

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

FINJAN, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00165
Patent 6,804,780

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE ‘780 PATENT	4
A. Overview of the ‘780 Patent.....	4
B. The Challenged Claims	6
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	8
A. “performing a hashing function on the Downloadable and the fetched software components to generate a Downloadable ID” (all claims).....	9
B. “Downloadable” (all claims).....	12
C. “Downloadable ID” (all claims).....	13
D. “means for obtaining a Downloadable” / “means for fetching at least one software component” / “means for performing a hashing function” (claim 17).....	15
IV. SPECIFIC REASONS WHY THE CITED REFERENCES DO NOT INVALIDATE THE CLAIMS, AND WHY <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED.....	17
A. Claims 1–18 are Patentable Over Rubin in view of Waldo	17
1. Rubin in View of Waldo does not Disclose “[a communications engine for/means for] obtaining a Downloadable that includes one or more references to software components required to be executed by a Downloadable” (claims 1, 9, 17, and 18)	20
2. Rubin in View of Waldo does not Disclose “fetching at least one software component identified by the one or more references” (claims 1, 9, 17, and 18)	26

3.	Rubin in View of Waldo does not Disclose “performing a hashing function on the Downloadable and the fetched software components to generate a Downloadable ID” (all challenged claims)	30
4.	The Petition Provides Inadequate Motivation to Combine the Rubin and Waldo References.....	34
(a)	The Proposed Combination of Rubin and Waldo is a Result of Hindsight Bias	35
(b)	Statements Made by Petitioner’s Declarant Should Not Be Considered As They Rely on Impermissible Incorporation by Reference	37
B.	Petitioner’s Obviousness Arguments Fail as a Matter of Law Because it did not Conduct a Complete Obviousness Analysis	39
1.	Petitioner Fails to Identify the Differences Between the Prior Art and the Challenged Claims	40
2.	Petitioner Fails to Identify the Level of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	42
3.	Petitioner Fails to Address Secondary Considerations of Nonobviousness	42
V.	CONCLUSION.....	43

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Communications, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	23, 41
<i>Apple Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	39
<i>In re Baxter Int'l, Inc.</i> , 678 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	9
<i>Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co.</i> , 441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	10
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , Case No. IPR2014-00454 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 29, 2014)	37
<i>Corning Inc. v. DSM IP Assets B.V.</i> , Case No. IPR2013-00043 (P.T.A.B. May 1, 2014).....	24, 29, 33
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	8, 9
<i>Google Inc. v. EveryMD.com LLC</i> , Case No. IPR2014-00347 (P.T.A.B. May 22, 2014).....	40
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	39, 40
<i>Insite Vision Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 783 F.3d 853 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	36
<i>Interactive Gift Express, Inc. v. Compuserve, Inc.</i> , 256 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	13
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	34, 36, 39
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	34, 43

<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	11
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	11
<i>Plantronics, Inc. v. Aliph, Inc.</i> , 724 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	42
<i>Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.</i> , 234 F.3d 654 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	39
<i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> , 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	12, 25
<i>Symantec Corp. v. Finjan, Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2015-01547 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 14, 2016).....	32
<i>Synopsys, Inc. v. Mentor Graphics Corp.</i> , Case No. IPR2012-00041 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 22, 2013)	40
<i>Thorner v. Sony Computer Entm't Am. LLC</i> , 669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	10, 14
<i>Travelocity.com L.P. v. Conos Techs., LLC</i> , Case No. CBM2014-00082 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 16, 2014).....	3

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102	17
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	17
35 U.S.C. § 112(f)	15
35 U.S.C. § 311(b)	16

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3)	38, 42
37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(2)	27, 33, 41
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	8

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.