

1 PAUL ANDRE (State Bar Number 196585)

pandre@kramerlevin.com

2 LISA KOBIALKA (State Bar Number 191404)

3 lkobialka@kramerlevin.com

JAMES HANNAH (State Bar Number 237978)

4 jhannah@kramerlevin.com

5 KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS

& FRANKEL LLP

6 990 Marsh Road

7 Menlo Park, CA 94025

8 Telephone: (650) 752-1700

9 Facsimile: (650) 752-1800

Attorneys for Plaintiff

10 FINJAN, INC.

11 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
12 **FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
13 **SAN DIEGO DIVISION**

14 FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17
18 ESET, LLC, a California Limited
19 Liability Corporation, and ESET SPOL.

20 S.R.O., a Slovak Republic Corporation,

21 Defendants.

22 ESET, LLC, a California Limited
23 Liability Corporation, and ESET SPOL.

24 S.R.O., a Slovak Republic Corporation,

25 Counterclaim-Plaintiffs,

26 v.

27 FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,

28 Counterclaim-Defendant.

Case No. 3:17-cv-00183-CAB-BGS

**PLAINTIFF FINJAN, INC.'S
OPENING CLAIM
CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. STATEMENT OF FACTS	1
A. Finjan.....	1
B. Summary of Finjan’s Patents	2
1. The ‘844 Patent	2
2. The ‘086 Patent	3
3. The ‘780 Patent	3
4. The ‘305 Patent	3
5. The ‘621 and ‘755 Patents	4
III. ARGUMENT	4
A. Finjan’s Proposed Terms.....	4
Term 1. “Downloadable” (‘844, ‘780, and ‘086 Patents)	5
Term 2. “Downloadable” (‘621 and ‘755 Patents).....	7
B. ESET’s Proposed Terms for Construction	8
Term 3. “before a web server makes the Downloadable available to web clients” (‘844 Patent)	8
Term 4. “web server” (‘844 Patent).....	8
Term 5. “software components required to be executed by the Downloadable” (‘780 Patent).....	10
Term 6. “performing a hashing function on the Downloadable and the fetched software components to generate a Downloadable ID” (‘780 Patent at Claims 1, 18).....	11
Term 7. “network interface, housed within a computer” (‘305 Patent at Claim 1).....	12
Term 8. “appended Downloadable” (‘086 Patent)	13
Term 9. “destination computer” (‘086 Patent, Claims 1, 9, 24).....	14
Term 10. “wherein the information pertaining to the downloadable includes information pertaining to an operation of the	

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

downloadable and distinct from information pertaining to the request” (‘621 Patent at Claim 1) 15

1. ESET Improperly Identifies Claims as Means-Plus-Function 16

Term 11. “a transmitter . . . for transmitting the appended Downloadable to a destination computer” (‘086 Patent at Claim 9)..... 16

Term 12. “a file appender ... for appending a representation of the Downloadable security profile data to the Downloadable, to generate an appended Downloadable” (‘086 Patent) 17

Term 13. “ID generator ... for performing a hashing function on the Downloadable and the fetched software components to generate a Downloadable ID” (‘780 Patent, Claim 9) 19

Term 14. “a response engine for performing a predetermined responsive action based on the comparison” (‘621 Patent, Claims 1 and 10).....20

Term 15. “a response engine for performing a predetermined responsive action based on the comparison with the information pertaining to the predetermined suspicious downloadable” (‘621 Patent, Claim 5)21

Term 16. “a response engine . . . according to the predetermined security policy” (‘755 Patent)22

Term 17. “downloadable engine for intercepting a request message being issued by a downloadable to an operating system” (‘755 Patent at Claim 3)23

Term 18. “intercepting a request message being issued by a downloadable to an operating system” (‘755 Patent at Claim 3).....24

2. ESET Ignores the Remainder of the Dependent Claim when Construing a Means-Plus-Function Limitation 25

Term 19. “downloadable engine” (‘621 Patent at Claim 15).....25

IV. CONCLUSION..... 26

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Federal Cases

1

2

3

4 *Abtox, Inc. v. Exitron Corp.*,

5 131 F.3d 1009 (Fed. Cir. 1997) 7

6 *Accent Packaging, Inc. v. Leggett & Platt, Inc.*,

7 707 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 7

8 *AIA Eng’g Ltd. V. Magotteaux Int’l S/A*,

9 657 F.3d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 6

10 *Aventis Pharms. Inc. v. Amino Chems. Ltd.*,

11 715 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 8, 10, 11, 13

12 *Baldwin Graphic Sys., Inc. v. Siebert, Inc.*,

13 512 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2008) 12

14 *Blast Motion, Inc. v. Zepp Labs., Inc.*,

15 No. 15-CV-700 JLS (NLS), 2017 WL 476428 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2017)..... 17

16 *Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. v. St. Jude Med., Inc.*,

17 296 F.3d 1106 (Fed. Cir. 2002) 25

18 *CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Burnswick Corp.*,

19 288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002) 5

20 *Collaborative Agreements, LLC v. Adobe Sys. Inc.*,

21 No. 15-CV-03853-EMC, 2015 WL 7753293 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 2, 2015) 17, 19

22 *Edwards Lifesciences LLC v. Cook Inc.*,

23 582 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2009) 5

24 *Finjan, Inc. v. Proofpoint, Inc.*,

25 3:13-cv-05808-HSG, 2015 WL 7770208 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 3, 2015)..... *passim*

26 *Finjan, Inc. v. Symantec Corp.*,

27 No. 14-CV-02998-HSG, 2017 WL 550453 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 10, 2017) 5, 9

28 *Laitram Corp. v. NEC Corp.*,

163 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 1998) 12

1 *Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.*,
2 134 S. Ct. 2120 (2014)..... 16

3 *Nazomi Commc’ns, Inc. v. Microsoft Mobile Oy*,
4 Nos. 2014-1173, 2014-1178, 2014 WL 6678247 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 26, 2014)..... 7

5 *NTP, Inc. v. Research In Motion, Ltd.*,
6 418 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2005) 7

7 *Odyssey Wireless, Inc. v. Apple Inc.*,
8 No. 15-CV-1735-H (RBB), 2016 WL 3055900 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 30, 2016)..... 16

9 *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*,
10 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc) 4

11 *Thorner v. Sony Computer Entm’t Am. LLC*,
12 669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012)*passim*

Federal Statutes

13 35 U.S.C. § 112.....*passim*

14
15
16
17
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.