

1 PAUL J. ANDRE (State Bar No. 196585)  
[pandre@kramerlevin.com](mailto:pandre@kramerlevin.com)  
2 LISA KOBIALKA (State Bar No. 191404)  
[lkobialka@kramerlevin.com](mailto:lkobialka@kramerlevin.com)  
3 JAMES HANNAH (State Bar No. 237978)  
[jhannah@kramerlevin.com](mailto:jhannah@kramerlevin.com)  
4 HANNAH LEE (State Bar No. 253197)  
[hlee@kramerlevin.com](mailto:hlee@kramerlevin.com)  
5 MICHAEL H. LEE (State Bar. No. 264592)  
[mhlee@kramerlevin.com](mailto:mhlee@kramerlevin.com)  
6 KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS  
7 & FRANKEL LLP  
8 990 Marsh Road  
Menlo Park, CA 94025  
9 Telephone: (650) 752-1700  
Facsimile: (650) 752-1800  
10 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
11 FINJAN, INC.

12 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
13 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
14 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

16 FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,  
17 Plaintiff,  
18 v.  
19 SYMANTEC CORP., a Delaware Corporation,  
20 Defendant.  
21

Case No.: 14-CV-02298-HSG

**PLAINTIFF FINJAN, INC.'S OPENING  
CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

Date: June 11, 2015  
Time: 2:00 p.m.  
Place: Courtroom 15 – 18th Floor  
Before: Hon. Haywood S. Gilliam Jr.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
I. NOTICE OF HEARING.....	1
II. INTRODUCTION .....	1
III. STATEMENT OF FACTS .....	2
A. Background of the Technology.....	2
B. Summary of Finjan’s Patents .....	2
1. The ‘844 Patent .....	4
2. The ‘926 Patent .....	4
3. The ‘494 Patent .....	4
4. The ‘996 Patent .....	4
5. The ‘299 and ‘182 Patents .....	5
6. The ‘289 and ‘154 Patents .....	5
IV. ARGUMENT.....	5
A. Finjan’s Proposed Terms .....	5
1. Downloadable (the ‘844 Patent: Claims 1, 15, 41, 43; the ‘926 Patent: Claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 29, 30; the ‘494 Patent: Claims 1, 10) .....	6
2. database (the ‘926 Patent: Claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 29, 30; the ‘494 Patent: Claims: 1, 10) .....	8
3. Means-Plus-Function Claim Terms (3 Terms) .....	11
a) “means for receiving a Downloadable” (‘844 Patent: Claim 43) .....	11
b) “means for generating a first Downloadable security profile that identifies suspicious code in the received Downloadable” (‘844 Patent: Claim 43) .....	13
c) “means for linking the first Downloadable security profile to the Downloadable before a web server makes the Downloadable available to web clients” (‘844 Patent: Claim 43) .....	15
B. Symantec’s Proposed Terms for Construction .....	16

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

- 1. protecting a computer from dynamically generated malicious content (the ‘289 Patent: Claims 1, 10, 19, 22, 35, 41; the ‘154 Patent: Claims 1, 6)..... 17
- 2. content processor (the ‘289 Patent: Claim 10; the ‘154 Patent: Claims 1, 6)..... 18
- 3. dynamically update[e/es/ing] the combined search and security results summary/dynamically updating the presentation when additional security assessments are received (the ‘299 Patent: Claims 1, 13, 20; the ‘182 Patent: Claims 1, 8, 15)..... 20
- 4. non-HTTP management data (the ‘996 Patent: Claims 1, 4, 7)..... 22
- 5. inspection[s] (the ‘289 Patent: Claims 1, 10, 19, 22, 35, 41)..... 23

V. CONCLUSION..... 24

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES****Page(s)****Cases**

1		
2		
3	<b>Cases</b>	
4	<i>Abtox, Inc. v. Exitron Corp.</i> ,	
5	131 F.3d 1009 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	8
6	<i>AIA Eng'g Ltd. v. Magotteaux Intern. S/A</i> ,	
7	657 F.3d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	7
8	<i>Aventis Pharms. Inc. v. Amino Chems. Ltd.</i> ,	
9	715 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	<i>passim</i>
10	<i>Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. v. St. Jude Med., Inc.</i> ,	
11	296 F.3d 1106 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	15, 16, 17
12	<i>CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Burnswick Corp.</i> ,	
13	288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	7
14	<i>Edwards Lifesciences LLC v. Cook Inc.</i> ,	
15	582 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	7
16	<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Secure Computing Corp.</i> ,	
17	626 F.3d 1197 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	7
18	<i>In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litig.</i> ,	
19	639 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	12
20	<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> ,	
21	52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995)(en banc), <i>aff'd</i> , 517 U.S. 370 (1996) .....	5
22	<i>Nazomi Comm's, Inc. v. Microsoft Mobile Oy</i> ,	
23	Nos. 2014-1173, 2014-1178, 2014 WL 6678247 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 26, 2014).....	7
24	<i>Noah Sys., Inc. v. Intuit Inc.</i> ,	
25	675 F.3d 1302 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	12, 13
26	<i>Novatek, Inc. v. Sollami Co.</i> ,	
27	559 Fed. Appx. 1011 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	17
28	<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> ,	
29	415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)(en banc).....	5, 21
30	<i>Thorner v. Sony Computer Entm't Am. LLC</i> ,	
	669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	<i>passim</i>

1 *Visto Corp. v. Sproqit Techs., Inc.*,  
445 F. Supp.2d 1104 (N.D. Cal. 2006) ..... 13

2 **Statutes**

3 35 U.S.C. § 112(6) ..... 12, 13, 15

4 **Other Authorities**

5 Patent Local Rule 4-3(c) ..... 1, 20

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

# 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.