

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

FINJAN, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2015-01974  
Patent 7,647,633

---

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. THE ‘633 PATENT .....	4
A. Overview .....	4
B. Challenged Claims .....	7
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	10
A. “mobile protection code (“MPC”)” (all challenged claims) .....	10
B. “information re-communicator” (challenged claims 2, 14, and 19).....	11
C. “means for receiving downloadable-information” (claim 13).....	12
D. “means for determining whether the downloadable-information includes executable code” (claim 13) .....	13
E. “means for causing mobile protection code to be communicated to at least one information-destination of the downloadable-information, if the downloadable information is determined to include executable code” (claim 13).....	14
IV. SPECIFIC REASONS WHY THE CITED REFERENCES DO NOT INVALIDATE THE CLAIMS, AND WHY INTER PARTES REVIEW SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED .....	15
A. The Board Should Deny the Petition Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	17
B. The Board Should Deny the Petition Under 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.20(c), 42.22(a)(2), and 42.104(b)(4) .....	24
C. Ground 1: Shin does not Render Obvious Claims 1–4, 6–8, 13, 14, and 19 .....	28
1. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Shin Discloses “[a content inspection engine communicatively coupled to the information monitor for/means for] determining [,by	

	the computer] whether the downloadable-information includes executable code” (claims 1, 8, and 13).....	30
2.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Shin Discloses “causing mobile protection code to be executed by the mobile code executor at a downloadable-information destination such that one or more operations of the executable code at the destination, if attempted, will be processed by the mobile protection code” (claims 14).....	32
D.	Ground 2: Poison Java Does Not Anticipate Claim 28.....	34
1.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Poison Java Discloses “receiving a sandboxed package that includes mobile protection code (“MPC”) and a Downloadable and one or more protection policies at a computer at a Downloadable-destination” (claim 28).....	35
E.	Ground 3: Poison Java in view of Shin does not Render Claim 1 Obvious .....	38
1.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Poison Java in view of Shin Discloses “determining ,by the computer whether the downloadable-information includes executable code” (claim 1).....	39
F.	Ground 4: Poison Java in view of Brown does not Render Claims 14, 19, and 34 Obvious .....	39
1.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Poison Java in view of Brown Discloses “causing mobile protection code to be executed by the mobile code executor at a downloadable-information destination such that one or more operations of the executable code at the destination, if attempted, will be processed by the mobile protection code” (claim 14).....	39
2.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Poison Java in view of Shin Discloses “a sandboxed package capable of being received an initiated by the mobile code executor on the computer, the sandboxed package including a Downloadable and mobile protection code (“MPC”) for	

causing one or more Downloadable operations to be intercepted by the computer and for processing the intercepted operations by the computer, if the Downloadable attempts to initiation the operations” (claim 34) .....40

V. THE PROPOSED GROUNDS ARE CUMULATIVE .....41

VI. CONCLUSION.....41

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>EMC Corp, v. Secure Axxess, LLC</i> , Case IPR2014-00475, Paper No. 10 (P.T.A.B. Sep. 9, 2014).....	27
<i>Goertek, Inc. v. Knowles Electronics, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00523, Paper 26 (PTAB May 30, 2014) .....	41
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	37, 38
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	38
<i>Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Inc.</i> , CBM2012-00003, Paper No. 7 (PTAB Oct. 25, 2012) .....	41
<i>Prism Pharma Co., v. Choongwae Pharma Corp.</i> , Case No. IPR2014-00315, Paper 14 (PTAB July 8, 2014). .....	16
<i>Ring &amp; Pinion Service Inc. v. ARB Corp.</i> , 743 F. 3d 831 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	12
<i>Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.</i> , 234 F.3d 654 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	38
<i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> , 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	12
<i>Travelocity.com L.P. v. Conos Techs., LLC</i> , CBM2014-00082, Paper 12 (PTAB Oct. 16, 2014) .....	4
<i>ZTE Corp. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00136, Paper 31 (Nov. 5, 2013) .....	27, 28
<b>Statutes</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 102(a) .....	15
35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	28

# 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.