

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

FINJAN, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-01979
Patent 8,141,154

**PATENT OWNER'S OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.64**

Palo Alto Networks, Inc. ("Petitioner") served and filed supplemental evidence on June 15, 2016. During a conference call with the Board on June 14, 2016, the Board granted Petitioner's request to add the Declaration of Mel DeSart (Ex. 1036) to the record in place of the Declaration of Dr. Emin Sirer (Ex. 1008). Patent Owner Finjan, Inc. ("Finjan") objects under the Federal Rules of Evidence and 37 C.F.R. § 42.64 to the admissibility of the evidence.

Finjan timely serves Petitioner this second set of objections under 37 C.F.R. § 42.64 to provide notice that Finjan will move to exclude the evidence as improper evidence.

I. The DeSart Declaration (Ex. 1036)

Finjan objects to the admissibility of the DeSart Declaration for at least the following reasons: Petitioner's service and filing of the DeSart Declaration is untimely and procedurally improper to the extent it is supplemental information under **37 C.F.R. § 42.123**, not supplemental evidence. Under **FRE 702**, Mr. Mel DeSart's opinions are inadmissible because they are conclusory, do not disclose underlying facts or data in support of his opinions, and are unreliable.

Additionally, Mr. Mel DeSart is unqualified as an expert to provide technical opinions of a person skilled in the art and lacks knowledge regarding the public accessibility of Sirer. As such, his opinions are inadmissible under **FRE 702** and he lacks personal knowledge under **FRE 602**. Moreover, Petitioner has failed to

establish that the Operating Systems Review Article (“Exhibit A”) referenced in the DeSart Declaration is what Petitioner claims it is, and has failed to authenticate the date by which Exhibit A was allegedly publicly accessible as a printed publication. Finjan also objects because the DeSart Declaration is hearsay under **FRE 801** and inadmissible under **FRE 802** and **FRE 803**. His opinions are also irrelevant, confusing, and of minimal probative value under **FRE 401**, **402**, and **403**. Further, his opinions that rely on the exhibits are also unreliable and inadmissible for the reasons set forth below.

A. Operating Systems Review Article (Exhibit A)

Finjan objects to the admissibility of Exhibit A for at least the following reasons: Petitioner is improperly introducing Exhibit A for the purpose of establishing the date Simer (Ex. 1036, pp. 6-20) was publicly available prior art. Accordingly, Petitioner has failed to authenticate Simer through the DeSart Declaration under **FRE 901** and **FRE 602**. Exhibit A is not self-authenticating under **FRE 901**, not the original under **FRE 1002**, and not a “duplicate” under **FRE 1001(e)** and **FRE 1003**. Specifically, Petitioner has failed to establish that Exhibit A is what Petitioner claims it to be. For example, it cannot be determined whether the Simer article was actually in the Operating Systems Review. Moreover, the original Simer article (Ex. 1004) that Petitioner introduced is different than the article produced in Exhibit A. Finjan further objects to

Petitioner's selective inclusion of material from the document in Exhibit A. Under **FRE 106**, the complete version of Exhibit A, in fairness, ought to be considered.

To the extent that Petitioner attempts to rely on any date that appears on Exhibit A to establish public accessibility of Simer as a printed publication, the date is hearsay under **FRE 801** and is inadmissible under **FRE 802** and **FRE 803**, and further, the date has not been authenticated and is inadmissible under **FRE 901** and **FRE 902**.

Because of these deficiencies, Petitioner has failed to establish that Simer is a prior art printed publication through the DeSart Declaration and Exhibit A. Accordingly, Exhibit A is irrelevant, confusing, and of minimal probative value under **FRE 401**, **FRE 402**, and **FRE 403**.

II. Conclusion

Therefore, Finjan will file motions to exclude these exhibits under 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c).

Patent Owner's Objections to Evidence
IPR2015-01979 (U.S. Patent No. 8,141,154)

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 22, 2016

/James Hannah/

James Hannah (Reg. No. 56,369)
Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP
990 Marsh Road
Menlo Park, CA 94025
Tel: 650.752.1700 Fax: 212.715.8000

Jeffrey H. Price (Reg. No. 69,141)
Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
Tel: 212.715.7502 Fax: 212.715.8302

Michael Kim (Reg. No. 40,450)
Finjan, Inc.
2000 University Ave., Ste. 600
E. Palo Alto, CA 94303
Tel: 650.397.9567
mkim@finjan.com

(Case No. IPR2015-01979)

Attorneys for Patent Owner

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.