

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.
Petitioner,

v.

FINJAN, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2019-00060
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. FACTS	4
A. Overview of ‘633 Patent	4
B. Challenged Claims	5
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	5
A. “executable code” (all challenged claims)	6
B. “mobile protection code” (all challenged claims)	6
C. “downloadable-information” (all challenged claims)	8
D. “determining, by the computer, whether the downloadable- information includes executable code”	9
E. “information re-communicator” and “information monitor” (claims 8 and 14)	11
F. “A Computer Program Product... The Method Comprising” (claims 14 and 19)	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 involved during examination.....	17
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, including whether the prior art was the basis for rejection	18
D. The extent of the overlap between the arguments made during examination and the manner in which Petitioner relies on the prior art or Patent Owner distinguishes the prior art;.....	19

E.	Whether Petitioner has pointed out sufficiently how the Examiner erred in its evaluation of the asserted prior art	20
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)	20
A.	Factor 1 Weighs Slightly Against Institution or is Neutral.....	22
B.	Factor 2 Weighs Against Institution	22
C.	Factor 3 Weighs Against Institution	23
D.	Factor 4 Weighs Against Institution	25
E.	Factor 5 Weighs Against Institution	26
F.	Factor 6 Weighs Against Institution	27
G.	Factor 7 is Neutral	27
VI.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE PATENTABLE	28
A.	Ground 1 Fails to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood That Any Challenged Claim is Unpatentable	28
1.	Sonnenberg In View of Jensen Fails to Disclose “determining, by the computer, whether the downloadable-information includes executable code” (claims 1 and 8).....	28
2.	Sonnenberg In View of Jensen Fails to Disclose “mobile protection code” (all challenged claims)	31
B.	Hanson Alone and Hanson in View of Lemay Fail to Render Obvious Claims 1, 8, 14, and 19	33
1.	Hanson Alone and Hanson in View of Lemay Does Not Disclose “receiving[...] downloadable-information”	34

2.	Hanson in View of Leamay Does Not Disclose an “information re-communicator” or an “information monitor”	36
3.	Hanson Alone and Hanson in View of Leamay Does Not Disclose an “determining, by the computer, whether the downloadable-information includes executable code”	37
4.	Hanson Alone 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”	39
	a. Petitioner’s Argument That Hanson Does Not Disclose Modifying the Executable Code Should be Rejected.....	40
	b. Hanson is Not Enabled	42
	c. To the Extent That Hanson is Comprehensible, it Teaches Modifying the Executable Code	43
5.	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”	46
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	48

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Aqua Prods., Inc. v. Matal</i> , 872 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	8
<i>Beckman Instruments, Inc. v. LKB Produkter AB</i> , 892 F.2d 1547, 1551 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	42
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , Case IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2017)	16
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	6
<i>Eset, LLC v. Finjan, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2017-01738, Paper 21 (P.T.A.B. June 18, 2018)	16
<i>General Plastic Industrial Co. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , Case IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 6, 2017).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>In re Kumar</i> , 418 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	42
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F. 3d 1292, 1298 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	8
<i>Motorola, Inc. v. Interdigital Tech. Corp.</i> , 121 F.3d 1461, 1471 (Fed.Cir.1997)	42
<i>See NetApp Inc. v. Realtime Data LLC</i> , Case IPR2017-01195, Paper 9 at 10 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 12, 2017)	21, 22
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279, 1288 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	8
<i>Palo Alto Networks, Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01974, Final Written Decision, Paper 49 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 16, 2017)	39

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.