

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.
Petitioner

v.

FINJAN, INC.
Patent Owner

Inter Partes Review No. 2015-01974¹
U.S. Patent No. 7,647,633

PETITIONER'S REPLY

¹ Case IPR2016-00480 has been joined with this proceeding.

Table of Contents

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. FINJAN IMPROPERLY CONFLATES PAN WITH BLUE COAT	2
III. THE BROADEST REASONABLE INTERPRETATION OF CLAIM 14 IS ITS PLAIN AND ORDINARY MEANING	3
A. The claims do not support Finjan’s construction	4
B. The specification does not support Finjan’s construction.....	5
C. Extrinsic evidence contradicts Finjan’s proposed construction.....	7
IV. FINJAN GROSSLY MISCHARACTERIZES DR. RUBIN’S TESTIMONY	9
V. SHIN, POISON JAVA, AND BROWN WERE PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE	12
A. Shin was publicly accessible.....	12
B. Poison Java was publicly accessible	13
C. Brown was publicly accessible	15
VI. GROUND 1: SHIN RENDERS CLAIMS 14 OBVIOUS	16
A. Shin renders claim 14 obvious under the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim	16
1. Shin processes “one or more operations of the executable code” at the downloadable-information destination	16
2. Shin teaches executing “mobile protection code”	17
3. Shin teaches a “mobile code executor”.....	18
B. Shin renders claim 14 obvious even under Finjan’s proposed construction	20
1. Shin does not modify problematic executable code	20
2. Shin does not modify the operation of the executable code	21

Table of Contents
(continued)

	Page
VII. GROUND 4: POISON JAVA IN VIEW OF BROWN RENDERS CLAIM 14 OBVIOUS.....	22
A. Poison Java + Brown renders claim 14 obvious under the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim	22
As with Shin, Finjan’s primary argument turns on the construction of claim 14.....	22
1. Poison Java + Brown processes “one or more operations of the executable code” at the downloadable-information destination	22
2. Poison Java + Brown teaches executing “mobile protection code”	23
B. A POSA would have combined Poison Java and Brown.....	24
C. Poison Java + Brown renders claim 14 obvious even under Finjan’s proposed construction	25
1. Poison Java + Brown does not modify problematic executable code	25
2. Poison Java + Brown does not modify the operation of the executable code	26
VIII. GROUNDS 1 AND 4 RENDER CLAIM 19 OBVIOUS	27
IX. FINJAN’S SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS EVIDENCE SHOULD BE GIVEN NO WEIGHT	27
A. Finjan fails to show copying of the challenged claims	27
B. Finjan fails to establish a nexus between its licensing program and the challenged claims	29
C. Finjan fails to establish a nexus between commercial success and the challenged claims	30
D. Finjan fails to establish long-felt need for the claimed invention.....	30
X. CONCLUSION.....	31

PETITIONER'S REVISED EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Description of Document
1001	U.S. Patent No. 7,647,633 (“Edery <i>et al.</i> ”)
1002	Declaration of Dr. Aviel D. Rubin in support of Petition for <i>Inter Partes Review</i>
1003	90/013,016, Final Office Action (“633 Reexam”) (May 22, 2015)
1004	Eva Chen “Poison Java” IEEE Spectrum (1999)
1005	2015-09-10 Declaration of Gerard P. Grenier in support of the “Poison Java” reference
1006	Webpage: Workshop and Miscellaneous Publications, Insik Shin
1007	Webpage: Filewatcher – 7/27/98
1008	Ian Welch and Robert Stroud “Kava – A Reflective Java Based on Bytecode Rewriting” (January 1999)
1009	Insik Shin and John C. Mitchell “Java Bytecode Modification and Applet Security” (1998)
1010	Carey Nachenberg “The Evolving Virus Threat”
1011	David M. Chess “Security Issues in Mobile Code Systems” (1998)
1012	R. Braden and J. Postel “Requirements for Internet Gateways” (June 1987)
1013	International Publication No. WO 9821683 (“Touboul”)
1014	U.S. Patent No. 6,088,803 (“Tso”)
1015	U.S. Patent No. 5,889,943 (“Ji”)
1016	Li Gong <i>et al.</i> “Going Beyond the Sandbox: An Overview of the New Security Architecture in the Java Development Kit 1.2” (1997)
1017	Webpage: Oracle - Java Security Architect
1018	Paul Sabanal, Mark Yason, and Mark Vincent “Digging Deep Into the Flash Sandboxes” (2012)
1019	Webpage: Oracle - Deploying With the Applet Tag
1020	Yougang Song <i>et al.</i> “BRSS: A Binary Rewriting Security System for Mobile Code”
1021	Yougang Song and Brett D. Fleisch “Utilizing Binary Rewriting for Improving End-host Security” IEEE Vol. 18, No. 12 (Dec. 2007)
1022	Stephen McCamant and Greg Morrisett “Efficient, Verifiable Binary Sandboxing for CISC Architecture”
1023	Virus Bulletin (March 1991)
1024	Patent Application 11/159,455 Office Action – Non-Final Rejection

PETITIONER'S REVISED EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Description of Document
1025	Patent Application 11/159,455 – Patent Owner Amendment and Response to Office Action Under 37.C.F.R. §1.111
1026	Patent Application 11/159,455 - Notice of Allowance and Fee(s) due (May 26, 2009)
1027	90/013,016 Reexam Non-Final Office Action (November 19, 2013)
1028	90/013,016 Reexam Supplemental Amendment to Correct Priority Paragraphs Required by 37 CFR §§ 1.78 (August 25, 2014)
1029	90/013,016 Reexam Notice of Appeal (June 22, 2015)
1030	Patent Application 11/159,455 Data Sheet
1031	U.S. Pat. No. 6,804,780 (“Touboul”)
1032	U.S. Pat. No. 6,480,962 (“Touboul”)
1033	Plaintiff Finjan, Inc.’s Reply Claim Construction Brief, <i>Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Systems, Inc.</i> , 13-cv-3999-BLF (July 7, 2014)
1034	Joint Post-Hearing Claim Construction Chart, Ex. A, <i>Finjan Software, Ltd. v. Secure Computing Corporation, et al.</i> 06-cv-369-GMS (October 30, 2007)
1035	Plaintiff Finjan, Inc.’s Opening Claim Construction Brief, <i>Finjan, Inc. v. Websense, Inc.</i> , 13-cv-4398-BLF (September 23, 2014)
1036	Order Construing Claims, <i>Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Systems, Inc.</i> , 13-cv-3999-BLF (October 20, 2014)
1037	Plaintiff Finjan, Inc.’s Opening Claim Construction Brief, <i>Finjan, Inc. v. Proofpoint, Inc. and Armorize Technologies, Inc.</i> , 5:13-cv-5808-HSG (May 1, 2015)
1038	Claim Construction Order, <i>Finjan Software, Ltd. v. Secure Computing et al.</i> 06-cv-369-GMS (December 11, 2007)
1039	Plaintiff Finjan, Inc.’s Opening Claim Construction Brief, <i>Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Systems, Inc.</i> , 13-cv-3999-BLF (June 16, 2014)
1040	Provisional Application No. 60/205,591
1041	Mark Brown “Using Netscape 3” (1996)
1042	90/013,016 Reexam Response to Non-Final Office Action (February 19, 2014)
1043	Finjan Investor Presentation, Q1 (2013)
1044	Dr. Frederick Cohen “Computer Viruses: Theory and Experiments” (1987)

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.