an inspection phase and a determination phase.

Independent claims 1 and 10 of the '494 patent are representative for purposes of this appeal and are reproduced below.

1. A computer-based method, comprising the steps of:

receiving an incoming Downloadable;

deriving security profile data for the Downloadable, including a list of suspicious computer operations that may be attempted by the Downloadable; and

storing the Downloadable security profile data in a database.

'494 patent col. 21 ll. 19–25 (emphasis added).

10. A system of managing Downloadables, comprising:

a receiver for receiving an incoming Downloadable;

a Downloadable scanner coupled with said receiver, for deriving security profile data for the Downloadable, including a list of suspicious computer operations that may be attempted by the Downloadable; and

a database manager coupled with said Downloadable scanner, for storing the Downloadable security profile data in a database.

Id. col. 22 ll. 7–16 (emphasis added).

Only the inspection phase is relevant to this appeal. It entails three steps. First, the computer receives a Downloadable from an external network. Second, the system analyzes the executable code of the Downloadable to generate Downloadable security profile (DSP) data. The Downloadable scanner in claim 10 is a code scanner that generates the DSP data by decomposing the code using conventional parsing techniques. The code scanner identifies suspicious computer operations in the Downloadable code and lists them as DSP data. Finally, the DSP data for the Downloadable is stored in a database.

B.

On March 6, 2014, Finjan filed a Petition to Accept an Unintentionally Delayed Priority Claim pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.78 to fix a break in the '494 patent's priority chain. Finjan sought to include U.S. Patent Nos. 6,092,194 (Touboul) and 6,167,502 as parent applications in U.S. Patent No. 7,058,822, which is a parent of the '494 patent. On February 16, 2016, the Patent Office issued a reexamination certificate amending the specification of the '822 patent. Because the '494 patent is a continuation of the '822 patent, this certificate effectively amended the specification of the '494 patent to incorporate Touboul by reference and change its priority date to 1997.

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.