

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SYMANTEC CORPORATION

Petitioner

v.

**THE TRUSTEES OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-00375

Patent No. 8,074,115

**PATENT OWNER THE TRUSTEES OF
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK'S
NOTICE OF APPEAL**

via mail

Director of the United States Patent & Trademark Office
c/o Office of the General Counsel
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

via PTAB E2E

Patent Trial and Appeal Board

via CM/ECF

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 141(c), 142, 319; 5 U.S.C. §§ 702, 703; and 37 C.F.R. §§ 90.2(a), 90.3(a), Patent Owner, the Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York ("Columbia") hereby appeals to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit from the final written decision entered on June 30, 2016 (Paper 47) ("the Final Written Decision") and all underlying orders, decisions, rulings and opinions which adversely affect Columbia, including but not limited to the Decision Instituting IPR.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 90.2(a)(3)(ii), Columbia further indicates that the issues on appeal include but are not limited to:

- whether the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (the "Board") erred in ruling that Claims 22, 25-29, 32, 35-39, and 42 of U.S. Patent No. 8,074,115 ("the '115 Patent") are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0108562 ("Khazan");
- whether the Board erred in ruling Claims 1, 4-8, 11, 14-18, and 21 of the '115 Patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Khazan and U.S. Patent No. 5,440,723 ("Arnold");
- whether the Board erred in ruling Claims 3, 13, 24, and 34 of the '115 Patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Khazan, Arnold and U.S. Patent No. 8,108,929 ("Agrawal");

- whether the Board erred in its construction and application of the construction for the term "model of function calls" as appearing in all claims;
- whether the Board erred in its construction and application of the construction of the term "the model reflects attacks against the at least a part of the program" as appearing in claims 8, 18, 29, and 39;
- whether the Board erred in its construction and application of the construction for the term "creating a combined model from at least two models created at different times" in claims 3, 13, 24 and 34;
- whether the Board erred in its finding that the cited art discloses the term "the model reflects normal activity of the at least a part of the program," as it appears in claims 7, 17, 28 and 38;
- whether the Board erred in its finding that the cited art discloses the term "the model reflects attacks of the at least a part of the program," as it appears in claims 8, 18, 29 and 39;
- whether the Board erred in its application of the construction for the term "application community" as applicable to claims 1-21;
- whether the Board erred in its application of the construction for the term "anomalous" as applicable to all claims;

- whether the Board erred in finding that cited art discloses the limitation "modifying a program" or "modifies a program" as applicable to claims 22-42;
- whether the Board erred in its finding that the cited art discloses an "emulator" as construed by the Board;
- whether the Board erred in its finding that the cited art discloses "notifying/notifies . . . of the anomalous function call" as applicable to claims 1-21;
- the Board's consideration of the record evidence, including but not limited to expert testimony;
- the Board's analysis regarding motivation for and reasons to combine in support of its obviousness conclusion; and
- all findings or determinations supporting or relating to those issue, as well as any other issues decided adversely to Columbia in any orders, decisions, rulings and opinions.

Simultaneous with this submission, a copy of this Notice of Appeal is being filed electronically through the Board's End to End (PTAB E2E) electronic filing system as well as mailed by Express Mail to Director of the United States Patent & Trademark Office, c/o Office of the General Counsel, at P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. In addition, Appellant Columbia files a copy of the

Notice of Appeal transmitted to the Board on August 23, 2016, the \$500 filing fee prescribed by 28 U.S.C. § 1913, and courtesy copies of the Final Written Decision with the Clerk's Office for the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Hong A. Zhong /

Date: August 23, 2016

Hong A. Zhong (Reg. No. 66,530)
Michael R. Fleming (Reg. No. 67,933)
Jason Sheasby (*pro hac vice*)
Irell & Manella LLP
1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900
Los Angeles, CA 90067-4276

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.