

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.
Petitioner,

v.

FINJAN, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00151
Patent 8,141,154

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction	1
II. The Board’s Decision violates the doctrine of judicial admissions and Fails to Comport with 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) and the Various Informative Decisions Decided Thereon	2
A. The Board Should Have Used its Discretion Under § 325(d) to Deny the Petition in Light of Petitioner’s Judicial Admissions	3
B. The Board’s Informative Decisions Weigh Heavily in Favor of Terminating <i>Inter Partes</i> Review.....	7
C. The Board’s Reasons for Declining to Exercise its Discretion to Deny the Petition Represent an Unreasonable Weighing of the Relevant Factors	10
1. The Board’s “Material Differences” Standard is the Incorrect Standard for Decisions Premised Upon 35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	10
2. The Board’s Reasons for Denying the Symantec Petition are Irrelevant Under § 325(d) and The Timing of Filing Weighs in Favor of Denial of the Petition	11
III. The Board’s Institution Decision Invites Substantial Abuse of Process and Harassment of Patent Owners.....	12
IV. Conclusion.....	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Christian Legal Soc. Chapter of Univ. of Cal., Hastings College of Law v. Martinez</i> , 130 S.Ct. 2971 (2010).....	5
<i>Conopco, Inc. v. The Procter & Gamble Co.</i> , Case IPR2014-00628, Paper 21 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 20, 2014).....	6
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc., v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , Case IPR2013-00324, Paper 19 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 21, 2013).....	9
<i>Medtronic, Inc., v. Nuvasive, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2014-00487, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 11, 2014).....	8, 9
<i>Medtronic, Inc., v. Robert Bosch Healthcare Sys., Inc.</i> , Case IPR2014-00436, Paper 17 (P.T.A.B. June 19, 2014)	8
<i>Prism Pharma Co. v. Choongwae Pharma Corp.</i> , Case IPR2014-00315, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. July 8, 2014).....	8
<i>Standard Fire Ins. Co. v. Knowles</i> , 133 S. Ct. 1345 (2013).....	4
<i>Star Fruits S.N.C. v. U.S.</i> , 393 F. 3d 1277 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	1, 2, 5, 10
<i>Unified Patents, Inc., v. Personalweb Techs., LLC</i> , Case IPR2014-00702, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. July 24, 2014)	8
<i>Unilever, Inc., v. The Procter & Gamble Co.</i> , Case IPR2014-00506, Paper 17 (P.T.A.B. July 7, 2014).....	8
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 103(a).....	14

35 U.S.C. § 315(b).....5, 6, 7

35 U.S.C. § 315(e) 13

35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....*passim*

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d) 1

157 Cong. Rec. S1360-S1394 (March 8, 2011)..... 12

I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner, Finjan, Inc. (“Finjan” or “Patent Owner”), respectfully requests rehearing of the Board’s Decision on Institution (IPR2016-00151, Paper No. 10) (the “Institution Decision”) under 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d). In particular, Finjan requests reconsideration of the decision to institute trial on claims 1–8, 10, and 11 on obviousness grounds over Ross U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/0113282 (Ex. 1003, “Ross”). Reconsideration of the Institution Decision is appropriate because the Board misapprehended the significance of its decision to institute trial on a ground of unpatentability based on substantially the same prior art and arguments that were previously presented to the Office. Supreme Court case law regarding judicial and evidentiary admissions, weight of the authority stemming from the language of 35 U.S.C. § 325(d), the legislative history behind § 325(d), each and every Informative Decision released by the Board concerning § 325(d), and the dire practical ramifications of the Board’s Institution Decision in this case all favor granting Patent Owner’s Request for Rehearing and termination of the instant *inter partes* review proceedings.

The Board’s misapprehension in this case resulted in an Institution Decision that “represents an unreasonable judgment in weighing relevant factors” and which, therefore, meets the stringent “abuse of discretion” standard. *See Star Fruits S.N.C. v. U.S.*, 393 F. 3d 1277, 1281 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (“An abuse of

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.