UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

FINJAN, INC.,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00159
Patent 8,677,494

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

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. THE '494 PATENT 5

A. Overview 5

B. Challenged Claims 7

C. Prosecution History 9

III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 9

A. "Downloadable security profile data" (all claims) 9

B. "database" (claims all claims) 12

C. "Downloadable" (all claims) 12

IV. SPECIFIC REASONS WHY THE CITED REFERENCES DO NOT INVALIDATE THE CLAIMS, AND WHY INTER PARTES REVIEW SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED 12

A. Grounds 1–4 Should be Rejected Because Touboul is not Prior Art 14

B. Finjan Properly Claims Priority to the '194 Patent Under 35 U.S.C. § 120 14

1. The '494 Patent and its Ancestral Applications Contain Specific References to the Earlier Filed Applications 15

2. The Amendments Made During Reexamination of the '822 Patent Are Retroactive 19

3. Each Application in the Priority Chain Satisfies the Written Description Requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112 20

a. Claimset 1 is Entitled to a Priority Date of November 6, 1997 21

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

b. Petitioner's Arguments Regarding the Priority Dates for Claim Sets 2 and 3 are Deficient as a Matter of Law 22

c. Claims 2 and 11 are Entitled to a Priority Date of November 6, 1997 24

d. Claims 7, 8, 16, and 17 are Entitled to a Priority Date of November 6, 1997 25

C. Grounds 5 and 6: Swimmer and Swimmer in view of Martin Do Not Render Claims 1–6 and 10–15 Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).....26

1. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Swimmer Discloses "[a receiver for] receiving an incoming Downloadable" (claims 1 and 10).....27

2. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Swimmer Discloses "[a Downloadable scanner coupled with said receiver, for] deriving security profile data for the Downloadable, including a list of suspicious computer operations that may be attempted by the Downloadable" (claims 1 and 10).....31

3. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Swimmer Discloses "[a database manager coupled with said Downloadable scanner, for] storing the Downloadable security profile data in a database" (claims 1 and 10).....34

4. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Swimmer Discloses "storing a date & time when the Downloadable security profile data was derived [by said Downloadable scanner], in the database" (claims 2 and 11) 38

5. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Swimmer Discloses "wherein suspicious computer operations include calls made to an operating system, a file system, a network system, and to memory" (claims 6 and 15) 39

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

V. PETITIONER'S OBVIOUSNESS ARGUMENTS FAIL AS A MATTER OF LAW BECAUSE IT DID NOT CONDUCT A COMPLETE OBVIOUSNESS ANALYSIS.....40

VI. CONCLUSION.....42

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

ActiveVideo Networks, Inc., v. Verizon Communications, Inc.,
694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 29

Apple Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n,
725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 41

Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Marchon Eyewear, Inc.,
672 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 19

Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co.,
441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006) 4, 32, 38

Biodelivery Sciences Int'l, Inc. v. Monosol RX, LLC,
Case No. IPR2013-00315 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 13, 2013) 19

Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc. v. Alpine Elecs. of Am., Inc.,
609 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2010) 15

Estee Lauder Inc. v. L'Oreal, SA,
129 F.3d 588 (Fed. Cir. 1997) 38

Finjan, Inc., v. Sophos, Inc.,
Case No. 14-cv-01197-WHO, Dkt. No. 73 44

Graham v. John Deere Co.,
383 U.S. 1 (1966).....41

In re Gurley,
27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994) 30

In re Kaslow,
707 F.2d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 1983) 20, 23, 24

In re Suitco Surface, Inc.,
603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010) 10

In re Wilson,
424 F.2d 1382 (C.C.P.A. 1970).....33, 36

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.