

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BLUE COAT SYSTEMS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

FINJAN, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01441
Patent 8,225,408

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Overview of The '408 Patent.....	2
III. Claim Construction.....	8
IV. The Petition is Moot Under 35 U.S.C. § 315(E)(1)	8
V. The Petition Should be Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(D).....	10
VI. The Petition Cannot be Considered Under 35 U.S.C. § 312.....	15
A. Petitioner Has Not Identified the Claims Challenged as Required Under 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3) or 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(1).....	17
B. Petitioner Has Not Paid the Full Fees Require Under 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(1) or 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.103(a) and 42.15(a)	20
C. Petitioner Has Not Identified All Real-Parties-In-Interest Under 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2)	22
VII. Because Petitioner failed to identify Symantec as a real-party in interest or identify the current entity that should be identified as Petitioner, this Petition should be denied under 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2).The Proposed Combinations of Chandnani, Kolawa, nd Walls Do Not Invalidate Claims 1, 9, 23, and 29 of the '408 Patent	23
VIII. Petitioner's Proposed Grounds 1 and 3 do not Invalidate Claims 2, 8, 11, 24–28, or 30–34 Of The '408 Patent	24
A. Grounds 1 and 3 Fail to Render Obvious Claims 26–28 and 32– 34	25
IX. Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness	28
A. Copying and Industry Praise	28

B. Commercial Success and Licensing.....30
X. Conclusion36

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Demaco Corp. v. F. Von Langsdorff Licensing Ltd.</i> , 851 F.2d 1387 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	31
<i>Finjan Software, Ltd. v. Secure Computing Corp.</i> , No. 06-cv-00369-GMS (D. Del.).....	29
<i>Finjan v. Websense, Inc.</i> , No. 13-CV-04398-BLF (N.D. Cal.).....	32
<i>Ford Motor Co. v. Paice LLC</i> , Case IPR2015-00767, Decision Denying Institution of	13
<i>GrafTech Int'l Holdings, Inc., v. Laird Techs., Inc.</i> , 652 Fed. Appx. 973 (Fed. Cir. June 17, 2016)	30
<i>Institut Pasteur & Universite Pierre Et Marie Curie v. Focarino</i> , 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	28
<i>J.T. Eaton & Co. v. Atl. Paste & Glue Co.</i> , 106 F.3d 1563 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	30
<i>Kofax, Inc., v. Uniloc USA, Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2015-01207 Decision on Motion to Terminate <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, Paper 22 (PTAB June 2, 2016)	10
<i>Life Techs. Corp. v. Unisone Strategic IP</i> , Case CBM2016-00025	12
<i>Minnesota Mining & Mfg. Co. v. Johnson & Johnson Orthopaedics, Inc.</i> , 976 F.2d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	35
<i>Oxford Nanopore Techs. LTD. v. University of Washington</i> , Case IPR2015-00057, Paper 10 (PTAB Apr. 27, 2015).....	15
<i>Palo Alto Networks, Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2016-00157, Paper 3 (PTAB Nov. 17, 2015).....	19

Praxair Distribution, Inc. v. Ino Therapeutics LLC,
Case IPR2016-00781, Decision Denying Institution of9

Synopsys, Inc. v. Mentor Graphics Corp.,
Case IPR2012-00042, Paper 60 (PTAB Feb. 22, 2014).....22

Travelocity.com L.P., Priceline.com Inc. v. Cronos Techs., LLC,
Case CBM2015-00047, Decision Denying Covered Business
Machine Patent Review, Paper 7 (PTAB June 15, 2015).....13

Travelocity.com L.P. v. Cronos Techs., LLC,
Case CBM2014-00082, Paper 12 (PTAB Oct. 16, 2014)24

Unilever, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.,
Case IPR2014-00506, Paper 17 (PTAB July 7, 2014)15

ZTE Corp. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.,
Case IPR2013-00454, Decision Institution of11

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3).....*passim*

35 U.S.C. § 10319, 27

35 U.S.C. § 31116, 18

35 U.S.C. § 31215, 16, 20, 22, 23

35 U.S.C. § 3152, 8, 9, 10, 16, 24

35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11).....9

35 U.S.C. § 325(d)*passim*

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.15(a).....17, 21, 21, 22

37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(2).....14

37 C.F.R. § 42.10317, 20, 22

37 C.F.R. § 42.10417, 18, 20

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.