

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 No. 8,141,154

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. THE ‘154 PATENT3

 A. Overview3

 B. Challenged Claims5

III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION6

 A. “first function” (all challenged claims):6

 B. “second function” (all challenged claims):8

IV. SPECIFIC REASONS WHY THE CITED REFERENCES DO NOT
INVALIDATE THE CLAIMS, AND WHY *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED12

 A. Ground 1: Khazan in view of Sierer Does Not Render Claims 1–5
 Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)12

 1. Khazan in view of Sierer Does not Disclose “a content processor
 (i) for processing content received over a network, the content
 including a call to a first function, and the call including an
 input” (claims 1 and 4).....14

 2. Khazan in view of Sierer Does not Disclose “wherein said
 content processor (i) suspends processing of the content after
 said transmitter transmits the input to the security computer”
 (claim 2)21

 3. Khazan in view of Sierer Does not Disclose “wherein the input is
 dynamically generated by said content processor prior to being
 transmitted by said transmitter” (claims 3 and 5)23

 B. Ground 2: Khazan in view of Sierer and Ben-Natan Does Not Render
 Claims 6–8, 10, and 11 Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).....24

 1. Ben-Natan is Not Analogous Art.....24

2.	Khazan in view of Sierer and Ben-Natan Does not Disclose “a content processor (i) for processing content received over a network, the content including a call to a first function, and the call including an input variable” (claims 6 and 10).....	28
3.	Khazan in view of Sierer and Ben-Natan Does not Disclose “(ii) for calling a second function with a modified input variable” (claims 6 and 10).....	28
4.	Khazan in view of Sierer Does not Disclose “wherein said content processor (i) suspends processing of the content after said transmitter transmits the input to the security computer” (claim 7)	29
5.	Khazan in view of Sierer Does not Disclose “wherein the input is dynamically generated by said content processor prior to being transmitted by said transmitter” (claims 8 and 11).....	30
V.	THE PETITION IMPERMISSIBLY PRESENTS ARGUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE.....	30
VI.	PETITIONER’S OBVIOUSNESS ARGUMENTS FAIL AS A MATTER OF LAW BECAUSE IT DID NOT CONDUCT A COMPLETE OBVIOUSNESS ANALYSIS	32
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	32

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	33
<i>Aventis Pharms. v. Amino Chems. Ltd.</i> , 715 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	8, 9
<i>BomTech Elects., Co., v. Medium-Tech Medizingerate GMBH</i> , IPR2014-00138, Paper No. 8 (PTAB April 22, 2014)	32
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc., v. C-Cation Technologies, LLC</i> , Case No. IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014)	31, 32
<i>EMC Corp. v. Secure Axxess, LLC</i> , Case No. IPR2014-00475, Paper No. 10 (PTAB Sept. 9, 2014)	23
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	33
<i>Leo Pharmaceutical v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	34, 35
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs, Inc.</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	34
<i>Plantronics, Inc. v. Aliph, Inc.</i> , 724 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	34
<i>Rambus Inc. v. Teresa Stanek Rea</i> , 731 F.3d 1248 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	35
<i>Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.</i> , 234 F.3d 654 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	33
<i>Thorner v. Sony Computer Entm't Am. LLC</i> , 669 F.3d (Fed. Cir. 2012)	2, 7

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) 12
35 U.S.C. § 103(a) 24, 28

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e)..... 38
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b) 15
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c)..... 1

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.