

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
990 Marsh Road
5 Menlo Park, CA 94025
Telephone: (650) 752-1700
6 Facsimile: (650) 752-1800

7 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
8 FINJAN, INC.

9
10 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
11 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
12 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**

13 FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 BLUE COAT SYSTEMS, INC., a Delaware
17 Corporation,

18 Defendant.

Case No.:

**COMPLAINT FOR PATENT
INFRINGEMENT**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

2 Plaintiff Finjan, Inc. (“Finjan”) files this Complaint for Patent Infringement and Jury Demand
3 against Defendant Blue Coat Systems, Inc. (“Defendant” or “Blue Coat”) and alleges as follows:

4 **THE PARTIES**

5 1. Finjan is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware, with its
6 principal place of business at 2000 University Ave., Ste. 600, East Palo Alto, California 94303.

7 2. Blue Coat is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware, with its
8 principal place of business at 420 North Mary Avenue, Sunnyvale, California 94085.

9 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

10 3. This action arises under the Patent Act, 35 U.S.C. § 101 *et seq.* This Court has
11 original jurisdiction over this controversy pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338.

12 4. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c) and/or 1400(b).

13 5. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant. Upon information and belief,
14 Defendant has conducted business in this District and continues to infringe and/or induce the
15 infringement in this District. Defendant also markets its products primarily in and from this District.
16 In addition, the Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because it has established minimum
17 contacts with the forum and the exercise of jurisdiction would not offend traditional notions of fair
18 play and substantial justice.
19
20

21 **INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

22 6. Pursuant to Local Rule 3-2(c), Intellectual Property Actions are assigned on a district-
23 wide basis.
24

25 **FINJAN’S INNOVATIONS**

26 7. Finjan was founded in 1997 as a wholly-owned subsidiary of Finjan Software Ltd., an
27
28

1 Israeli corporation. Finjan was a pioneer in developing proactive security technologies capable of
2 detecting previously unknown and emerging online security threats, recognized today under the
3 umbrella of “malware.” These technologies protect networks and endpoints by identifying suspicious
4 patterns and behaviors of content delivered over the Internet. Finjan has been awarded, and continues
5 to prosecute, numerous patents in the United States and around the world as a result of Finjan’s more
6 than decade-long research and development efforts, supported by many inventors.

7
8 8. Finjan built and sold software, including application programming interfaces and
9 appliances for network security, using these patented technologies. Finjan’s licensing partners
10 continue to support these products and customers. At its height, Finjan employed nearly 150
11 employees around the world, building and selling security products, while operating the Malicious
12 Code Research Center through which it frequently published research regarding network security and
13 current threats on the Internet. Finjan’s pioneering approach to online security drew equity
14 investments from two major software and technology companies, the first in 2005 and the second in
15 2006.

16
17 9. Finjan generated millions of dollars in product sales and related services and support
18 revenues through 2009, when it spun off certain hardware and technology assets in a merger. Pursuant
19 to this merger, Finjan was bound to a non-compete and confidentiality agreement, under which it
20 could not make or sell a competing product or disclose the existence of the non-compete clause.

21
22 10. Finjan became a publicly traded company in June 2013, capitalized with \$30 million.
23 After Finjan’s obligations under the non-compete and confidentiality agreement expired in March
24 2015, Finjan re-entered the development and production sector of secure products for the consumer
25 market. On June 16, 2015, Finjan introduced its first Finjan Mobile Secure Browser, which offers
26 users security and awareness to keep their data safe while surfing the web on their mobile devices.

1 11. Finjan's commitment to innovation in the security space continues through incubating
2 and investing in up-and-coming technology startups that are pioneering a new generation of security
3 technologies. Finjan has distributed \$1 million of a \$5 million commitment to one such startup so far.
4 Additionally, in June 2015, Finjan announced the expansion of its "Mobile Defense Challenge 2015"
5 for College Students, in which a \$40,000 grant will be awarded to develop a winning security
6 application. Also in June 2015, Finjan launched CybeRisk Security Solutions, a product that provides
7 cybersecurity risk advisory services to customers around the world.
8

9 12. Finjan's founder and original investors are still involved with and invested in the
10 company today, as are a number of other key executives and advisors. Finjan continues to work with
11 inventors, acquire technology companies, and invest in research laboratories, startups and
12 universities.
13

14 13. On March 18, 2014, U.S. Patent No. 8,677,494 ("the '494 Patent"), entitled
15 MALICIOUS MOBILE CODE RUNTIME MONITORING SYSTEM AND METHODS, was issued
16 to Yigal Mordechai Edery, Nimrod Itzhak Vered, David R. Kroll and Shlomo Touboul. A true and
17 correct copy of the '494 Patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit A and is incorporated by
18 reference herein.

19 14. All rights, title, and interest in the '494 Patent have been assigned to Finjan, who is the
20 sole owner of the '494 Patent. Finjan has been the sole owner of the '494 Patent since its issuance.
21

22 15. The '494 Patent is generally directed towards computer networks and more
23 particularly provides a system that protects devices connected to the Internet from undesirable
24 operations from web-based content. One of the ways in which this is accomplished is by deriving
25 security profiles for content and storing the profiles in a database.
26
27
28

1 16. On October 22, 2013, U.S. Patent No. 8,566,580 (“the ‘580 Patent”), entitled
2 SPLITTING AN SSL CONNECTION BETWEEN GATEWAYS, was issued to Yuval Ben-Itzhak,
3 Shay Lang and Dmitry Rubinstein. A true and correct copy of the ‘580 Patent is attached to this
4 Complaint as Exhibit B and is incorporated by reference herein.

5 17. All rights, title, and interest in the ‘580 Patent have been assigned to Finjan, who is the
6 sole owner of the ‘580 Patent. Finjan has been the sole owner of the ‘580 Patent since its issuance.

7 18. The ‘580 Patent is generally directed towards a system for secure communication.
8 The ‘580 Patent generally discloses a system which uses an SSL connector to provide secure
9 communication.
10

11 19. On November 28, 2000, U.S. Patent No. 6,154,844 (“the ‘844 Patent”), entitled
12 SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR ATTACHING A DOWNLOADABLE SECURITY PROFILE TO
13 A DOWNLOADABLE, was issued to Shlomo Touboul and Nachshon Gal. A true and correct copy
14 of the ‘844 Patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit C and is incorporated by reference herein.
15

16 20. All rights, title, and interest in the ‘844 Patent have been assigned to Finjan, who is the
17 sole owner of the ‘844 Patent. Finjan has been the sole owner of the ‘844 Patent since its issuance.

18 21. The ‘844 Patent is generally directed towards computer networks, and more
19 particularly, provides a system that protects devices connected to the Internet from undesirable
20 operations from web-based content. One of the ways this is accomplished is by linking a security
21 profile to such web-based content to facilitate the protection of computers and networks from
22 malicious web-based content or to provide further analysis of potential threats on the Internet.
23

24 22. On November 15, 2005, U.S. Patent No. 6,965,968 (“the ‘968 Patent”), entitled
25 POLICY-BASED CACHING, was issued to Shlomo Touboul. A true and correct copy of the ‘968
26 Patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit D and is incorporated by reference herein.
27
28

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.