

1 PAUL J. ANDRE (State Bar No. 196585)  
pandre@kramerlevin.com  
2 LISA KOBIALKA (State Bar No. 191404)  
lkobialka@kramerlevin.com  
3 JAMES HANNAH (State Bar No. 237978)  
jhannah@kramerlevin.com  
4 KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP  
5 990 Marsh Road  
Menlo Park, CA 94025  
6 Telephone: (650) 752-1700  
7 Facsimile: (650) 752-1800  
8 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
FINJAN, INC.

10 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
11 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
12 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**

14 FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,  
15 Plaintiff,  
16 v.  
17 WEBSENSE, INC., a Delaware Corporation,  
18 Defendant.

Case No.: 13-cv-04398-BLF

**PLAINTIFF FINJAN, INC.'S OPENING  
CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

Date: November 21, 2014  
Time: 9:00 a.m.  
Dept.: Courtroom 3, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Judge: Hon. Beth Labson Freeman

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

	<b>Page</b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. STATEMENT OF FACTS .....	1
A. Background of the Technology.....	1
B. Summary of Finjan’s Patents .....	2
1. ‘822, ‘633 Patents .....	3
2. ‘154 Patent .....	3
3. ‘408 Patent .....	4
4. ‘494 Patent .....	4
III. ARGUMENT .....	4
A. Finjan’s Proposed Terms .....	5
1. Mobile Protection Code (the ‘822, ‘633 Patents) .....	6
2. Parse tree (the ‘408 Patent).....	8
3. Terms Websense Asserts are Indefinite.....	11
i. Indicates a level of downloadable-information characteristic and executable code characteristic correspondence (the ‘822 Patent).....	11
ii. Wherein the analyzer rules identify certain combinations of tokens and patterns (the ‘408 Patent).....	12
iii. Receiving, by the computer, one or more executable code characteristics of executable code that is capable of being executed by the information-destination (the ‘633 Patent).....	14
B. Websense’s Proposed Terms for Construction.....	16
1. Security computer (the ‘154 Patent) .....	16
2. Dynamically generated (the ‘154 Patent) .....	18
3. Content (the ‘154 Patent) .....	19
4. Information-destination of the downloadable-information (the ‘822 and ‘633 Patents) .....	21

5. Determining whether the downloadable-information include executable code (the '822 Patent) and determining, by the computer, whether the downloadable-information includes executable code (the '633 Patent) ..... 23

IV. CONCLUSION..... 25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Aventis Pharms. Inc. v. Amino Chems. Ltd.</i> , 715 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	5, 16, 17, 18
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Systems, Inc.</i> , Case No. 4:13-cv-03999-BLF (N.D. Cal.).....	7
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Secure Computing Corp.</i> , 626 F.3d 1197 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	5, 7
<i>Finjan Software Ltd. v. Secure Computing Corp.</i> , Case No. 1:06-cv-00369 (D. Del. Aug. 24, 2007), Dkt. No. 108-1 .....	7
<i>Funai Elec. Co. v. Dawwoo Elecs. Corp.</i> , 616 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	8
<i>Grober v. Mako Prods., Inc.</i> , 686 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	5
<i>Hoechst Celanese Corp. v. BP Chems. Ltd.</i> , 78 F.3d 1575 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	8
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995)(en banc), <i>aff'd</i> , 517 U.S. 370 (1996) .....	4
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , No. 13-369, 134 S. Ct. 2120 (2014).....	11
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)(en banc).....	4, 24
<i>SuperGuide Corp. v. DirecTV Enterprises, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 870 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	7
<i>Thorner v. Sony Computer Ent't Am. LLC</i> , 669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	5, 20
<i>Visto Corp. v. Sproqit Techs., Inc.</i> , 445 F. Supp.2d 1104 (N.D. Cal. 2006) .....	7
<i>Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.</i> , 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	7

## I. INTRODUCTION

Through over a decade of research, Finjan developed a suite of technologies that protect against a variety of threats from the Internet. Finjan's Patents are a reflection of its extensive development of innovative technology. While a number of companies have recognized Finjan's innovations and licensed its intellectual property, Websense has refused to do so, even though its products employ Finjan's patented technology. As a result, Finjan filed this action based on Websense's infringement of five of Finjan's Patents covering these security technologies.

The claims of Finjan's Patents are generally able to stand by themselves without reference to the intrinsic record because they are written in language that is commonly understood by those of skill in the art and define the terms in the claims themselves. As a result, most of the claim terms of Finjan's Patents do not require construction. Finjan's positions regarding claim construction reflect this fundamental nature of Finjan's patents.

Websense's definitions violate a variety of claim construction tenants. Mostly notably, Websense seeks to change well-understood claim terms even though no explicit disavowal exists in the intrinsic record. Without a clear indication in the intrinsic record to limit a claim term, a well-understood term should be afforded its plain and ordinary meaning. This principle alone dictates that the terms Websense proposed for construction should not be construed.

To eliminate any doubt regarding the propriety of Finjan's positions, Finjan offers uncontested expert testimony supporting its constructions. During the claim construction discovery process, Websense's expert offered no testimony rebutting Finjan's claim construction positions. Websense's expert only testified that certain terms were indefinite, but in the very same breath, admitted that all of the terms had well-understood meanings, and leaving Finjan's expert, Dr. Medvidovic's opinions unrebutted.

## II. STATEMENT OF FACTS

### A. Background of the Technology

In the modern era of computing, computers are constantly under attack from computer viruses propagating on the Internet. Viruses have proven to be one of the most difficult, not to mention costly,

# 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.