

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.
Petitioner,

v.

FINJAN, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-02001
Case IPR2016-00157
Patent 8,225,408

**PATENT OWNER'S PARTIAL REQUEST FOR
REHEARING PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.71(c) and 42.71(d)¹**

¹ The word-for-word identical paper is filed in each proceeding identified in the caption.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. The Board Overlooked Patent Owner’s Substantive Arguments Regarding Chandnani’s Failure to Disclose “dynamically detecting...”	2
III. The Board Overlooked Patent Owner’s Arguments Regarding Walls’ Failure to Disclose “dynamically detecting...”	4
IV. Conclusion	6

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Star Fruits S.N.C. v. U.S.</i> , 393 F.3d 1277 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	1, 2
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	6
Other Authorities	
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)	1

Patent Owner, Finjan, Inc. (“Finjan” or “Patent Owner”), respectfully requests rehearing of the Board’s Decision on Institution (IPR2015-02001, Paper No. 7; IPR2016-00157, Paper No. 10) (the “Consolidated Institution Decision”) under 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d). In particular, Finjan respectfully requests reconsideration of the decision to institute trial on the four grounds identified in the Consolidated Institution Decision.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Board applies an abuse of discretion standard when rehearing a decision on institution. “An abuse of discretion occurs where the decision is based on an erroneous interpretation of the law, on factual findings that are not supported by substantial evidence, or represents an unreasonable judgment in weighing relevant factors.” *Star Fruits S.N.C. v. U.S.*, 393 F.3d 1277, 1281 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (citation omitted). Here, the Board should grant Patent Owner’s Request for Rehearing of the Institution Decision because the Board’s decision to institute trial with respect to Chandnani and Kolawa (and Chandnani and Kolawa further in view of Walls and/or Huang) rely on factual findings that are not supported by substantial evidence.

II. THE BOARD OVERLOOKED PATENT OWNER'S SUBSTANTIVE ARGUMENTS REGARDING CHANDNANI'S FAILURE TO DISCLOSE "DYNAMICALLY DETECTING..."

The Institution Decision should be modified because it relies "on factual findings that are not supported by substantial evidence." *Star Fruits*, 393 F.3d at 1281. In particular, the Board overlooked Patent Owner's argument that Chandnani does not disclose the "dynamically detecting..." feature of the challenged claims at least because Chandnani "discloses a sequential, disjointed process for tokenizing a data stream and processing the tokens." *See* IPR2016-00157, Paper No. 9 ("157 POPR") at 29; *see also* IPR2015-02001, Paper No. 6 ("2001 POPR") at 19–20 and 30 n.6. In its Consolidated Institution Decision, the Board indicated that it adopted Petitioner's fatally flawed argument because "Patent Owner's counterargument relies on its position that Chandnani fails to disclose receipt of an incoming stream that is scanned." *See* Institution Decision at 18. However, this analysis does not address Patent Owner's substantive arguments regarding the clear deficiencies of Chandnani presented in the '157 and '2001 POPRs:

In fact, Chandnani's lexical analyzer (notably, tokenizer is not mentioned anywhere in the reference) does not operate 'continuously and simultaneously,' but rather discloses a sequential, disjointed process for tokenizing a data stream and processing the tokens. Once the data stream is generated on the computer, **Chandnani discloses**

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.