

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

FINJAN, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-02155
Patent 8,677,494

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
I. Introduction.....	1
II. The '494 Patent.....	3
A. Overview	3
B. Challenged Claims	4
III. Claim Construction.....	4
A. "a list of suspicious computer operations" (all challenged claims)	5
B. "database" (all challenged claims)	11
IV. The Petition Should be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	12
A. General Plastic Factors 2–7 Weigh Strongly in Favor of Denial	13
1. Factor 2: The Cited References Were Available At the Time the Earlier Petitions Were Filed	13
2. Factor 3: At the Time of Filing, An Extensive Inter Partes Review Record Already Existed With Respect to the '494 Patent	14
3. Factor 4: The Timing of the Instant Petition Weighs in Favor of Denial	16
4. Factor 5: Petitioner Provides No Justification for Filing This Petition and Does Not Account for the Delay in Filing	17
5. Factors 6 and 7: The Board's Resources Are Better Directed Elsewhere	18
B. Factor 1 Is Neutral or Weighs In Favor of Denial	20

1.	Factor 1: The Same Claims Have Previously Been Challenged and the Identity of Petitioner Does Not Preclude Denial Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....	20
V.	The Petition Should be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	21
A.	Petitioner Improperly Provides No Justification For The USPTO To Consider This Petition Over 35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	22
B.	The Same or Substantially the Same Arguments Have Already Been Presented to the USPTO	23
C.	The Petition Uses the Other Decisions As a Roadmap.....	26
1.	Petitioner Uses the Final Written Decisions as a Roadmap	26
2.	Petitioner Uses the ‘1894 Institution Decision as a Roadmap	27
VI.	Specific Reasons Why The Cited References Do Not Invalidate The Claims, And Why Inter Partes Review Should Not Be Instituted	29
A.	Shear in View of Kerchen Does Not Render Obvious the Challenged Claims	30
1.	Shear in View Kerchen Fails to Disclose a Downloadable Scanner For Deriving Downloadable Security Profile Data, Including a List of Suspicious Computer Operations	30
(a)	Shear’s “Well-Known Software Tools” Do Not Generate the Specification	30
(b)	Shear’s Specification Does Not Include a List of Suspicious Computer Operations.....	32
(c)	Kerchen Does Not Cure The Deficiencies of Shear.....	34
(d)	It Would Not Have Been Obvious to Modify Shear with Kerchen	36

2.	Shear in View Kerchen Fails to Disclose a Database Manager for Storing Downloadable Security Profile Data in a Database.....	39
(a)	Petitioner Fails to Identify a Database Manager for Storing DSP Data	40
(b)	Shear and Kerchen Fail to Disclose a Database.....	41
B.	Crawford '91 In View of Knowledge of a POSA Does Not Render Obvious the Challenged Claims	45
1.	Crawford '91 Fails to Disclose a Receiver for Receiving an Incoming Downloadable.....	45
2.	Crawford '91 Fails to Disclose a Downloadable Scanner For Deriving Downloadable Security Profile Data, Including a List of Suspicious Computer Operations	46
3.	Crawford '91 Fails to Disclose a Database Manager for Storing the DSP data in a Database.....	47
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	49

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Accent Packaging, Inc. v. Leggett & Platt, Inc.</i> , 707 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	9
<i>AG</i> , IPR2016-01792, Paper 15	5
<i>AG v. 511 Innovations, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2016-01792, Decision Denying Institution of	5
<i>Apple Inc. v. Immersion Corp.</i> , IPR2017-01371, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 21, 2017).....	13
<i>Beachcombers v. WildeWood Creative Prods., Inc.</i> , 31 F.3d 1154 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	41, 48
<i>Blue Coat Systems, LLC, v. Finjan, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01443, Paper 1	11
<i>Blue Coat Systems, LLC, v. Finjan, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01444	11
<i>Blue Coat Systems, LLC, v. Finjan, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01444, Paper 1	11
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-02154	21
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Sophos, Inc.</i> , No. 14-cv-01197 (N.D. Cal. 2014)	11
<i>FireEye, Inc., v. Finjan, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-00155, Paper 1	11
<i>Gen. Plastic Indus. Co. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , Case No. IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (P.T.A.B. Sep. 6, 2017).....	12, 13, 14
<i>Kinetic Techs., Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00529, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 23, 2014).....	34, 44

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.