

Filed on behalf of Symantec Corporation

By: Joseph J. Richetti
Bryan Cave LLP
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10104
Tel: (212) 541-2000
Fax: (212) 541-4630

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SYMANTEC CORP.
Petitioner

v.

FINJAN, INC.
Patent Owner

Case: To Be Assigned
U.S. Patent No. 8,141,154

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §42.100 *et seq.***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8).....	1
II.	GROUND FOR STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)).....	2
III.	IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)).....	2
	A. Claims for Which Review Is Requested	2
	B. Priority Date of the ‘154 Patent.....	2
	C. The Specific Art on Which the Challenge Is Based.....	5
	D. The Statutory Grounds on Which the Challenge Is Based.....	7
IV.	OVERVIEW OF THE ‘154 PATENT	7
	A. The Specification.....	7
	B. The Challenged Claims	11
V.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL	14
VI.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS	14
	A. “dynamically generate[d]”	14
VII.	GROUND OF UNPATENTABILITY.....	15
	A. Ground 1: Claims 1-5 are Anticipated by Ross Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).....	15
	1. Ross Anticipates Independent Claims 1 and 4	17
	a. Ross discloses a system for protecting a computer from dynamically generated malicious content (1[P])	17
	b. Ross discloses a computer-readable storage medium (4[P]).....	18
	c. Ross discloses [a content processor for] processing content received over a network, the content including a call to a first function including an input (1[A], 4[A]) ..	18

d.	Ross discloses [a transmitter for] transmitting the input [to a security computer/for inspection], when the first function is invoked (1[C], 4[C]).....	20
e.	Ross discloses suspending processing of the content (4[D])	22
f.	Ross discloses [a receiver for] receiving an indicator of whether it is safe to invoke a second function with the input (1[E1], 4[E1])	23
g.	Ross discloses resuming processing of the content after receiving the indicator (4[F])	24
h.	Ross discloses invoking the second function with the input only if the [security computer/indicator] indicates it is safe (1[B1], 4[B1])	25
2.	Ross anticipates dependent claim 2	25
3.	Ross anticipates dependent claims 3 and 5	26
B.	Ground 2: Claims 2, 4-8, and 10-11 are rendered obvious by Ross under 35 U.S.C. § 103	27
1.	Ross renders obvious independent claims 4, 6, and 10	27
a.	Ross teaches limitations 4[Pre, A, B1, C, E1], 6[Pre, A, C], and 10[Pre, A, C].	30
b.	Ross teaches receiving the modified input variable [from the security computer] (6[E2], 10 [E2])	30
c.	Ross teaches calling a second function with a modified input variable (6[E2], 10[E2])	32
d.	Ross teaches modifying the input variable if the security computer determines that calling a function with the input variable may not be safe (6[G], 10[G])	32
e.	Ross teaches suspending and resuming processing of the content (4[D][F], 10[D][F])	33

2.	Ross renders obvious dependent claims 2 and 7	34
3.	Ross renders obvious dependent claims 5, 8, and 11	35
C.	Ground 3: Claims 9 and 12 are rendered obvious by Ross in view of Calder under 35 U.S.C. § 103	35
D.	Ground 4: Claims 1-12 of the '154 Patent are obviated by Calder in view of Sirer under 35 U.S.C. § 103	37
1.	Calder in view of Sirer renders obvious independent claims 1, 4, 6, and 10	41
a.	Calder teaches a system for protecting a computer from dynamically generated malicious content (1[P], 6[P])	41
b.	Calder teaches a non-transitory computer-readable storage medium storing program code (4[P], 10[P])	42
c.	Calder teaches [a content processor for] processing content received over a network, the content including a call to a first function including an input [variable] (1[A], 4[A], 6[A], 10[A])	43
d.	Calder in view of Sirer teaches [a transmitter for] transmitting the input [variable] [to a security computer] for inspection, when the first function is called (1[C], 4[C], 6[C], 10[C])	45
e.	Calder in view of Sirer teaches suspending and resuming processing of the content (4[D][F], 10[D][F])	47
f.	Calder in view of Sirer teaches [a receiver for] receiving an indicator [from the security computer] of whether it is safe to invoke a second function with the input (1[E1], 4[E1])	48
g.	Calder teaches invoking the second function with the input [variable] only if the [indicator/security computer] indicates that such invocation is safe (1[B1], 4[B1])	50

h. Calder in view of Sirer teaches [a receiver for]
receiving the modified input variable (6[D2], 10 [D2])...51

i. Calder teaches calling a second function with a
modified input variable (6[B2], 10[B2])52

j. Calder in view of Sirer teaches modifying the input
variable if the security computer determines that
calling a function with the input variable may not be
safe (6[G], 10[G])53

2. Calder in view of Sirer render obvious dependent claims 2
and 753

3. Calder in view of Sirer renders obvious dependent claims 3,
5, 8, and 1154

4. Calder and Sirer render obvious dependent claims 9 and 12 ...55

VIII. CONCLUSION.....58



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.