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 PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. THE '494 PATENT 5

A. Overview 5

B. Challenged Claims 7

C. Prosecution History 8

III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 9

A. "database" (claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 11, 14, and 15) 9

IV. SPECIFIC REASONS WHY THE CITED REFERENCES DO NOT INVALIDATE THE CLAIMS, AND WHY INTER PARTES REVIEW SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED 12

A. Grounds 1 and 2: Swimmer Does not Anticipate Challenged Claims 13

1. Swimmer Cannot Anticipate the '494 Patent Because Swimmer is not Enabled 13

2. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Swimmer Discloses "[a receiver for] receiving an incoming Downloadable" (claims 1 and 10) 15

3. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Swimmer Discloses "[a Downloadable scanner coupled with said receiver, for] deriving security profile data for the Downloadable, including a list of suspicious computer operations that may be attempted by the Downloadable" (claims 1 and 10) 17

4. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Swimmer Discloses "[a database manager coupled with said

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

Downloadable scanner, for] storing the Downloadable security profile data in a database" (claims 1 and 10) 19

5. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Swimmer Discloses "storing a date & time when the Downloadable security profile data was derived [by said Downloadable scanner], in the database" (claims 2 and 11) 22

6. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Swimmer Discloses "wherein suspicious computer operations include calls made to an operating system, a file system, a network system, and to memory" (claims 6 and 15) 23

B. Ground 2: Swimmer Does not Render Obvious Claims 5 and 14 24

1. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Swimmer Discloses "wherein the Downloadable includes program script" (claims 5 and 14) 24

C. Ground 3: Swimmer Does not Render Obvious the Challenged Claims 25

D. Ground 4: Cline in view of Ji Does not Render Obvious the Challenged Claims 27

1. Cline is not Analogous Art 28

2. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Cline in view of Ji Discloses "[a Downloadable scanner coupled with said receiver, for] deriving security profile data for the Downloadable, including a list of suspicious computer operations that may be attempted by the Downloadable" (claims 1 and 10) 31

3. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Cline in view of Ji Discloses "[a database manager coupled with said Downloadable scanner, for] storing the Downloadable security profile data in a database" (claims 1 and 10) 39

E. Ground 5: Forrest in view of Ji does not render the Challenged Claims obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) 43

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

1. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Forrest in view of discloses: "[a Downloadable scanner coupled with said receiver, for] deriving security profile data for the Downloadable, including a list of suspicious computer operations that may be attempted by the Downloadable" (claims 1 and 10) 43

2. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Forrest in view of Ji Discloses "[a database manager coupled with said Downloadable scanner, for] storing the Downloadable security profile data in a database" (claims 1 and 10) 47

V. PETITIONER'S OBVIOUSNESS ARGUMENTS FAIL AS A MATTER OF LAW BECAUSE IT DID NOT CONDUCT A COMPLETE OBVIOUSNESS ANALYSIS 48

VI. THE PROPOSED GROUNDS ARE CUMULATIVE 51

VII. THE PETITION DOES NOT COMPLY WITH 37 C.F.R. § 42.6 51

VIII. CONCLUSION 52

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

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Activevideo Networks, Inc., v. Verizon Communications, Inc.,
694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 26

Amgen Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.,
314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003) 13, 14, 16

In re Antor Media Corp.,
689 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 13

Apple Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n,
725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 48

In re Arkley,
455 F.2d 586 (Fed. Cir. 1972) 16

In re Bigio,
381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004) 29

In re Clay,
966 F.2d 656 (Fed. Cir. 1992) 31

CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Intern. Corp.,
349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003) 42

Estee Lauder Inc. v. L'Oreal, SA,
129 F.3d 588 (Fed. Cir. 1997) 22

Goertek, Inc. v. Knowles Electronics, LLC,
Case No. IPR2013-00523, Paper 26 (PTAB May 30, 2014).....51

Graham v. John Deere Co.,
383 U.S. 1 (1966).....48

In re Klein,
647 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 29, 31

Leo Pharm. Prods. Ltd. v. Rea,
726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 49, 50, 51

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.