

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

ZSCALER, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

SYMANTEC CORPORATION,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2017-01345  
Patent No. 7,392,543

---

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

*Submitted Electronically via the Patent Review Processing System*

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	OVERVIEW OF THE '543 PATENT .....	6
III.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	7
IV.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION UNDER § 325(d) BECAUSE THE PATENT OFFICE PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED ALL OF THE RELIED-UPON REFERENCES.....	8
V.	OVERVIEW OF ALLEGED PRIOR ART .....	14
VI.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	15
A.	“packet” .....	16
B.	“caller’s address” .....	23
C.	“malicious code signature” .....	23
VII.	PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT ANY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE.....	25
A.	Ground 1: Petitioner has failed to demonstrate a reasonable likelihood that <i>Arnold</i> anticipates Claims 1-3, 5-8, 20, 22, 26, and 29-31 .....	26
1.	Petitioner has failed to establish that <i>Arnold</i> anticipates Claims 1-3, 5-8, 20, 22, 26, and 29-31 at least because Petitioner has failed to show that <i>Arnold</i> discloses a “malicious code packet” .....	27
2.	Petitioner has failed to establish that <i>Arnold</i> anticipates Claims 1-3, 5, and 30 at least because Petitioner has failed to show that <i>Arnold</i> discloses “extracting a specific number of bytes backwards from said caller’s address” .....	41

B.	Grounds 2-4: Petitioner has failed to demonstrate a reasonable likelihood that Claims 4, 9-19, 20-21, 23-25, and 27-29 are obvious in view of one or more of <i>Arnold, Nachenberg</i> , and <i>White</i> .....	57
1.	The Board should deny institution of all claims in Grounds 2-4 because they rely exclusively on the flawed inherency analysis of Ground 1 and do not present an obviousness argument for the claim term “malicious code packet” .....	57
2.	The Board should deny institution of Claim 4 in Ground 2 because it relies exclusively on the flawed inherency analysis of Ground 1 and does not present an obviousness argument for the claim term “extracting a specific number of bytes backwards from said caller’s address” .....	63
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	64

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Apple Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00446, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. July 10, 2015).....	30, 31, 47
<i>Baker Hughes Inc. v. LiquidPower Specialty Prods. Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01905, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 10, 2017) .....	15, 25
<i>Benitec Biopharma Ltd. v. Cold Spring Harbor Lab.</i> , IPR2016-00014, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 23, 2016).....	11
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 29, 2014).....	30, 47
<i>Continental Can Co. v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991) .....	26, 28, 42, 49, 54
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	15
<i>DeSilva v. DiLeanoardi</i> , 181 F.3d 865 (7th Cir. 1999) .....	30, 47
<i>Ford Motor Co. v. Paice LLC</i> , IPR2015-00800, Paper 32 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 26, 2016).....	15
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	57
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	29
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	16, 21, 37
<i>In re Oelrich</i> , 666 F.2d 578 (CCPA 1981).....	26, 28

<i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> , 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	16, 21, 37
<i>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 1250 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	15
<i>InTouch Technologies, Inc. v. VGO Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	54
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	57
<i>Metalcraft of Mayville, Inc. v. The Toro Company</i> , 848 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	54
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	16, 21, 37
<i>Nu-Mark v., Fontem Holdings I, B.V.</i> IPR2016-01309, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. December 15, 2016) .....	13
<i>Skechers USA, Inc. v. Adidas AG</i> , IPR2017-00322, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. May 30, 2017) .....	13
<i>Summit 6, LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.</i> , 802 F.3d 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	26
<i>SuperGuide Corp. v. DirectTV Enters., Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 870 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	15
<i>Transclean Corp. v. Bridgewood Servs., Inc.</i> , 290 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	26, 42, 49
<i>United States Patents Inc., v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC</i> , IPR2016-01643, Paper 9.....	29
<i>Verlander v. Garner</i> , 348 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	32
<i>Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. &amp; Eng'g, Inc.</i> , 200 F.3d 795 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	25

# 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.