

1 SPENCER HOSIE (CA Bar No. 101777)
shosie@hosielaw.com
2 DIANE S. RICE (CA Bar No. 118303)
drice@hosielaw.com
3 GEORGE F. BISHOP (CA Bar No. 89205)
gbishop@hosielaw.com
4 WILLIAM P. NELSON (CA Bar No. 196091)
wnelson@hosielaw.com
5 HOSIE RICE LLP
6 600 Montgomery Street, 34th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
7 (415) 247-6000 Tel.
(415) 247-6001 Fax

8
9 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
IMPLICIT NETWORKS, INC.

10
11
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

13
14 IMPLICIT NETWORKS, INC.,
15 Plaintiff,
16 v.
17 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY,
18 Defendant.

FILED

FEB 10 2012

14

RICHARD W. WIEKING
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JSC

CV12
Case No.

0685

**COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR
JURY TRIAL**

1 Plaintiff Implicit Networks, Inc. (“Implicit” or “Plaintiff”) hereby files its complaint
2 against defendant Hewlett-Packard Company (“HP” or “Defendant”), for patent
3 infringement. For its complaint, Plaintiff alleges, on personal knowledge as to its own acts
4 and on information and belief as to all other matters, as follows:

5 **PARTIES**

6 1. Implicit is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Washington,
7 with its principal place of business in Seattle, Washington.

8 2. HP is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its
9 principal place of business in Palo Alto, California.

10 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

11 3. This complaint asserts a cause of action for patent infringement under the
12 Patent Act, 35 U.S.C. § 271. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this matter by
13 virtue of 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a). Venue is proper in this Court by virtue of 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)
14 and (c) and 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b), in that HP may be found in this district, has committed acts
15 of infringement in this district, and a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to
16 the claim occurred and a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action is
17 situated in this district.

18 4. This Court has personal jurisdiction over HP because Defendant has a place of
19 business in, and provides infringing products and services in, the Northern District of
20 California.

21 **STATEMENT OF FACTS.**

22 **A. Implicit’s Server Request Management Patent**

23 5. On March 18, 1998, Edward Balassanian filed the first patent application on
24 his invention of novel methods and systems for serving applets to client computers over the
25
26
27
28

1 Internet or other computer networks, and for moving processing of applets to the server-side.
2 This invention solved problems of distributing to numerous, diverse clients the diverse
3 applications those clients demanded, and of accelerating processing and economizing on use
4 of client-side resources by moving processing of applets to the server-side. On October 31,
5 2007, Mr. Balassanian filed the application for what became U.S. Patent No. 8,056,075 (the
6 '075 Patent). The '075 Patent discloses a novel method for delivering applets to client
7 computers from the Internet or other networks, with the use of a server manager that
8 performs server-side processing that includes compressing, optimizing and/or verifying the
9 applets. A true and correct copy of the '075 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
10

11 **B. HP's Infringement.**

12 6. HP infringes the '075 Patent by, *inter alia*, making and selling products and
13 services, including computer servers such as the HP-UX server, that practice the methods of
14 the '075 Patent. The HP-UX server with Apache-based Web Server is an enterprise-class
15 web server, which provides http web serving. As stated by HP, the HP-UX server with
16 Apache-based Web Server is "Enterprise Ready: The highly scalable HP-UX-11i Apache-
17 based Web Server is always available servicing enterprise requirements for multiple web
18 servers, geographically dispersed servers, and servicing millions of http/https pages and
19 eCommerce transactions 24/7." These HP servers receive requests for web pages and other
20 applets from client computers that are connected to the server over the Internet or other
21 networks. The HP servers forward the client requests, to the Internet or other networks, and
22 receive back the requested web page or other applet. The HP server compresses or otherwise
23 processes the web page or other applet, and returns the applet to the client computer.
24
25
26
27
28

COUNT I

PATENT INFRINGEMENT

1
2
3 7. Plaintiff incorporates by this reference paragraphs 1 through 6 above, as if
4 fully set forth herein.

5 8. On November 8, 2011, United States Patent No. 8,056,075, entitled "Server
6 Request Management," was duly and legally issued.

7
8 9. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. Section 282, the '075 Patent is presumed valid.

9 10. Edward Balassanian is the sole inventor of the '075 Patent. This patent has
10 been assigned to Plaintiff. Plaintiff Implicit is the sole legal and rightful owner of the '075
11 Patent.

12 11. HP makes, uses, and sells products that infringe the '075 Patent, as alleged
13 above. This conduct constitutes infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

14 12. HP has also infringed and is still infringing the '075 Patent in this country,
15 through, *inter alia*, its active inducement of others to make, use, and/or sell the systems,
16 products and methods claimed in one or more claims of the patent. HP supplies infringing
17 products to others, including HP-UX server with Apache-based Web Server. Numerous HP
18 customers directly infringe the '075 Patent. HP's customers directly infringed the '075
19 Patent, and were induced to do so by HP. HP has been selling its infringing products and
20 services for many years. HP continues to sell these products today. HP advertises infringing
21 uses, provides support, and instructs customers to use HP products in an infringing manner.
22 HP knows of the '075 Patent and its contents. HP actively and knowingly encouraged, aided
23 and abetted its customers to directly infringe the '075 Patent. HP offered its infringing
24 products for sale with the intent of promoting their use to infringe, and with that object, HP
25 intentionally encouraged its customers to infringe the '075 Patent by advertising its products
26
27
28

1 for infringing uses, and instructing its customers how to use the products to engage in
2 infringement. HP specifically intended that its customers infringe the '075 Patent, and knew
3 that its actions would encourage customers to actually infringe the '075 Patent. This conduct
4 constitutes infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b).

5 13. In addition, HP has infringed and is still infringing the '075 Patent in this
6 country through, *inter alia*, providing and selling goods and services including products
7 designed for use in practicing one or more claims of the '075 Patent, where the goods and
8 services constitute a material part of the invention and are not staple articles of commerce,
9 and which have no use other than infringing one or more claims of the '075 Patent. HP's
10 customers commit the entire act of direct infringement. HP has committed these acts with
11 knowledge that the goods and services it provides are specially made for use in a manner that
12 directly infringes the '075 Patent. This conduct constitutes infringement under 35 U.S.C. §
13 271(c).
14

15 14. As a result of the infringement by HP, Plaintiff has been damaged, and will
16 continue to be damaged, until this Defendant is enjoined from further acts of infringement.
17

18 15. HP will continue to infringe unless enjoined by this Court. Plaintiff faces real,
19 substantial and irreparable damage and injury of a continuing nature from infringement for
20 which Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law.
21

22 PRAYER FOR RELIEF

23 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for entry of judgment:

- 24 A. that the Patent-in-Suit is valid and enforceable;
25 B. that Defendant has infringed one or more claims of the Patent-in-Suit;
26
27
28

1 C. that Defendant account for and pay to Plaintiff all damages caused by the
2 infringement of the Patent-in-Suit, which by statute can be no less than a reasonable
3 royalty;

4 D. that Plaintiff be granted pre-judgment and post-judgment interest on the
5 damages caused to them by reason of Defendant's infringement of the Patent-in-Suit;

6 E. that this Court require Defendant to file with this Court, within thirty (30)
7 days after entry of final judgment, a written statement under oath setting forth in detail
8 the manner in which Defendant has complied with the injunction;

9 F. that this be adjudged an exceptional case and the Plaintiff be awarded its
10 attorney's fees in this action pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285;

11 G. that this Court award Plaintiff its costs and disbursements in this civil
12 action, including reasonable attorney's fees; and

13 H. that Plaintiff be granted such other and further relief as the Court may
14 deem just and proper under the current circumstances.

15 Dated: February 10, 2012

16 Respectfully submitted,

17
18
19
20 SPENCER HOSIE (CA Bar No. 101777)
shosie@hosielaw.com
21 DIANE S. RICE (CA Bar No. 118303)
drice@hosielaw.com
22 GEORGE F. BISHOP (CA Bar No. 89205)
gbishop@hosielaw.com
23 WILLIAM P. NELSON (CA Bar No. 196091)
wnelson@hosielaw.com
24 HOSIE RICE LLP
25 600 Montgomery Street, 34th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
26 (415) 247-6000 Tel.
27 (415) 247-6001 Fax
28

Attorneys for Plaintiff
IMPLICIT NETWORKS, INC.


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

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, by its undersigned attorneys, demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Dated: February 10, 2012

Respectfully submitted,



SPENCER HOSIE (CA Bar No. 101777)

shosie@hosielaw.com

DIANE S. RICE (CA Bar No. 118303)

drice@hosielaw.com

GEORGE F. BISHOP (CA Bar No. 89205)

gbishop@hosielaw.com

WILLIAM P. NELSON (CA Bar No. 196091)

wnelson@hosielaw.com

HOSIE RICE LLP

600 Montgomery Street, 34th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94111

(415) 247-6000 Tel.

(415) 247-6001 Fax

Attorneys for Plaintiff

IMPLICIT NETWORKS, INC.

EXHIBIT A



US008056075B2

(12) **United States Patent**
Balassanian

(10) **Patent No.:** **US 8,056,075 B2**
(45) **Date of Patent:** ***Nov. 8, 2011**

(54) **SERVER REQUEST MANAGEMENT**

(76) Inventor: **Edward Balassanian**, Kirkland, WA (US)

(*) Notice: Subject to any disclaimer, the term of this patent is extended or adjusted under 35 U.S.C. 154(b) by 931 days.

This patent is subject to a terminal disclaimer.

(21) Appl. No.: **11/933,161**

(22) Filed: **Oct. 31, 2007**

(65) **Prior Publication Data**

US 2008/0140772 A1 Jun. 12, 2008

Related U.S. Application Data

(63) Continuation of application No. 11/241,985, filed on Oct. 4, 2005, now Pat. No. 7,774,740, which is a continuation of application No. 09/968,704, filed on Oct. 1, 2001, now Pat. No. 6,976,248, which is a continuation of application No. 09/040,972, filed on Mar. 18, 1998, now Pat. No. 6,324,685.

(51) **Int. Cl.**

G06F 9/445 (2006.01)
G06F 9/44 (2006.01)

(52) **U.S. Cl.** 717/177; 717/171; 709/203

(58) **Field of Classification Search** 717/168-177; 709/203-204

See application file for complete search history.

(56) **References Cited**

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

5,920,725 A *	7/1999	Ma et al.	717/171
5,923,885 A *	7/1999	Johnson et al.	717/176
5,926,631 A *	7/1999	McGarvey	703/23
6,105,063 A *	8/2000	Hayes, Jr.	709/223
6,195,794 B1 *	2/2001	Buxton	717/108

6,253,228 B1 *	6/2001	Ferris et al.	709/203
6,757,894 B2 *	6/2004	Eylon et al.	717/177
6,766,366 B1 *	7/2004	Schafer et al.	709/223
6,996,817 B2 *	2/2006	Birum et al.	717/170
7,069,294 B2 *	6/2006	Clough et al.	709/203
7,131,122 B1 *	10/2006	Lakhdir	717/168
7,150,015 B2 *	12/2006	Pace et al.	717/176
7,155,715 B1 *	12/2006	Cui et al.	717/177
7,444,629 B2 *	10/2008	Chirakansakcharoen et al.	717/166
7,523,158 B1 *	4/2009	Nickerson et al.	709/203
7,721,283 B2 *	5/2010	Kovachka-Dimitrova et al.	717/177
7,814,475 B2 *	10/2010	Cohen et al.	717/168
7,934,212 B2 *	4/2011	Lakhdir	717/170
7,991,834 B2 *	8/2011	Ferris et al.	709/203

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Bonisch et al, "Server side compresslets for internet multimedia streams", IEEE, pp. 82-86, 1999.*

Wirthlin et al, "Web based IP evaluation and distribution using applets", IEEE vol. 22, No. 8, pp. 985-994, 2003.*


(Continued)

Primary Examiner — Anil Khatri

(57) **ABSTRACT**

The present invention is an applet server which accepts requests for applets from client computers. A request specifies the format in which an applet is to be delivered to the requesting client computer. The applet server has a cache which it uses to store applets for distribution to client computers. If the specified form of the requested applet is available in the cache, the applet server transmits the applet to the requesting client. If the applet is not available in the cache, the server will attempt to build the applet from local resources (program code modules and compilers) and transformer programs (verifiers and optimizers). If the applet server is able to build the requested applet, it will then transmit the applet to the requesting client computer. If the applet server is unable to build the requested applet, it will pass the request to another applet server on the network for fulfillment of the request.

13 Claims, 3 Drawing Sheets



US 8,056,075 B2

Page 2

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Ding et al, "Selective Java applet filtering on Internet", IEEE, pp. 110-114, 1999.*

Lai et al, "On the performance of wide area thin client computing", ACM Trans. on Compt. Sys> vo. 24, No. 2, pp. 175-209, 2006.*

* cited by examiner




Fig. 1

Request Data Type

Tag	Value
Applet-URL	(String) specifies the name of the requested applet
Code-Type	(Source/Intermediate/Binary) specifies the format the applet is to be delivered to the requesting client in. A request for binary would specify the CPU of the requesting client (e.g., x86)
Verification-Level	(0-100) specifies the degree of verification to be performed. 0 = no/minimal verification, 100 = maximum verification (highest level of security).
Optimization-Level	(0-100) specifies the degree of optimization to be performed. 0 = no/minimal optimization, 100 = maximum optimization.

Fig. 2A**Code Data Type**

Tag	Value
Applet-URL	(String) specifies the name of the requested applet
Code-Type	(Source/Intermediate/Binary) specifies the format the applet is to be delivered to the requesting client in. A request for binary would specify the CPU of the requesting client (e.g., x86)
Verification-Level	(0-100) specifies the degree of verification to be performed. 0 = no/minimal verification, 100 = maximum verification (highest level of security).
Optimization-Level	(0-100) specifies the degree of optimization to be performed. 0 = no/minimal optimization, 100 = maximum optimization.
Applet Length	(0-2 ³²) specifies the size of the requested applet.
Applet Code	The Requested Applet in the form specified by the request data type.

Fig. 2B




Fig. 3

US 8,056,075 B2

1

SERVER REQUEST MANAGEMENT

PRIORITY CLAIM

This application is a continuation of U.S. application Ser. No. 11/241,985 filed Oct. 4, 2005 now U.S. Pat. No. 7,774,740 which is a continuation of U.S. application Ser. No. 09/968,704 filed on Oct. 1, 2001 now U.S. Pat. No. 6,976,248, which is a continuation of U.S. application Ser. No. 09/040,972 filed on Mar. 18, 1998, now U.S. Pat. No. 6,324,685.

BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

Field of the Invention

The present invention relates to computer operating system and, in particular to a server architecture providing application caching and security verification.

The growth of the Internet's importance to business, along with the increased dependence upon corporate networks, has created a demand for more secure and efficient computer systems. The traditional solution to this problem has been to depend upon improvements in hardware performance to make up for the performance penalty that is typically incurred when a computer system is made more secure and stable. Increased interconnectivity has also created a need for improved interoperability amongst a variety of computers that are now connected to one another. One solution to the problem of the variety of computers interconnected via the Internet and corporate networks has been the development of portable architecture neutral programming languages. The most widely known of these is the Java™ programming language, though, there are numerous other architecture neutral languages.

Architecture neutral programming languages allow programs downloaded from a server computer to a client computer to be interpreted and executed locally. This is possible because the compiler generates partially compiled intermediate byte-code, rather than fully compiled native machine code. In order to run a program, the client machine uses an interpreter to execute the compiled byte-code. The byte-codes provide an architecture neutral object file format, which allows the code to be transported to multiple platforms. This allows the program to be run on any system which implements the appropriate interpreter and run-time system. Collectively, the interpreter and runtime system implement a virtual machine. This structure results in a very secure language.

The security of this system is premised on the ability of the byte-code to be verified independently by the client computer. Using the Java™ programming language or some other virtual machine implementing technology, a client can ensure that the downloaded program will not crash the user's computer or perform operations for which it does not have permission.

The traditional implementations of architecture neutral languages are not without problems. While providing tremendous cross platform support, the current implementations of architecture neutral languages require that every client performs its own verification and interpretation of the intermediate code. The high computation and memory requirements of a verifier, compiler and interpreter restrict the applicability of these technologies to powerful client computers.

Another problem with performing the verification process on the client computer is that any individual within an organization may disable some or all of the checks performed on downloaded code. The current structure of these systems

2

makes security management at the enterprise level almost impossible. Since upgrades of security checking software must be made on every client computer, the cost and time involved in doing such upgrades makes it likely that outdated or corrupt copies of the verifier or interpreter exist within an organization. Even when an organization is diligent in maintaining a client based security model, the size of the undertaking in a large organization increases the likelihood that there will be problems.

There is a need for a scalable distributed system architecture that provides a mechanism for client computers to request and execute applets in a safe manner without requiring the client machines to have local resources to compile or verify the code. There is a further need for a system in which the applets may be cached in either an intermediate architecture neutral form or machine specific form in order to increase overall system performance and efficiency.

SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

In accordance with one embodiment of the invention, an applet server architecture is taught which allows client computers to request and execute applets in a safe manner without requiring the client to have local resources to verify or compile the applet code. Compilation and byte-code verification in the present invention are server based and thereby provide more efficient use of resources and a flexible mechanism for instituting enterprise-wide security policies. The server architecture also provides a cache for applets, allowing clients to receive applet code without having to access nodes outside the local network. The cache also provides a mechanism for avoiding repeated verification and compilation of previously requested applet code since any client requesting a given applet will have the request satisfied by a single cache entry.

Machine specific binary code is essentially interpreted code since the processor for a given computer can essentially be viewed as a form of an interpreter, interpreting binary code into the associated electronic equivalents. The present invention adds a level of indirection in the form of an intermediate language that is processor independent. The intermediate language serves as the basis for security verification, code optimizations, or any other compile time modifications that might be necessary. The intermediate form allows a single version of the source to be stored for many target platforms instead of having a different binary for each potential target computer. Compilations to the target form can either be done at the time of a cache hit or they can be avoided all together if the target machine is able to directly interpret the intermediate form. If the compilation is done on the server, then a copy of the of the compiled code as well as the intermediate form can be stored in the cache. The performance advantage derived from caching the compiled form as well as the intermediate depends upon the number of clients with the same CPU.

The novel features believed characteristic of the invention are set forth in the appended claims. The invention itself, however, as well as other features and advantages thereof will best be understood by reference to the detailed description which follows, when read in conjunction with the accompanying drawings.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

FIG. 1 is diagram showing the major components which may be used to implement an applet server in one embodiment of the present invention;

FIG. 2a is a table which illustrates the structure of the request format data type;

US 8,056,075 B2

3

FIG. 2b is a table which illustrates the structure of the returned code data type.

FIG. 3 is a diagram showing the compilation and transformation of a program module into an applet in a particular form.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION

Referring to FIG. 1, an applet server architecture according to one embodiment of the invention is based on an applet server computer 10 which in turn is connected to client computer A 12, client computer B 14, an external network 16 and an untrusted network 18. The applet server computer 10 connects to client computers 12 and 14, an external network 16, and an untrusted network 18 by means of a network interface 20. Typically this connection will involve one or more of the computers or networks having a connection to the Internet.

The applet server computer 10 accomplishes its objectives by manipulating computer programs in several formats. An applet (e.g. applets 1-3, 25a-25c) is any form of program instructions, whether in binary, source or intermediate format. In the case of this architecture, the applet code can either be a self contained program, or it can be a code fragment associated with a larger application.

Binary format refers to processor specific machine instructions suitable for running natively on a given computing platform (also referred to as "target" because of the concept of "targeting" a compiler to produce binary code for a given processor type).

Source refers to non-binary applet code, generally in the form of high level languages (i.e. the CTM, C++TM, JavaTM, Visual BasicTM, ActiveXTM, FortranTM, and ModulaTM programming languages).

Intermediate format refers to a common intermediate byte-code that is produced by compiling a given source code input. The intermediate byte-code need not necessarily be JavaTM byte-code.

Treating applets in this general sense allows client computers 12 and 14 to request not only applications, but portions of applications. Client computers 12 and 14 are thus able to use applet server computer 10 as the equivalent of a loader, loading in appropriate parts of the application in the form of applets. In turn client computers 12 and 14 can run large applications without requiring that the client computers 12 and 14 have the resources to store the entire application in memory at once.

Having the applets delivered from applet server computer 10 allows code in intermediate form to be verified, optimized, and compiled before being transmitted to client computers 12 and 14. This reduces the amount of work the client computers 12 and 14 have to do and provides a convenient way to impose global restrictions on code.

In operation, client computer A 12 transmits a request to an applet server computer 10 requesting an applet in a particular form. The form may be selected from a large matrix of many possible forms that can be recognized by the system. The request specifies the format (source, intermediate, or binary) in which the client wishes to receive the applet. The request may also specify that the applet be verified or have some other transformation operation preformed upon it. Verification, optimization and compression are examples of types of transformation operations. The request is received by the network interface 20 of the applet server computer 10 which passes the request onto the applet server manager 22.

After interpreting the request, the applet server manager 22 checks to see if the requested applet is available in the cache 24. The cache 24 stores applets in a variety of formats (source,

4

intermediate, or binary). If the requested form of the applet is available in the cache 24 (applet 1 25a, applet 2 25b, or applet 3 25c in this example) the applet server manager 22 instructs the network interface 20 to transmit the applet to requesting client computer A 12.

If the requested applet is not available in the cache 24, then the applet server manager 22 will attempt to build the requested applet from local resources 26 and one or more transformation operations performed by one or more of the transformers 28. Local resources 26 are comprised of compilers 30a, 30b and 30c and program code modules 32a, 32b, 32c and 32d. The requested applet is built by selecting one or more program code modules 32 and compiling them with one or more compilers 30. Transformer operations may be performed by the verifier 34 or the optimizer 36. After the applet server manager 22 builds the applet, the network interface 20 transmits the applet to the requesting client computer A 12.

If the request can not be satisfied by building the applet from local resources 26 and transformers 28, the applet server manager 22 will pass a request for the requested applet to external network 16 and/or untrusted network 18. The applet server manager 22 may request the applet in intermediate form or in executable form or it may request the local resources 26 and transformers 28 it needs to complete building the applet itself.

The cache 24 is capable of responding to the following commands: GET, PUT, and FLUSH. GET is used to retrieve a given applet from the cache. PUT is used to store an applet in the cache. FLUSH is used to clear the cache of one or more entries. When the cache is unable to locate an item in response to a GET operation, it returns a cache miss. The program which issued the GET command is then responsible for locating the desired form of the applet by other means and optionally storing it in the cache when it is retrieved (using the PUT operation). The FLUSH command will clear the cache of one or more entries and any subsequent GETs for the FLUSHed applet code will result in a cache miss. This is useful if a particular applet needs to be updated from a remote server on a periodic basis. When using PUT, the program issuing the command specifies a time to live (TTL) in the cache. When the TTL expires, the cache entry is removed by means of a FLUSH operation.

Local resources 26 are comprised of program modules 32 (applets in source form, not the requested form) and compilers 30. The program modules 32 are run through the compilers 30 in order to produce applets in the requested form. The applet server manager 20 may also direct the modules 32 to be processed by a verifier 34 or another transformer such as an optimizer 36. Program modules 32 are program code used to build applets. Program modules 32 may be stored in local resources 26 in source binary, or intermediate formats. When an applet is built it may require the operation of one or more compilers 30 upon one or more program modules 32. The program modules 32 may be combined and recompiled with previously cached applets and the resulting applet may be also cached for use at a future time. Additionally, program modules 32, compilers 30 and transformers 28 (including verifiers 34 and optimizers 36) may be distributed across a network. The applet server manager 22 may pass requests for the components it needs to build a particular applet back to the network interface 20 which in turn passes the request onto the rest of the network and may include external network 16 and untrusted network 18.

FIG. 3 provides further illustration of how an applet is produced from local resources and transformers. In this illustration the request is for an optimized and verified applet compiled to a machine specific form. A program module 40 is

US 8,056,075 B2

5

compiled into an intermediate form program module **44** by an intermediate compiler **42**. The intermediate form program module **44** is then transformed by an optimizer **46** or a verifier **48**. The resulting transformed intermediate form program module **50** is then compiled by target compiler **52** into machine specific code applet **54**.

There are two types of compilers used to build applets: intermediate compilers **42** and target compilers **52**. The intermediate compiler **42** compiles program modules (source applet code) **40** and produces a common intermediate pseudo-binary representation of the source applet code (intermediate form program module **44**). The word pseudo is used because the intermediate form **44** is not processor specific but is still a binary representation of the source program module **40**. This intermediate form can be re-targeted and compiled for a particular processor. Alternatively, the intermediate form **44** can be interpreted by an interpreter or virtual machine that understands the internal binary representation of the intermediate form. A target compiler **52** compiles intermediate applet code **44** into an applet **54** in a processor specific format (binary) suitable for running natively on a given computing platform.

Transformers **56** are programs that take in intermediate code and put out intermediate code. Transformers **56** are generally used for things like verification and optimization. Other transformers might include compressors that identify portions of code that can be replaced with smaller equivalents. Transformers can be matched up to any other component that takes in intermediate code as an input. These include the cache **24** and the target compilers **52**. Global policies for transformers **56** can be implemented which ensure that all applets are run through some set of transformers before being returned to the client.

A verifier **48** is a type of transformer that is able to analyze input code and determine areas that might not be safe. The verifier **48** can determine the level of safety. Some verifiers **48** look for areas where unsafe or protected memory is being accessed, others might look for accesses to system resources such as IO devices. Once a verifier **48** determines the portion of unsafe applet code several steps can be taken. The offending code portion can be encased with new code that specifically prevents this unsafe code section from being executed. The unsafe code can be modified to be safe. The unsafe code can be flagged in such a way that a user can be warned about the possible risks of executing the code fragment. The verifier's role can therefore be summarized as determining where unsafe code exists and possibly altering the offending code to render it harmless. Verifiers **48** can operate on any format of input code, whether in source intermediate or binary form. However, since intermediate code is a common format, it is most efficient to have a single verifier that will operate on code in this format. This eliminates the need to build specific knowledge of various source languages into the verifier. Verifiers **48** are a form of a transformer. Verifiers **48** take in intermediate code and put out verified intermediate code. Verifiers **48** are responsible for identifying non-secure portions of code in the intermediate code and modifying this code to make it secure. Security problems generally include access to memory areas that are unsafe (such as system memory, or memory outside the application space of the applet).

The choice of adding in the verification step can be left up to the client computers **12**, the applet server computer **10** (see FIG. 1), or can be based on the network that the applet originated from. Server managers can institute global policies that affect all clients by forcing all applets to be run through the verifier **48**. Alternatively, verification can be reserved for un-trusted networks (**18** in FIG. 1), or it can be left up to the

6

client to determine whether the verification should be performed. In the preferred embodiment, verification level is determined by the applet server **10**. In this way, a uniform security policy may be implemented from a single machine (i.e., the applet server **10**).

Optimizers **46** are another type of transformer program. Optimizers **46** analyze code, making improvements to well known code fragments by substituting in optimized but equivalent code fragments. Optimizers **46** take in intermediate code **44** and put out transformed intermediate code **50**. The transformed intermediate code **50** is functionally equivalent to the source intermediate code **44** in that they share the same structure.

Referring again to FIG. 1, policies may be instituted on the applet server **10** that force a certain set of request parameters regardless of what the client asked for. For example, the applet server manager **22** can run the applet through a verifier **34** or optimizer **36** regardless of whether the client **12** requested this or not. Since the server **10** might have to go to an untrusted network **18** to retrieve a given applet, it will then run this applet through the required transformers **28**, particularly the verifier **34** before returning it to the client **12**. Since clients **12** and **14** have to go through the applet server computer **10**, this ensures that clients **12** and **14** do not receive applets directly from an untrusted network **18**. In addition, since the server will be dealing directly with untrusted network **18**, it can be set up to institute policies based on the network. A trusted external network **16** may be treated differently than an untrusted network **18**. This will provide the ability to run a verifier **34** only when dealing with an untrusted network **18**, but not when dealing with a trusted external network **16**. In one embodiment, all intermediate code is passed through a verifier **34** and the source of the code merely determines the level of verification applied.

The client **12** is the target computer on which the user wishes to execute an applet. The client **12** requests applets from the server **10** in a specific form. Applets can be requested in various formats including source, intermediate and binary. In addition, an applet can be requested with verification and/or other compile time operations. Optionally, the client **12** can pass a verifier to the server to provide verification. If the server **10** implements its own security, then both the client and server verifiers will be run. The verifier that is passed from the client to the server is cached at the server for subsequent verification. The client can refer to this verifier by a server-generated handle to avoid having to pass the verifier each time an applet is requested.

Client computers **12** and **14** requesting applet code in intermediate format need to have an interpreter or virtual machine capable of interpreting the binary code in the intermediate format if the applet is to be executed on the client machine.

In the preferred embodiment, requests to the applet server are in a format similar to those of an HTTP header and are comprised of tags and values. In one embodiment, an HTTP GET method is used to make the request (though use of the HTTP protocol is not necessary to implement the present invention). The request is made up of a series of tags which specify the requested applet, the platform on which it is to be run and the type of code (source/intermediate/binary), a verification level and an optimization level. New tags and values can be added to extend functionality as needed and the applet server manager **22** will discard any tag it does not recognize. When the applet server computer **10** returns the requested applet to the requesting client computer **12**, it will transmit the request header followed by the applet code. In this instance, the header will additionally include a field which

US 8,056,075 B2

7

defines the length of the applet code. FIG. 2 provides a table which illustrates the request format and the returned code format.

While this invention has been described with reference to specific embodiments, this description is not meant to limit the scope of the invention. Various modifications of the disclosed embodiments, as well as other embodiments of the invention, will be apparent to persons skilled in the art upon reference to this description. It is therefore contemplated that the appended claims will cover any such modifications or embodiments as fall within the scope of the invention.

I claim:

1. A method for delivering one or more applets to one or more client computers, comprising, in no particular order, the steps of:

configuring an applet server manager at a server computer to manage at least one request from the one or more client computers for the one or more applets, the applet server manager having access to one or more networks;

receiving the at least one request at the applet server manager;

passing the at least one request from the applet server manager to at least one of the one or more networks;

receiving the one or more applets at the applet server manager from the at least one of the one or more networks;

processing the one or more applets at the applet server manager, wherein processing the one or more applets includes at least one of the following steps:

compressing the one or more applets before sending the one or more applets to the one or more client computers, optimizing the one or more applets before sending the one or more applets to the one or more client computers, and verifying the one or more applets before sending the one or more applets to the one or more client computers; and

sending the one or more applets from the applet server manager to the one or more client computers.

8

2. The method of claim 1 wherein processing the one or more applets further includes discarding at least one of the one or more applets based on one or more policies.

3. The method of claim 1 wherein processing the one or more applets further includes transforming at least one of the one or more applets by modifying the data in the at least one of the one or more applets before sending the one or more applets to the one or more client computers.

4. The method of claim 1 wherein at least one of the one or more networks is a trusted network.

5. The method of claim 1 wherein at least one of the one or more networks is an untrusted network.

6. The method of claim 1 wherein the at least one request specifies the name of at least one of the one or more applets using a Uniform Resource Locator.

7. The method of claim 1 wherein the at least one request specifies at least one of the one or more applets using an HTTP header.

8. The method of claim 1 wherein the at least one request specifies at least one of the one or more applets using a cookie.

9. The method of claim 1 wherein processing the one or more applets includes producing at least one of the one or more applets in the form of a web page.

10. The method of claim 1 wherein processing the one or more applets includes producing at least one of the one or more applets in the form of a portion of a web page.

11. The method of claim 1 wherein sending the one or more applets includes sending at least one of the one or more applets to the one or more client computers in an HTTP response.

12. The method of claim 1 wherein the at least one request is processed prior to passing the at least one request from the applet server manager to at least one of the one or more networks.

13. The method of claim 1 wherein processing the one or more applets further includes performing security verification based on one or more policies.

* * * * *