

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 RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
<b>PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST</b> .....	i
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Facts .....	2
A. Overview of '633 Patent .....	2
B. Overview of Hanson.....	4
III. Claims at Issue .....	8
IV. Claim Construction.....	8
A. "downloadable-information" (all challenged claims).....	10
B. "information re-communicator" and "information monitor" (claims 2, 3, and 14) .....	11
V. Petitioner Did Not Provide A Proper Obviousness Analysis .....	15
VI. Petitioner Has Waived Rebuttal to Arguments Presented in the Preliminary Response .....	17
VII. The Board Should Accord Dr. Clark's Declaration No Weight.....	20
VIII. The Challenged Claims Are Patentable.....	22
A. Hanson in View of Hypponen Fails to Render Obvious Claims 1-4, 8, and 11-14.....	22
1. Hanson in View of Hypponen Does Not Disclose "receiving[...] downloadable-information" .....	22
2. Hanson in View of Hypponen Does Not Disclose an "information re-communicator," an "information monitor," or "means for receiving downloadable- information" .....	25

B.	Hanson Does Not Render Claim 14 Invalid as Unpatentable or Anticipated .....	26
1.	Hanson Does Not Disclose “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” .....	26
a.	Petitioner’s Argument That Hanson Does Not Disclose Modifying the Executable Code is Conclusory and Unsubstantiated.....	26
b.	Hanson is Not Enabled .....	29
c.	To the Extent That Hanson is Comprehensible, it Teaches Modifying the Executable Code .....	30
2.	Hanson Does Not Disclose “providing a system, wherein the system comprises distinct software modules, and wherein the distinct software modules comprise an information re-communicator and a mobile code executor” .....	34
IX.	Secondary Considerations .....	36
A.	Commercial Success and Licensing.....	39
B.	Industry Praise .....	45
C.	Long Felt Need and Recognition of a Problem.....	45
X.	CONCLUSION.....	46

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Federal Cases</b>	
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	22
<i>Apple Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	36
<i>Beckman Instruments, Inc. v. LKB Produkter AB</i> 892 F.2d 1547 (Fed. Cir. 1989) .....	30
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	8
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	38, 45, 46
<i>Demaco Corp. v. F. Von Langsdorff Licensing Ltd.</i> , 851 F.2d 1387 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....	40
<i>GrafTech Int'l Holdings, Inc. v. Laird Techs., Inc.</i> , 652 Fed. Appx. 973 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	39
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	17, 36
<i>Institut Pasteur &amp; Universite Pierre Et Marie Curie v. Focarino</i> , 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	39
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	18, 19
<i>Kinetic Techs., Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00529, Decision Denying Institution, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 23, 2014) .....	27
<i>In re Kumar</i> , 418 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	30

<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	37, 38, 39
<i>Minnesota Mining &amp; Mfg. Co. v. Johnson &amp; Johnson Orthopaedics, Inc.</i> , 976 F.2d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1992) .....	44
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	37
<i>Orthopedic Equip. Co. v. All Orthopedic Appliances, Inc.</i> , 707 F.2d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 1983) .....	46
<i>Palo Alto Networks, Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01974, Final Written Decision, Paper 49 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 16, 2017) .....	26
<i>Plantronics, Inc. v. Aliph, Inc.</i> , 724 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	37, 38
<i>Rambus Inc. v. Rea</i> , 731 F.3d 1248 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	38
<i>Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.</i> , 234 F.3d 654 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	36
<i>SAS Institute, Inc. v. Complementsoft, LLC</i> , 825 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	10
<i>to SAS Inst., Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018).....	1, 22
<i>Trivascular, Inc., v. Samuels</i> , 812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	18, 19
<i>TRW Automotive US LLC v. Magna Elecs. Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00257, Decision on Petitioner's Request for Rehearing, Paper 18 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 28, 2014) .....	16
<i>Volkswagen Group of Am., Inc., v. Emerachem Holdings, LLC</i> , IPR2014-01558, Final Written Decision, Paper 59 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 22, 2016) .....	16

# 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.