

Declaration of Aviel D. Rubin
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of Patent No. 7,647,633

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Palo Alto Networks, Inc.
Petitioner

v.

Finjan, Inc.
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 7,647,633

Filing Date: June 22, 2005

Issue Date: Jan. 12, 2010

Title: Malicious Mobile Code Runtime Monitoring System and Methods

**DECLARATION OF AVIEL D. RUBIN IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,647,633**

Inter Partes Review No. 2015-01974

Table of Contents

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS	1
A. Engagement Overview	1
B. Summary of Opinions	1
C. Qualifications and Experience	3
1. Education	3
2. Career	3
3. Publications:.....	7
4. Curriculum Vitae.....	8
D. Materials Considered.....	8
II. LEGAL PRINCIPLES USED IN THE ANALYSIS	13
A. Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art (“POSA”)	13
B. Prior Art.....	15
C. Broadest Reasonable Interpretations.....	15
D. Standards for Anticipation and Obviousness	16
III. TECHNOLOGY TUTORIAL	28
IV. THE ’633 PATENT	41
A. Overview of the ’633 Patent.....	41
B. The Claims of the ’633 Patent.....	42
C. Interpretation of Claim Limitations in the ’633 Patent	44
1. Non-Means-Plus-Function Limitations	44
2. Means-Plus-Function Limitations.....	47
D. The Priority Claims of the ’633 Patent	50
V. OVERVIEW OF THE PRIOR ART	53
A. Overview of Poison Java.....	53
B. Overview of Shin.....	55
C. Overview of Brown.....	55
D. Poison Java, Shin, and Brown Are All Analogous Art.....	56

Table of Contents
Continued

	Page
VI. ANALYSIS.....	57
A. Shin Renders Claims 1–4, 6–8, 13, 14, and 19 Obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).....	57
1. Independent Claim 1	57
a. Claim element 1[b]: “receiving” limitation.....	57
b. Claim element 1[c]: “determining” limitation.....	57
2. Claim 3	59
3. Claims 6 and 7.....	60
4. Claim 8	61
5. Claim 13	62
6. Independent Claim 14	63
a. Claim element 14[a]: “computer program product”.....	63
b. Claim element 14[c]: “information re- communicator” and “mobile code executor”	63
c. Claim element 14[d]: “receiving” limitation.....	64
d. Claim element 14[e]: “causing” limitation.....	64
B. Poison Java in view of Shin Renders Claim 1 Obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).....	65
1. Independent Claim 1	65
a. Claim element 1[c]: “determining” limitation.....	65
C. Poison Java in view of Brown Renders Claims 14, 19, and 34 Obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).....	67
1. Independent Claim 14	67
a. Claim element 14[a]: “computer program product”.....	67
b. Claim element 14[c]: “information re- communicator” and “mobile code executor”	68
c. Claim element 14[d]: “receiving” limitation.....	69

Table of Contents
Continued

	Page
d. Claim element 14[e]: “causing” limitation.....	69
2. Independent Claim 34	70
a. Claim element 34[b]: “mobile code executor”	70
VII. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS	71
VIII. CONCLUSION.....	72

Declaration of Aviel D. Rubin
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of Patent No. 7,647,633

1. I, Aviel Rubin, declare as follows:

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this declaration, and could and would testify to these facts under oath if called upon to do so.

I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS

A. Engagement Overview

3. I have been retained by counsel for Palo Alto Networks, Inc. in this case as an expert in the relevant art. I am being compensated for my work at the rate of \$688 per hour. No part of my compensation is contingent upon the outcome of this petition.

4. I was asked to study U.S. Patent 7,647,633 (the “’633 patent”), its prosecution history, and the prior art and to render opinions on the obviousness or non-obviousness of certain claims of the ’633 patent (the “Petitioned Claims”) in light of the teachings of the prior art, as understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art in the 2000-2001 timeframe.

B. Summary of Opinions

5. After studying the ’633 patent, its file history, and the prior art, and considering the subject matter of the claims of the ’633 patent in light of the state of technical advancement in the field of mobile-code security in the 2000-2001 timeframe, I reached the following conclusions:

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.