

EXHIBIT B

1 PAUL J. ANDRE (State Bar No. 196585)
 2 pandre@kramerlevin.com
 3 LISA KOBIALKA (State Bar No. 191404)
 4 lkobialka@kramerlevin.com
 5 JAMES HANNAH (State Bar No. 237978)
 6 jhannah@kramerlevin.com
 7 HANNAH LEE (State Bar No. 253197)
 8 hlee@kramerlevin.com
 9 KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP
 10 990 Marsh Road
 11 Menlo Park, CA 94025
 12 Telephone: (650) 752-1700
 13 Facsimile: (650) 752-1800

14 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
 15 FINJAN, INC.

16 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 17 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
 18 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

19 FINJAN, INC.,

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 PROOFPOINT, INC., and ARMORIZE
 23 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

24 Defendants.

Case No.:13-cv-05808-HSG

**PLAINTIFF FINJAN, INC.’S OPPOSITION
 TO PROOFPOINT, INC. AND ARMORIZE
 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.’S MOTION FOR
 SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND FINJAN,
 INC.’S CROSS-MOTION FOR SUMMARY
 JUDGMENT**

Date: March 31, 2016
 Time: 2:00 p.m.
 Place: Courtroom 10, 19th Floor
 Before: Hon. Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr.

25 **REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED**
 26
 27
 28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

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

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....2

III. ARGUMENT.....2

 A. Defendants Infringe the Asserted Patents 2

 1. EP Infringes the ‘822, ‘633, ‘305, ‘408 and ‘844 Patents.....2

 2. The Accused Products Infringe the ‘822 and ‘633 Patents by Their Use of Mobile Protection Code.....4

 3. The Accused Products Infringe the ‘305 Patent Because They Include Rules That Identify “Types of Tokens”5

 4. The Accused Products Infringe the ‘408 Patent Because They Dynamically Detect Exploits While Dynamically Building a Parse Tree8

 5. EP, Essentials and TAP Infringe the ‘844 Patent Because They Meet the Web Server Requirement.....9

 (a) URL Defense Infringes the ‘844 Patent 11

 (b) Attachment Defense Infringes the ‘844 Patent..... 13

 6. HackAlert Infringes the ‘086 Patent Because it Transmits Downloadables to a Destination Computer15

 7. HackAlert Infringes the ‘918 Patent Because It Uses “Executable Wrapper Code” (CODE-B).....16

 8. HackAlert Infringes the ‘154 Patent Because It Satisfies the Claim Elements Concerning First and Second Functions Including Input.....18

 B. Defendants are Not Entitled a Partial Summary Judgment on the Invention Dates of the ‘844, ‘633 and ‘822 Patents 19

 C. Defendants are Not Entitled a Partial Summary Judgment of Invalidity of Claim 14 of the ‘633 Patent 21

 D. Defendants are Not Entitled Partial Summary Judgment on the Priority Date of the ‘086 Patent 23

IV. CROSS-MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT24

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

A. Claim 14 of the '633 Patent is Not Anticipated by the Ji Reference 24

B. The '086 Patent is Entitled to a Priority Date of November 6, 1997 25

C. Claims 17 and 24 of the '086 Patent are Valid 25

V. CONCLUSION.....25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

1

2

3

4 *Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Concepts In Optics, Inc.*,
111 F. App'x 582 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... 24

5 *GPNE Corp. v. Apple, Inc.*,
No. 12-CV-02885-LHK, 2014 WL 1390039 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 9, 2014) 1

6

7 *Henkel Corp. v. Procter & Gamble Co.*,
485 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2007)..... 19

8

9 *Int'l Rectifier Corp. v. IXYS Corp.*,
361 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... 1

10 *Jones v. Evans*,
46 F.2d 197 (C.C.P.A. 1931) 19

11

12 *PowerOasis, Inc. v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.*,
522 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 25

13

14 *Ralston Purina Co. v. Far-Mar-Co, Inc.*,
772 F.2d 1570 (Fed. Cir. 1985)..... 19

15 *Ralston Purina Co. v. Far-Mar-Co.*,
586 F.Supp. 1176, 1189 (D. Kan. 1984)..... 25

16

17 *Taylor v. Sturgell*,
553 U.S. 880 (2008)..... 20

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

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.