

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BLUE COAT SYSTEMS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

FINJAN, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01443
Patent 8,677,494

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. FACTS	3
A. The ‘494 Patent	3
B. Overview of Swimmer	5
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	6
IV. THE PETITION IS MOOT UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 315(E)(1).....	6
V. THE PETITION SHOULD BE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(D).....	9
VI. THE PETITION IS BARRED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 315(B)	14
VII. THE PETITION CANNOT BE CONSIDERED UNDER Considered Under 35 U.S.C. § 312	15
VIII. SWIMMER DOES NOT INVALIDATE CLAIMS 1 AND 10 OF THE ‘494 PATENT.....	17
IX. PETITIONER’S PROPOSED GROUNDS 1–4 DO NOT INVALIDATE CLAIMS 7–9 AND 16–18 OF THE ‘494 PATENT	19
A. Swimmer in view of Ji does not Render Obvious “wherein the Downloadable security profile data includes a URL from where the Downloadable originated” (claims 7 and 16).....	19
B. Swimmer in view of Luotonen does not Render Obvious “wherein the Downloadable security profile data includes a URL from where the Downloadable originated” (claims 7 and 16).....	22
C. Swimmer in view of Apperson does not Render Obvious “wherein the Downloadable security profile data includes a digital certificate” (claims 8 and 17).....	26

D.	Swimmer in view of Lo does not Render Obvious “wherein said deriving Downloadable security profile data comprises disassembling the incoming Downloadable” (claim 9) or “wherein said Downloadable scanner comprises a disassembler for disassembling the incoming Downloadable” (claim 18).....	30
X.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS	31
A.	Long-Felt But Unresolved Need and Recognition of a Problem	38
B.	Skepticism and Unexpected Results	39
C.	The Failure of Others	39
D.	Teaching Away by Others.....	40
XI.	CONCLUSION.....	41

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	40
<i>Beckman Instruments, Inc. v. LKB Produkter AB</i> , 892 F.2d 1547 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	18
<i>In re: Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	39
<i>Demaco Corp. v. F. Von Langsdorff Licensing Ltd.</i> , 851 F.2d 1387 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	32
<i>DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	21
<i>Ford Motor Co., v. Paice LLC</i> , Case No. IPR2015-00767, Paper 14 (PTAB Aug. 18, 2015)	11
<i>Graftech Int'l Holdgs, Inc., v. Laird Techs., Inc.</i> , No. 2015-1796, 2016 WL 3357427 (Fed. Cir. June 17, 2016).....	32
<i>Institut Pasteur & Universite Pierre Et Marie Curie v. Focarino</i> , 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	31
<i>J.T. Eaton & Co. v. Atl. Paste & Glue Co.</i> , 106 F.3d 1563 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	32
<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)	8
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	28
<i>In re Kumar</i> , 418 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	18

<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	21
<i>Life Techs. Corp. v. Unisone Strategic IP</i> , CBM2016-00025, Paper 7 (PTAB July 5, 2016)	11
<i>Minnesota Mining & Mfg. Co. v. Johnson & Johnson Orthopaedics, Inc.</i> , 976 F.2d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	37
<i>Orthopedic Equip. Co. v. All Orthopedic Appliances, Inc.</i> , 707 F.2d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	39
<i>Osram Sylvania Inc. v. Am. Induction Techs. Inc.</i> , 701 F.3d 698 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	40
<i>Oxford Nanopore Techs. LTD. v. University of Washington</i> , Case IPR2015-00057, Paper 10 (PTAB Apr. 27, 2015).....	13
<i>Palo Alto Networks, Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2016-00157, Paper 3 (PTAB Nov. 17, 2015)	15
<i>In re Payne</i> , 606 F.2d 303 (C.C.P.A. 1979)	18
<i>Praxair Distribution, Inc., v. Ino Therapeutics LLC</i> , Case IPR2016-00781, Paper 10 (PTAB Aug. 25, 2016).....	7
<i>Rambus Inc. v. Rea</i> , 731 F.3d 1248 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	40
<i>Ricoh Co. v. Quanta Computer Inc.</i> , 550 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	21
<i>Synopsys, Inc. v. Mentor Graphics Corp.</i> , Case No. IPR2012-00042, Paper 60 (PTAB Feb. 22, 2014).....	14
<i>Travelocity.com L.P., Priceline.com Inc. v. Cronos Techs., LLC</i> , CBM2015-00047, Paper 7 (PTAB June 15, 2015).....	11
<i>Unilever, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.</i> , Case No. IPR2014-00506, Paper 17 (PTAB July 7, 2014)	13

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.