

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

FINJAN, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00391
Patent 7,647,633

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE ‘633 PATENT	4
A. Overview	4
B. Challenged Claims	5
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	7
A. “determining... whether the downloadable-information includes executable code” (claims 1–4, 8, 11–13).....	9
B. “causing mobile protection code to be executed by the mobile code executor at a downloadable-information destination such that one or more operations of the executable code at the destination, if attempted, will be processed by the mobile protection code” (claim 14).....	9
C. “means for receiving downloadable-information” (claim 13)	11
D. “means for determining whether the downloadable-information includes executable code” (claim 13)	11
E. “means for causing mobile protection code to be communicated to at least one information-destination of the downloadable-information, if the downloadable information is determined to include executable code” (claim 13).....	13
IV. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(D).....	14
A. The Similarities and Material Differences Between the Asserted Art and the Prior Art Previously Considered By the Office	14
B. The Cumulative Nature of the Asserted Art and the Prior Art Evaluated During Examination.....	17
C. The Extent to Which the Asserted Art was Evaluated During Examination	18

D.	The Extent of the Overlap Between the Arguments Made During Examination and the Manner in Which Petitioner Relies on the Prior Art.....	18
E.	Whether Petitioner Has Pointed Out Sufficiently How the Examiner Erred In Its Evaluation of the Asserted Prior Art.....	19
F.	The Extent to Which Additional Evidence and Facts Presented in the Petition Warrant Reconsideration of the Prior Art or Arguments	20
V.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 314(A).....	21
A.	General Plastic Factors 2–7 Weigh Strongly in Favor of Denial	23
1.	<u>Factor 2</u> : The Cited References Were Available At the Time the Earlier Petitions Were Filed	23
2.	<u>Factor 3</u> : At the Time of Filing, An Extensive <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Record Already Existed With Respect to the ‘494 Patent	24
3.	<u>Factor 4</u> : The Timing of the Instant Petition Weighs in Favor of Denial	26
4.	<u>Factor 5</u> : Petitioner Provides No Justification for Filing This Petition and Does Not Account for the Delay in Filing	27
5.	<u>Factors 6 and 7</u> : The Board’s Resources Are Better Directed Elsewhere	28
B.	Factor 1 Is Neutral or Weighs In Favor of Denial	29
1.	<u>Factor 1</u> : The Same Claims Have Previously Been Challenged and the Identity of Petitioner Does Not Preclude Denial Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....	29
VI.	SPECIFIC REASONS WHY THE CITED REFERENCES DO NOT INVALIDATE THE CLAIMS, AND WHY <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED.....	30

A. Hanson in View of Hypponen Does Not Render Obvious the Claims 1–4, 8, 11, 13, and 14.....31

1. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Hanson in View of Hypponen Discloses “[a content inspection engine communicatively coupled to the information monitor for/means for] determining [,by the computer] whether the downloadable-information includes executable code” (claims 1, 8, and 13)32

2. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Hanson in View of Hypponen Discloses “causing mobile protection code to be executed by the mobile code executor at a downloadable-information destination such that one or more operations of the executable code at the destination, if attempted, will be processed by the mobile protection code” (claims 14).....36

B. Hanson In View of Hypponen and Touboul ’98 Does Not Render Obvious the Claim 1239

VII. CONCLUSION.....39

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	38
<i>Apple Inc. v. Immersion Corp.</i> , Case IPR2017-01371, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 21, 2017)	22
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co., v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , Case IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2017)	<i>passim</i>
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	7
<i>General Plastic Indus. Co. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , Case IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 6, 2017)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Jiawei Tech. (HK) Ltd. v. Simon Nicholas Richmond</i> , Case IPR2014-00937, Paper 24 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 6, 2015)	8
<i>Kayak Software Corp. v. IBM Corp.</i> , Case CBM2016-00075, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2016)	25
<i>Kinetic Techs., Inc. v. Skyworks Sols., Inc.</i> , Case IPR2014-00529, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 23, 2014)	38
<i>Mentor Graphics Corp. v. In-Depth Test LLC</i> , IPR2017-02094, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 14, 2018)	8, 9, 10
<i>Netapp Inc. v. Realtime Data LLC</i> , Case IPR2017-01195, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 12, 2017)	24
<i>Netapp, Inc. v. Realtime Data LLC</i> , Case IPR2017-01354, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 14, 2017)	23, 30
<i>Travelocity.com L.P. v. Conos Techs., LLC</i> , Case CBM2014-00082, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 16, 2014)	4

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.