

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SYMANTEC CORP.,

Petitioner,

v.

FINJAN, INC.,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-01892
Patent 8,677,494

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Facts	1
A. THE '494 PATENT.....	1
B. Overview of Swimmer	3
C. Overview of Evidence Before the Board	4
1. Dr. Sylvia Hall-Ellis.....	5
2. Dr. Jack Davidson	5
III. Claim Construction.....	6
A. “database” (claims all claims).....	6
B. “list of suspicious computer operations” (all claims)	10
C. “storing the DSP data in a database” (all claims)	13
IV. Swimmer does not invalidate the '494 Patent.....	16
A. Swimmer was not Publically Available	16
V. Swimmer Does Not Render Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 11, 14, and 15 Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	18
A. Swimmer Teaches Away from the Invention Claimed in the '494 Patent.....	19
B. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Swimmer Discloses “[a Downloadable scanner coupled with said receiver, for] deriving DSP data, including a list of suspicious computer operations that may be attempted by the Downloadable” (claims 1 and 10)	20
1. Swimmer does not disclose “a list of suspicious computer operations that may be attempted by the Downloadable”	

	because Swimmer never deems any operations as suspicious	22
2.	Petitioner's Argument That Swimmer Discloses a List of Suspicious Computer Operations Fails Because no Computer Operations are <i>a priori</i> Suspicious	24
3.	Swimmer's Audit Trail Does not Include a List of Suspicious Computer Operations Simply Because it can be Used to Detect Viruses.....	25
4.	The Claims Require Deriving a List of Suspicious Computer Operations	27
5.	Swimmer's Activity Data Contained Within an Audit Record Cannot Correspond to DSP Data Because an Audit Record does not Include a List of Suspicious Computer Operations	28
C.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Swimmer Discloses storing the DSP data in a database" (claims 1 and 10)	30
1.	Converting Data Does Not Store the Data in a Database	33
2.	Swimmer's Audit Trail Is Not A Database Because Swimmer's Audit Trail Is Undisputedly a Log File	35
	a. Dr. Davidson Admitted that Swimmer's Audit Trail is a Log File.....	36
	b. Swimmer's Audit Trail Is Not A Database Due to Fundamental Differences in Structure and Function.....	37
	c. "Canonical Format" is a Generic File Format not a "Database Schema"	41
3.	Petitioner Provides Insufficient Motivation to Substitute Swimmer's Log File With a Database	43
4.	The Claims of the '494 Patent Impose a Timing Requirement not Met by Swimmer's VIDES System	46

D.	Swimmer does not Teach or Suggest “a database manager coupled with said Downloadable scanner, for storing the DSP data in a database” (claim 10)	48
E.	Swimmer does not Teach or Suggest “wherein the Downloadable includes program script” (claims 5 and 15).....	52
VI.	Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness	53
A.	Long-Felt But Unresolved Need and Recognition of a Problem	60
B.	Skepticism and Unexpected Results	61
C.	The Failure of Others	61
D.	Teaching away by others.....	62
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	63

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	62
<i>In re Baxter Int'l, Inc.</i> , 678 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	9
<i>Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	17
<i>In re: Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	61, 62
<i>Demaco Corp. v. F. Von Langsdorff Licensing Ltd.</i> , 851 F.2d 1387 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	55
<i>In re Gal</i> , 980 F.2d 717 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	46, 51, 53
<i>Graftech Int'l Holdgs, Inc., v. Laird Techs., Inc.</i> , 2016 WL 3357427 (Fed. Cir. June 17, 2016)	54
<i>In re Hall</i> , 781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	16
<i>Institut Pasteur & Universite Pierre Et Marie Curie v. Focarino</i> , 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	54
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	45
<i>Kyocera Wireless Corp. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 545 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	17, 18
<i>L-3 Commc'n Holdings, Inc. v. Power Survey, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00832, Paper 9 (PTAB Nov. 14, 2014).....	16

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.