

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

Cisco Systems, Inc.,  
Petitioner,

v.

Finjan, Inc.,  
Patent Owner.

---

U.S. Patent No. 7,647,633

---

Case No. IPR2018-00391

---

**PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

***Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"***  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. Petitioner Has Not Waived Any Challenge To The ID, But Finjan Has Waived An Argument From Its POPR That It Did Not Include In Its POR.....	1
III. Finjan Does Not Submit Evidence Sufficient to Rebut Petitioner’s Showing of Invalidity of the Challenged Claims .....	2
A. Finjan’s Claim Construction Arguments Are Overly Restrictive and Unnecessary.....	3
1. <i>Downloadable-information</i> .....	3
2. <i>Information re-communicator/monitor</i> .....	4
3. <i>determining....whether the downloadable-information includes executable code</i> .....	5
B. Finjan’s Arguments That Hanson Does Not Include “Receiving Downloadable-Information” Lack Merit .....	8
1. Finjan Attacks Disclosure Of Hanson That The Petition Did Not Use .....	8
2. Finjan Does Not Apply Its Proposed Construction of “Downloadable-Information” .....	9
C. Finjan’s Arguments That Claim 14 Is Valid Over Ground 1 Fails .....	10
1. The Petition Properly Sets Forth a Single Reference Obviousness Challenge to Claim 14.....	10
2. Hanson Discloses Each Limitation Recited In Claim 14.....	10
D. Factual Issues Identified by the Board In The Institution Decision.....	17

Petitioner’s Reply to Patent Owner’s Response IPR2018-00391

E. Finjan’s Evidence of Secondary Considerations Is Not Sufficient .....24

**I. CONCLUSION** .....26

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b><u>Page(s)</u></b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Beckman Instruments v. LKB Produkter AB</i> , 892 F.2d 1547 (Fed. Cir. 1989) .....	14
<i>In re Donohue</i> , 766 F.2d 531(Fed. Cir. 1985) .....	14
<i>Edmund Optics, Inc. v. Semrock, Inc.</i> IPR2014-00599 .....	14
<i>Symbol Techs. Inc. v. Opticon Inc.</i> , 935 F.2d 1569 (Fed. Cir. 1991) .....	14
<i>In re GPAC Inc.</i> , 57 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1995) .....	24
<i>Palo Alto Networks, Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2015-01979, Paper 22, 58–66.....	25-26
<i>Symantec Corp. v. Finjan, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01892, Paper 27, 53-62 .....	25
<b>Other Authorities</b>	
<b>37 C.F.R 42.104(B)(2)</b> .....	<b>10</b>

**Petitioner's Exhibit List**

<i>Exhibit #</i>	<i>Description</i>
<b>1001</b>	U.S. Patent No. 7,647,633 (“the ’633 Patent”)
<b>1002</b>	Select portions of prosecution history of the ’633 Patent (“File History”)
<b>1003</b>	Declaration of Petitioner’s Expert Dr. Paul Clark (“Clark”)
<b>1004</b>	PCT Published Application WO 98/31124 (“Hanson”)
<b>1005</b>	U.S. Patent No. 6,577,920 (“Hypponen”)
<b>1006</b>	<i>Rx PC The Anti-Virus Handbook</i> , Endrijonas. Windcrest/McGraw-Hill in 1993. (“Rx PC”)
<b>1007</b>	PCT Published Application WO 98/21683 (“Touboul 98”)
<b>1008</b>	PCT Published Application WO 99/35583 (“Touboul 99”)
<b>1009</b>	<i>Hardening COTS Software with Generic Software Wrappers.</i> , 1999 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy Proceedings, T. Fraser <i>et al.</i> , May 1999 (“Fraser”)
<b>1010</b>	<i>User’s Guide: WebScanX for Windows 3.1x, Windows 95, and Windows NT</i> , McAfee Associates, Inc., Aug. 1997 (“WebScanX”)
<b>1011</b>	UK Patent Application GB 2 322 035 A (“Nash”)
<b>1012</b>	U.S. Patent No. 6,772,346 (“Chess”)
<b>1013</b>	Related Patents
<b>1014</b>	Select portions of the prosecution history of U.S. Reexamination application No. 90/013,652, (“the ’652 reexam”)
<b>1015</b>	U.S. Patent application ser. No. 08/964,388 (“the ’388 application”)
<b>1016</b>	U.S. Patent application ser. No. 09/861,229 (“the ’229 application”)
<b>1017</b>	U.S. Provisional application No. 60/205,591 (“the ’591 provisional”)
<b>1018</b>	Select portions of the prosecution history of U.S. Reexamination application No. 90/013,016 (“the ’016 reexam”)
<b>1019</b>	U.S. Provisional application No. 60/030,639 (“the ’639 Provisional”)
<b>1020</b>	U.S. Patent No. 6,092,194 (“the ’194 Patent”)

# 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.