

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.
Petitioner,

v.

FINJAN, INC.,
Finjan

Inter Partes Review No. 2015-01979
Patent 8,141,154

PETITIONER'S REPLY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. SIRER WAS PUBLISHED MORE THAN FIVE YEARS BEFORE THE '154 PATENT’S PRIORITY DATE	2
III. THE BROADEST REASONABLE CONSTRUCTION OF “CONTENT” IS CODE.....	5
A. The claims do not support Finjan’s construction	6
B. The specification supports interpreting “content” as “code”	6
C. Extrinsic evidence supports Petitioner’s proposed construction of “content”	7
IV. GROUNDS 1 AND 2: KHAZAN IN COMBINATION WITH SIRER RENDER ALL BUT THE “MODIFIED INPUT VARIABLE” LIMITATION OF THE ASSERTED CLAIMS OBVIOUS	8
A. Khazan renders obvious “content received over a network” (Claims 1, 4, 6, and 10)	8
1. Khazan’s libraries are “content received over a network”	9
2. The “content received over a network” limitations are obvious in view of Khazan’s instrumented application.....	10
a. Khazan teaches receiving an application over a network	11
B. Khazan renders obvious “the content including a call to a first function” (Claims 1, 4, 6, and 10).....	12
1. The teachings of Sirer and Khazan render obvious “the content including a call to a first function”	13
C. “The call including an input” limitation is obvious in view of Khazan (claims 1 and 4).....	14
1. Detours is additional evidence that Khazan teaches the “call including an input”	15
D. Khazan discloses invoking a second function with the input “only if a security computer indicates that such invocation is safe” (claims 1 and 4).....	15

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
1. Khazan and Sirer render obvious transmitting input “when the first function is invoked”	16
E. The receiver elements (claims 1 and 4) are obvious in view of Khazan and Sirer	17
F. Khazan and Sirer “suspend[] processing of the content after said processor transmits the input to the security computer” (claim 2).....	18
G. Khazan “resumes processing of the content after said receiver receives the indicator from the security computer” (claim 2).....	19
H. It was obvious to combine Khazan and Sirer.....	19
V. KHAZAN IN COMBINATION WITH SIRER AND BEN-NATAN RENDERS OBVIOUS CLAIMS 6-8, 10, AND 11	21
A. The “modified input variable” limitations of claims 6 and 10 are obvious	21
B. A person of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine Ben-Natan with Khazan and Sirer.....	21
VI. FINJAN’S SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS EVIDENCE SHOULD BE GIVEN NO WEIGHT	23
A. Finjan fails to establish a nexus between commercial success and the challenged claims	23
B. Finjan’s other secondary indicia evidence lacks evidentiary support.....	25
VII. CONCLUSION.....	26

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
Cases	
<i>In re Antor Media Corp.</i> , 689 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	10, 24
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.</i> , CBM2015-00080, Paper 44 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 26, 2016)	23, 24, 25
<i>In re Baird</i> , 16 F.3d 380 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	13, 15
<i>Blue Belt Techs, Inc. v. All-of-Innovation GmbH</i> , Case IPR2015-00765, Paper 35 (P.T.A.B. July 26, 2016)	20
<i>In re Burhans</i> , 154 F.2d 690, 69 USPQ 330 (C.C.P.A. 1946).....	19
<i>In re Cronyn</i> , 890 F.2d 1158 (Fed. Cir 1989)	4, 5
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	5
<i>Ecolab, Inc. v. FMC Corp.</i> , 569 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	20
<i>In re Etter</i> , 756 F.2d 852 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (en banc)	22
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Software Rights Archive, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00479, Paper 54 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 2, 2015).....	24
<i>Ford Motor Co. v. Versata Development Group, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01016, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 27, 2016).....	4
<i>GraftTech Int'l Holdings, Inc. v. Laird Techs., Inc.</i> , 2016 WL 3357427, *4-5 (Fed. Cir. June 17, 2016).....	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page
<i>In re Hall</i> , 781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	4
<i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Mustek Sys., Inc.</i> , 340 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	16
<i>Hill-Rom Services, Inc. v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	6
<i>i4i Partnership v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 598 F.3d 831 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	7
<i>IBM Corp. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC</i> , IPR2014-00681, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 30, 2014).....	3
<i>Johns Manville Corp. v. Knauf Insulation, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01402, Paper 45 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 19, 2016).....	11
<i>In re Lister</i> , 583 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	2, 4, 5
<i>Malico, Inc. v. Cooler Master USA Inc.</i> , 594 Fed. Appx. 621 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	11
<i>MBO Labs., Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.</i> , 474 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	7
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Bradium Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2016-00448, Paper No. 9 (P.T.A.B. July 25, 2016).....	4
<i>PAN v. Finjan, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01974, Paper 22 (Aug. 9, 2016).....	25
<i>In re Paulsen</i> , 30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	23

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.