17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FINJAN, INC.,

Plaintiff.

v.

ESET, LLC, a California Limited Liability and ESET SPOL. S.R.O., a Slovak Republic Corporation,

Defendants.

Case No.: 3:17-cv-0183-CAB-(BGS)

CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER

On September 25 and 26, 2017, the Court held a hearing to construe certain terms and phrases of the following patents: U.S. Patent Nos. 6,154,844; 6,804,780; 8,079,086; 9,189,621; 9,219,755; and 7,975,305. The parties submitted briefing in accordance with this District's local patent rules and the case management order. A tutorial was presented by both sides to assist the Court with the history and background of the patents.

The Court requested further briefing regarding certain terms. Having now considered all the submissions of the parties, the arguments of counsel and for the reasons set forth at the hearing and herein, the Court hereby enters the claim constructions set forth below.



A. "Downloadable" in U.S. Patent Nos. 6,154,844; 6,804,780; 8,079,086; 9,189,621 and 9,219,755

The parties seek construction of the term **Downloadable** as it is used in five of the patents at issue. This claim term can be traced through two branches of the family tree of this patent (*see* Attachment A) with somewhat differing definitions. The Court however concludes that the variations between the definitions can be reconciled and the specifications in their entirety give notice of what is encompassed by the claim term **Downloadable** to one of skill in the art.

Downloadable initially appears as a defined term in the specification of the 6,167,520 patent, and its continuation the 6,480,962 patent, as *a small executable or interpretable application program which is downloaded from a source computer and run on a destination computer.*

The specification of the 6,092,194 patent, and its continuation the '780 patent (which is at issue in this litigation), define **Downloadable** as an executable application program which is downloadable from a source computer and run on the destination computer. The specification however provides as examples of a **Downloadable**, application programs such as JavaTM applets, known as little application programs in machine language, and JavaScriptsTM scripts, an interpretable application program. These examples are in accord with the definition, incorporated by reference, set forth in the '520 patent. The '194 patent and its progeny therefore conform to the '520 patent's definition of **Downloadable** as small executable or interpretable application programs through the use of the examples in the specifications. The Court finds that one of skill in the art would be able to ascertain what is claimed as a **Downloadable** in the context of these patents, and that in light of the examples provided in the '194 patent specification, concludes that the meaning of **Downloadable** is consistent with the definition provided in the '520 patent.

The '844 patent (which is at issue in this litigation) defines **Downloadable** as an executable application program which is downloadable from a source computer and run on the destination computer and also includes references to small executable and



interpretable application programs as examples of a **Downloadable**. The '844 patent incorporates by reference the '520 patent and '194 patent. The Court finds that the definition of **Downloadable** based on the '844 patent specification, the examples provided therein and the incorporation of the '520 patent and the '194 patent, informs one of skill in the art with reasonable certainty the scope of the invention. The entirety of the specification's description would inform that **Downloadable** includes executable and interpretable application programs, in accordance with the examples and incorporated references.

The '822 patent is a Continuation in Part of both the '962 patent and '780 patent and incorporates those patents by reference. Its continuation patents, including the '086 patent, '621 patent and '755 patent, which are at issue in this litigation, do not include a definition of **Downloadable** in the specification but incorporate by reference the '962 patent and the '780 patent, and their definitions and examples of a **Downloadable**.

The Court finds that the two branches of the family tree of the patents at issue inform that a **Downloadable** in the context of these patents means a *small executable or interpretable application program which is downloaded from a source computer and run on a destination computer*. This construction comports with the plain definition set forth in the '520 patent and the '962 patent, and is supported by the written description including the definition and the examples set forth in the '194 patent and its progeny, and in the entirety of specification of the '844 patent.

The Court therefore construes the term **Downloadable** in all five patents as *a small* executable or interpretable application program which is downloaded from a source computer and run on a destination computer.



B. U.S. Patent No. 6,154,844

The parties sought construction of the following phrase appearing in various claims of the '844 patent: **before the web server makes the Downloadable available to web clients**. The Court's construction for this term is: *Before the Downloadable is available on a web server to be called up or forwarded to a web client*. ('844 @ Col. 3:32-52; Col. 4:65 - Col. 5:13; Figure 1.)

C. U.S. Patent No. 6,804,780

The parties sought construction of the following terms and phrases appearing in various claims of the '780 patent. The Court's constructions for these terms are:

Claim Term	COURT'S CONSTRUCTION
software components	components of code that the Downloadable is
required to be executed	required to execute
by the Downloadable	(agreed construction)
ID generator	Defendant's request for application of 112 ¶6 denied.
	"ID generator" is not a nonce term as advocated by
	Defendant. It is a common name for a known
	program construct that would be familiar to one of
	skill in the art to perform a function further identified
	by its modifier.
performing a hashing	performing a hashing function on the
function on the	Downloadable together with its fetched software
Downloadable and the	components
fetched software	(Adopting PTO Construction from the IPR of the
components to generate a	'780 patent April, 2016.)
Downloadable ID	

D. U.S. Patent No. 7,975,305

The parties sought construction of the following phrase appearing in various claims of the '305 patent, **network interface**, **housed within a computer**. Defendant's proposed construction that "housed within a computer" necessarily limits the structure of the network interface to a hardware component is declined. The specification includes software interface examples. The Court therefore finds in the context of the patent, the use of "housed" in contrast to "stored" does not dictate that the claim be limited to hardware components. To the extent clarification is required the Court construes this phrase as *network interface*, *contained within the computer*.

The parties agreed construction for database, a collection of interrelated data organized according to a database schema to serve one or more applications, is adopted.

E. U.S. Patent No. 8,079,086

The parties sought construction of the following terms appearing in various claims of the '086 patent. The Court's constructions for these terms are:

Claim Term	COURT'S CONSTRUCTION
appended Downloadable	a Downloadable with a representation of the
	DSP data attached to the end of the
	Downloadable
	Declaration of Dr. Spafford, ¶¶36-39, and
	references cited therein, that one skilled in the
	art at the time would understand "append" to
	mean attach or add to the end of the existing file.
	The claim recites appending a representations of
	the DSP data to the Downloadable indicating an
	order.
destination computer	Separate computer receiving the appended
	Downloadable

DOCKET

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.

