

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

FINJAN, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00157
Patent No. 8,225,408

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE '408 PATENT	4
A. Overview	4
B. Challenged Claims	5
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	6
A. "parse tree" (all challenged claims):	6
B. "dynamically building . . . while said receiving receives the incoming stream" (all claims):	7
C. "dynamically detecting, while said dynamically building builds the parse tree" (all claims):.....	9
D. "instantiating . . . a scanner for the specific programming language" (claims 1 and 22):.....	10
IV. SPECIFIC REASONS WHY THE CITED REFERENCES DO NOT INVALIDATE THE CLAIMS, AND WHY <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED.....	11
A. The Board Should Deny the Petition Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	13
B. Grounds 1 and 2 Do Not Render the Challenged Claims Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	16
1. Chandnani in view of Kolawa Does not Disclose "receiving, by a computer, an incoming stream of program code" (claims 1 and 9).....	19
2. Chandnani in view of Kolawa Does not Disclose "instantiating a scanner for the specific programming language, in response to said determining" (claims 1 and 9)	21

3.	Chandnani in view of Kolawa Does not Disclose “dynamically building, by the computer while said receiver receives the incoming stream, a parse tree whose nodes represent tokens and patterns in accordance with the parser rules” (all challenged claims).....	23
(a)	Chandnani does not Disclose Building the Claimed Parse Tree	23
(b)	Chandnani in view of Kolawa does not Disclose Dynamically Building a Parse Tree Whose Nodes Represent Tokens and Patterns in Accordance with the Parser Rules	25
4.	Chandnani in view of Kolawa Does not Disclose “dynamically detecting, by the computer while said dynamically building builds the parse tree, combinations of nodes in the parse tree which are indicators of potential exploits, based on the analyzer rules” all challenged claims).....	27
5.	The Petition Provides Inadequate Motivation to Combine the Chandnani and Kolawa References to Reach the Claimed “dynamically detecting, by the computer while said dynamically building builds the parse tree, combinations of nodes in the parse tree which are indicators of potential exploits, based on the analyzer rules”	30
6.	The Petition Provides Inadequate Motivation to Combine the Huang with the Chandnani and Kolawa References	32
C.	Grounds 3 and 4 Do Not Render the Challenged Claims Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	33
1.	Chandnani in view of Kolawa and Walls Does not Disclose “receiving, by a computer, an incoming stream of program code” (all challenged claims).....	34
2.	Chandnani in view of Kolawa and Walls Does not Disclose “instantiating a scanner for the specific	

programming language, in response to said determining”
(claims 1 and 22).....34

3. Chandnani in view of Kolawa and Walls Does not
Disclose “dynamically building, by the computer while
said receiver receives the incoming stream, a parse tree
whose nodes represent tokens and patterns in accordance
with the parser rules” (all challenged claims).....35

4. Chandnani in view of Kolawa and Walls Does not
Disclose “dynamically detecting, by the computer while
said dynamically building builds the parse tree,
combinations of nodes in the parse tree which are
indicators of potential exploits, based on the analyzer
rules” (all challenged claims).....37

5. The Petition Provides Inadequate Motivation to Combine
the Huang with the Chandnani, Kolawa, and Walls
References.....39

D. The Board Should Also Deny Instituting Trial Because
Petitioner Cannot Rely on Impermissible Incorporation by
Reference To Cure Its Defective Petition40

V. PETITIONER’S OBVIOUSNESS ARGUMENTS FAIL AS A
MATTER OF LAW BECAUSE IT DID NOT CONDUCT A
COMPLETE OBVIOUSNESS ANALYSIS.....42

VI. CONCLUSION.....44

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'n, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	32, 36
<i>Apple Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	43
<i>Aventis Pharms. Inc. v. Amino Chems. Ltd.</i> , 715 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	11
<i>In re Baxter Int'l, Inc.</i> , 678 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	6
<i>Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co.</i> , 441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	19
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc., v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , Case No. IPR2014-00454 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 29, 2014)	41, 42
<i>Corning Inc. v. DSM IP Assets B.V.</i> , Case No. IPR2013-00043 (P.T.A.B. May 1, 2014).....	29
<i>DeSilva v. DiLeonardi</i> , 181 F.3d 865 (7th Cir. 1999)	41
<i>EMC Corp. v. Secure Axxess, LLC</i> , Case No. IPR2014-00475 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 9, 2014).....	24
<i>Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. CardioKinetix, Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2013-00183 (P.T.A.B. July 31, 2013)	31
<i>Interactive Gift Express, Inc. v. Compuserve, Inc.</i> , 256 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	7, 9
<i>Kinetic Techs., Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2014-00529 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 23, 2014).....	31
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	30, 42

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.