

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.,  
BLUE COAT SYSTEMS, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

FINJAN, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2015-01974<sup>1</sup>  
Patent 7,647,633

---

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

---

<sup>1</sup> Blue Coat Systems, Inc., who filed a Petition in IPR2016-00480, has been joined as a petitioner in this proceeding.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST .....	i
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Facts .....	4
A. Overview of Proceedings .....	4
B. Overview of '633 Patent .....	5
C. Overview of Shin.....	7
D. Overview of Poison Java.....	9
E. Overview of Brown.....	10
III. Claims at Issue .....	11
A. Claim 14 .....	11
B. Claim 19 .....	11
IV. Claim Construction.....	12
A. "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" (All Challenged Claims).....	12
V. Petitioner's Expert Did Not Provide A Proper Obviousness Analysis .....	19
VI. Petitioner Has Failed to Show that the References were publicly Available.....	22
B. Shin Was Not Publicly Available.....	22
C. Poison Java Was Not Publicly Available.....	23
D. Brown Was Not Publicly Available .....	25

VII. Shin Does Not Render Claims 14 And 19 Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).....	26
A. Shin Does Not Render Obvious “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”.....	27
1. Shin teaches modification of the executable code.....	27
2. Even if the proper construction is not adopted, Shin fails to meet the claim element. ....	29
a. Claim 14 requires the same executable code to be received and executed at the destination.....	29
b. Shin fails to disclose mobile protection code.....	29
c. Shin fails to render obvious a mobile code executor.....	31
VIII. Poison Java in view of Brown Does Not Render Claims 14 And 19 Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) .....	34
A. Poison Java in view of Brown Does Not Render Obvious “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” .....	35
1. Poison Java teaches modification of the executable code .....	35
2. Even if the proper construction is not adopted, Poison Java in view of Brown fails to render obvious the claim element. ....	37
a. Claim 14 requires the same executable code to be received and executed at the destination.....	37
b. Poison Java in view of Brown fails to render obvious mobile protection code .....	38

c.	There is no motivation to combine Poison Java and Brown .....	39
IX.	Claim 19 is Valid over the Cited Prior Art.....	42
X.	Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness .....	42
A.	Copying .....	42
B.	Licensing and Commercial Success.....	45
C.	Long Felt Need.....	51
XI.	CONCLUSION.....	51

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>In re Baxter Int'l, Inc.</i> , 678 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	19
<i>In re Bayer</i> , 568 F.2d 1357 (C.C.P.A. 1978) .....	30
<i>Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	27, 29
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Constellation Techs. L.L.C.</i> , IPR2014-011085, Paper 11 (Jan. 9, 2015).....	27
<i>In re Cortright</i> , 165 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	21
<i>In re Cronyn</i> , 890 F.2d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 1989) .....	27
<i>In re: Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	56
<i>Demaco Corp. v. F. Von Langsdorff Licensing Ltd.</i> , 851 F.2d 1387 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....	51
<i>Diamond Rubber Co. of New York v. Consol. Rubber Tire Co.</i> , 220 U.S. 428 (1911).....	47
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Systems, Inc.</i> , Case No. 13-cv- .....	v, 7
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Systems, Inc.</i> , Case No. 13-cv-03999-BLF.....	v
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Proofpoint Technologies, Inc. et al.</i> , Case No. 13-cv-05808-HSG (N.D. Cal.).....	v, 53

# 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.