

IPR2016-01071

Paper No. 1

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

Symantec Corp.,  
Petitioner

v.

Finjan, Inc.,  
Patent Owner

Patent No. 8,141,154

Issue Date: Mar. 20, 2012

Title: System and Method for Inspecting Dynamically Generated Executable Code

---

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2016-01071

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,141,154**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
PETITION FOR <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,1419,154.....	1
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. SUMMARY OF THE '154 PATENT .....	3
A. Background .....	3
B. Purported features of the '154 Patent .....	5
1. Content modifier .....	5
2. Content processor .....	5
3. Input inspector .....	6
C. The claims of the '154 patent .....	7
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	8
A. “dynamically generated” .....	9
IV. SUMMARY OF THE PRIOR ART OF THE '154 PATENT FORMING THE BASIS OF THIS PETITION .....	10
A. Ross .....	10
a. Hook script generator (i.e., content modifier) .....	11
b. Script Processing Engine (i.e., content processor) .....	12
c. Decision Service (i.e., content inspector) .....	13
V. OF CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. §42.104(B)) .....	14
A. GROUND 1: Claims 1-8 and 10-11 are invalid as obvious over Ross .....	14
1. Ross renders independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-3 obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). .....	14
a. Claim 1 .....	14
(i) [1.P]: A system for protecting a computer from dynamically generated malicious content.....	14

- (ii) [1.1.a] a content processor (i) for processing content received over a network ..... 15
    - (iii) [1.1.b] the content including a call to a first function, and the call including an input ..... 16
    - (iv) [1.1.c] and (ii) for invoking a second function with the input, only if a security computer indicates that such invocation is safe..... 18
    - (v) [1.2] a transmitter for transmitting the input to the security computer for inspection, when the first function is invoked ..... 19
    - (vi) [1.3] a receiver for receiving an indicator from the security computer whether it is safe to invoke the second function with the input..... 21
  - b. Claim 2 ..... 21
    - (i) [2.1] wherein said content processor suspends processing of the content after said transmitter transmits the input to the security computer..... 21
    - (ii) [2.2] and resumes processing of the content after said receiver receives the indicator from the security computer..... 22
  - c. Claim 3 ..... 23
    - (i) [3.1]: wherein the input is dynamically generated by said content processor prior to being transmitted by said transmitter..... 23
- 2. Ross renders independent claim 4 and its dependent claim 5 obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)..... 25
  - a. Claim 4 ..... 25
    - (i) [4.P]: A non-transitory computer-readable storage medium storing program code for causing a computing device to..... 26
    - (ii) [4.1]: process content received over a network, the content including a call to a first function, and the call including an input ..... 26
    - (iii) [4.2]: transmit the input for inspection, when the first function is invoked, and suspend processing of the content ..... 27

- (iv) [4.3]: receive an indicator of whether it is safe to invoke a second function with the input..... 27
    - (v) [4.4.a]: resume processing of the content after receiving the indicator ..... 28
    - (vi) [4.4.b]: and invoke the second function with the input only if the indicator indicates that such invocation is safe ..... 28
  - b. Claim 5 ..... 29
    - (i) [5.1] wherein the program code causes the computer device to dynamically generate the input prior to transmitting the input for inspection ..... 29
- 3. Ross renders independent claim 6 and its dependent claims 7-8 obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). ..... 29
  - a. Claim 6 ..... 29
    - (i) [6.P]: A system for protecting a computer from dynamically generated malicious content..... 29
    - (ii) [6.1.a] a content processor for processing content received over a network, the content including a call to a first function, and the first function including an input variable ..... 29
    - (iii) [6.1.b] and for calling a second function with a modified input variable. .... 30
    - (iv) [6.2]: a transmitter for transmitting the input variable to a security computer for inspection, when the first function is called..... 31
    - (v) [6.3]: a receiver for receiving the modified input variable from the security computer..... 32
    - (vi) [6.4] wherein the modified input variable is obtained by modifying the input variable if the security computer determines that calling a function with the input variable may not be safe ..... 32
  - b. Claim 7 ..... 33
    - (i) [7.1.a] wherein said content processor suspends processing of the content after said

	transmitter transmits the input variable to the security computer, and.....	33
(ii)	[7.1.b]: resumes processing of the content after said receiver receives the modified input variable from the security computer .....	33
c.	Claim 8 .....	34
(i)	[8.1]: wherein the input variable in dynamically generated by said content processor prior to being transmitted by said transmitter .....	34
4.	Ross renders independent claim 10 and its dependent claim 11 obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).....	34
a.	Claim 10 .....	34
(i)	[10.P]: A non-transitory computer-readable storage medium storing program code for causing a computing device to.....	34
(ii)	[10.1]: process content received over a network, the content including a call to a first function, and the first function including an input variable .....	34
(iii)	[10.2]: transmit the input variable for inspection, when the first function is called, and suspend processing of the content .....	35
(iv)	[10.3]: receive a modified input variable Claim element [10.3] is substantially identical to claim element [6.3]. Thus .....	35
(v)	[10.4.a] resume processing of the content after receiving the modified input variable, and .....	35
(vi)	[10.4.b] calling a second function with the modified input variable.....	36
(vii)	[10.5] wherein the modified input variable is obtained by modifying the input variable if the inspection of the input variable indicates that calling a function with the input variable may not be safe .....	36
b.	Claim 11 .....	36

# 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.