UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SYMANTEC CORP.

Petitioner

v.

FINJAN, INC.,

Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-01547

Patent No. 8,141,154

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. THE '154 PATENT 4

A. Overview 4

B. Challenged Claims 6

III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 7

A. "dynamically generated" (claims 1, 10, 14, and 14): 7

IV. SPECIFIC REASONS WHY THE CITED REFERENCES DO NOT INVALIDATE THE CLAIMS, AND WHY INTER PARTES REVIEW SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED 9

A. Ground 1: Ross Does Not Anticipate Claims 1–5 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) 9

1. Ross does not disclose "a system for protecting a computer from dynamically generated malicious content" (claim 1) 10

2. Ross does not disclose "a content processor (i) for processing content received over a network, the content including a call to a first function, and the call including an input" (claims 1 and 4) 12

3. Ross does not disclose "invoking a second function with the input, only if a security computer indicates that such invocation is safe" (claims 1 and 4) 15

4. Ross does not disclose "wherein the input is dynamically generated by said content processor prior to being transmitted by said transmitter" (claims 3 and 5) 16

B. Ground 2: Ross Does Not Render Claims 2, 4-8, 10, and 11 Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) 19

1. Ross does not disclose "a content processor (i) for processing content received over a network, the content including a call to

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

a first function, and the call including an input" (claims 4, 6, and 10).....19

2. Ross does not disclose "calling a second function with a modified input variable" (claims 6 and 10).....19

C. Ground 3: Ross in view of Calder Does Not Render Claims 9 and 12 Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).....20

1. Ross in view of Calder fails to show or suggest "wherein the input variable includes a call to an additional function, and wherein the modified input variable includes a call to a modified additional function instead of the call to the additional function".....20

D. Ground 4: Calder in view of Sirer Does Not Render Claims 1–12 Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).....28

1. Calder in view of Sirer does not disclose "a content processor (i) for processing content received over a network, the content including a call to a first function, and the call including an input" (claims 1, 4, 6, and 10).....29

2. Calder in view of Sirer does not disclose a content processor "(ii) for invoking a second function with the input, only if a security computer indicates that such invocation is safe" (claims 1 and 4).....31

3. Calder in view of Sirer does not disclose "calling a second function with a modified input variable" (claims 6 and 10).....32

4. Calder in view of Sirer does not disclose "wherein the input is dynamically generated by said content processor prior to being transmitted by said transmitter" (claims 3, 5, 8, and 11).....32

5. Calder in view of Sirer does not disclose "wherein the input variable includes a call to an additional function, and wherein the modified input variable includes a call to a modified additional function instead of the call to the additional function" (claims 9 and 12).....33

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

V. PETITIONER'S OBVIOUSNESS ARGUMENTS FAIL AS A MATTER OF LAW BECAUSE IT DID NOT CONDUCT A COMPLETE OBVIOUSNESS ANALYSIS 34

VI. THE PROPOSED GROUNDS ARE CUMULATIVE.....37

VII. THE PRIORITY DATE FOR THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS IS NOT PROPERLY BEFORE THE BOARD.....38

VIII. CONCLUSION 39

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Apple Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n,
725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 34

Aventis Pharms. v. Amino Chems. Ltd.,
715 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 8

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....26, 34

Leo Pharmaceutical v. Rea,
726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 35, 37

Novatek, Inc. v. Sollami Co.,
559 Fed. Appx. 1011 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....10

Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs, Inc.,
520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008) 35

Plantronics, Inc. v. Aliph, Inc.,
724 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 35, 36

Rambus Inc. v. Teresa Stanek Rea,
731 F.3d 1248 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 36

Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.,
234 F.3d 654 (Fed. Cir. 2000) 34

Thorner v. Sony Computer Entm't Am. LLC,
669 F.3d (Fed. Cir. 2012) 4, 8

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102.....38

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) 9

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) 19, 20, 28, 29

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.