

PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL

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
U.S. Patent No. 8,141,154

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. The '154 Patent.....	2
III. Claim Construction.....	5
A. “dynamically generated”	5
IV. Ross is not Prior Art	5
A. The '154 Patent Was Conceived and Diligently Reduced to Practice From a Time Predating Ross.....	5
V. Ross Does Not Render Claims 1–8, 10 and 11 Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).....	16
A. Ross does not disclose processing content received over a network, the content including a call to a first function, and the call including an input (claims 1, 4, 6, and 10).....	17
1. The Board’s Institution Decision Identifies the Hook Script as Content Received Over the Network.....	18
2. Petitioner Has Not Identified a Call to a First Function in Ross	20
3. Ross Does not Teach or Suggest Content Received Over a Network Including a Call to a First Function	22
4. Ross Does not Teach or Suggest Receiving Content Over a Single Network, the Content Including a Call to a First Function	25
5. Ross’s Third Device Embodiment Fails to Disclose “Processing Content Received Over a Network”	29
B. Ross does not disclose “for invoking a second function with the input”	35

C.	Ross does not disclose a receiver for receiving an indicator from the security computer whether it is safe to invoke the second function with the input”	38
D.	Ross does not disclose “calling a second function with a modified input variable” (claims 6 and 10)	40
VI.	Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness	44
A.	Commercial Success.....	44
B.	Long-Felt But Unresolved Need and Recognition of a Problem	50
C.	Skepticism and Unexpected Results	50
D.	The Failure of Others	51
VII.	Petitioner did not Establish a Prima Facie Case of Obviousness Because it Neglected the Graham Factors	51
A.	Secondary Considerations Must be Considered.....	52
B.	Petitioner did not Identify Differences Between the Claimed Invention and the Prior Art.....	52
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	53

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	52
<i>Beckman Instruments, Inc. v. LKB Produkter AB</i> , 892 F.2d 1547 (Fed.Cir.1989)	33
<i>Bey v. Kollonitsch</i> , 806 F.2d 1024 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	9
<i>Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co.</i> 441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	36
<i>Brown v. Barbacid</i> , 436 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	6, 7
<i>In re: Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Pat.</i> <i>Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	51
<i>Demaco Corp. v. F. Von Langsdorff Licensing Ltd.</i> , 851 F.2d 1387 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	45
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC. V. National Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d (Fed. Cir. 2015)	42
<i>Finjan v. Websense, Inc.</i> , 13-CV-04398-BLF (N.D. Cal.)	47
<i>Graftech Int’l Holdgs, Inc., v. Laird Techs., Inc.</i> , Nos. 2015-1796, -1797, -1798, 2016 WL 3357427 (Fed. Cir. June 17, 2016)	44
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	2, 51, 53
<i>Griffith v. Kanamaru</i> , 816 F.2d 624 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	6

<i>Harari v. Lee</i> , 656 F. 3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	26
<i>Hyatt v. Boone</i> , 146 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	5
<i>Institut Pasteur & Universite Pierre Et Marie Curie v. Focarino</i> , 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	53
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	2, 43
<i>In re Kumar</i> , 418 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	33
<i>In re: Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> , No. 2015-1300 (Fed. Cir. July 25, 2016).....	41, 42
<i>Minnesota Mining & Mfg. Co. v. Johnson & Johnson Orthopaedics, Inc.</i> , 976 F.2d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	49
<i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Sci., Inc.</i> , 261 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	6
<i>Orthopedic Equip. Co. v. All Orthopedic Appliances, Inc.</i> , 707 F.2d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	51
<i>Osram Sylvania Inc. v. Am. Induction Techs., Inc.</i> , 701 F.3d 698 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	52
<i>In re Payne</i> , 606 F2d 303 (C.C.P.A. 1979)	33
<i>Rambus Inc. v. Rea</i> , 731 F.3d 1248 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	52
<i>SAS Institute, Inc. v. Complementsoft, LLC</i> , No. 2015-01346, -1347 (Fed. Cir. June 10, 2016).....	5, 18
<i>In re Wilson</i> , 424 F.2d 1382 (CCPA 1970)	36, 38

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.