

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED

1 IRELL & MANELLA LLP
Jonathan S. Kagan (SBN 166039)
2 jkagan@irell.com
Joshua Glucoft (SBN 301249)
3 jglucoft@irell.com
Casey Curran (SBN 305210)
4 ccurran@irell.com
Sharon Song (SBN 313535)
5 ssong@irell.com
1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900
6 Los Angeles, California 90067-4276
Telephone: (310) 277-1010
7 Facsimile: (310) 203-7199

8 Rebecca Carson (SBN 254105)
rcarson@irell.com
9 Kevin Wang (SBN 318024)
kwang@irell.com
10 840 Newport Center Drive, Suite 400
Newport Beach, California 92660-6324
11 Telephone: (949) 760-0991
Facsimile: (949) 760-5200
12

Attorneys for Defendant
13 JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.

14

15 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
16 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
17 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

18	FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,)	Case No. 3:17-cv-05659-WHA
19	Plaintiff,)	DEFENDANT JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF FINJAN, INC.'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF INFRINGEMENT OF CLAIM 10 OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,677,494
20	vs.)	
21	JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC., a Delaware)	
22	Corporation,)	
23	Defendant.)	
24	_____)		Date: July 26, 2018 Time: 8:00 a.m. Courtroom: 12, 19 th Floor Before: Hon. William H. Alsup

25
26
27
28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
1	
2	
3 I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
4 II. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND	2
5 A. Malware Detection	2
6 B. '494 Patent.....	2
7 C. Operation of SRX & Sky ATP	4
8 III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	5
9 A. Legal Standard.....	5
10 B. Agreed Constructions.....	6
11 C. Additional Terms For Construction	7
12 IV. FINJAN IS NOT ENTITLED TO SUMMARY JUDGEMENT	13
13 A. Legal Standard.....	13
14 B. Finjan Is Not Entitled To Summary Judgment Because It Has Not	
15 Met Its Burden To Establish Compliance With 35 U.S.C. § 287	13
16 1. The Undisputed Facts Show That Finjan And Its Licensees	
17 Failed To Mark.....	14
18 2. There Is No Evidence That Finjan Provided Juniper With	
19 Actual Notice Prior To Filing Its Complaint.....	19
20 C. Finjan Is Not Entitled To Summary Judgment Because It Has Not	
21 Met Its Burden To Demonstrate No Factual Disputes Regarding	
22 Infringement	22
23 1. Finjan Presents No Evidence That SRX Infringes Claim 10	22
24 2. Sky ATP Does Not Infringe, Or At A Minimum There Are	
25 Disputed Factual Issues.....	22
26 (a) Finjan offers no evidence that Sky ATP includes a	
27 "scanner"	22
28 (b) Sky ATP does not derive a "list of suspicious	
computer operations that may be attempted by the	
Downloadable"	23
(c) Finjan Has Not Established That Sky ATP Meets	
Element 10(b) Under Doctrine of Equivalents.....	25

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED

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

Page

(d) Finjan Has Not Established That Sky ATP Stores A List Of Suspicious Computer Operations In A “Database”26

(e) Finjan Has Not Established That Sky ATP Meets Element 10(c) Under Doctrine of Equivalents30

(f) Finjan Has Not Established That Sky ATP Has A “Database Manager”32

(g) Finjan Has Not Established That Sky ATP Derives The Downloadable Security Profile Before Storing It33

3. Finjan Is Not Entitled To Summary Judgment That The Combination of SRX & Sky ATP Infringe Claim 1035

D. Finjan Is Not Entitled To Summary Judgment Because Claim 10 Is Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 10135

1. Claim 10 Is Directed Towards An Abstract Idea36

2. Claim 10 Does Not Have A Transformative Inventive Concept.....38

V. CONCLUSION40

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

		Page(s)
1		
2		
3	Cases	
4	<i>Acantha LLC v. Depuy Orthopedics Inc.</i> ,	
5	No. 15-C-1257, 2018 WL 1951231 (E.D. Wis. Apr. 25, 2018).....	18
6	<i>Accent Packaging, Inc. v. Leggett & Platt, Inc.</i> ,	
7	707 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	12
8	<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l</i> ,	
9	134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014) <i>passim</i>	
10	<i>Amsted Indus. Inc. v. Buckeye Steel Castings Co.</i> ,	
11	24 F.3d 178 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	15, 19, 21
12	<i>Apple, Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.</i> ,	
13	842 F.3d 1229 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	37
14	<i>Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.</i> ,	
15	926 F. Supp. 2d 1100 (N.D. Cal. 2013)	19
16	<i>Arctic Cat, Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prods. Inc.</i> ,	
17	876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	14
18	<i>Asylus Networks, Inc. v. Apple, Inc.</i> ,	
19	856 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. May 11, 2017).....	6
20	<i>Bascom Glob. Internet Servs., Inc. v. AT&T Mobility LLC</i> ,	
21	827 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	38
22	<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> ,	
23	561 U.S. 593 (2010)	36
24	<i>Cal. Inst. of Tech. v. Hughes Commc’ns Inc.</i> ,	
25	59 F. Supp. 3d 974 (C.D. Cal. 2014).....	36
26	<i>Calmar, Inc. v. Emson Research, Inc.</i> ,	
27	850 F. Supp. 861 (C.D. Cal. 1994).....	18
28	<i>Clancy Sys. Int’l, Inc. v. Symbol Techs., Inc.</i> ,	
	953 F. Supp. 1170 (D. Colo. 1997)	15
	<i>Commil USA, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> ,	
	135 S. Ct. 1920 (2015)	35
	<i>Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, Nat’l Ass’n</i> ,	
	776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	40

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED

1	<i>Corning Optical Commc'ns Wireless Ltd. v. SOLiD, Inc.</i> ,	
2	5:14-cv-03750-PSG, 2015 WL 5723403 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 16, 2015)	17
3	<i>CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions Inc.</i> ,	
4	654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	37
5	<i>Cybiotronics, Ltd. v. Golden Source Elecs. Ltd.</i> ,	
6	130 F. Supp. 2d 1152 (C.D. Cal. 2001).....	14
7	<i>Datamize, LLC v. Plumtree Software, Inc.</i> ,	
8	417 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	9, 11
9	<i>DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.</i> ,	
10	773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	9
11	<i>Devices for Med., Inc. v. Boehl</i> ,	
12	822 F.2d 1062 (Fed. Cir. 1987).....	21
13	<i>Dunlap v. Schofield</i> ,	
14	152 U.S. 244 (1894)	13
15	<i>Eastman Kodak Co. v. Agfa-Gevaert N.V.</i> ,	
16	560 F. Supp. 2d 227 (W.D.N.Y. 2008), <i>judgment entered</i> , 2008 WL 5115252	
17	(W.D.N.Y. Dec. 4, 2008), <i>and aff'd</i> , 351 F. App'x 441 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	21
18	<i>Elec. Power Grp., LLC v. Alstom S.A.</i> ,	
19	830 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	38
20	<i>Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.</i> ,	
21	822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	37
22	<i>Evolutionary Intelligence, LLC v. Sprint Nextel Corp.</i> ,	
23	No. 13-03587, 2014 WL 4802426 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 26, 2014)	6
24	<i>FairWarning IP, LLC v. Iatric Sys, Inc.</i> ,	
25	839 F.3d 1089 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	38
26	<i>Finjan v. Sophos</i> ,	
27	244 F. Supp. 3d 1016 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 14, 2017).....	36, 37, 39
28	<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Sys., LLC</i> ,	
	No. 15-cv-03295, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 157429 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 14, 2016).....	<i>passim</i>
	<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Sys., LLC</i> ,	
	No. 15-cv-03295-BLF, 2016 WL 7212322 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 13, 2016)	36, 37, 38, 39
	<i>Finjan, Inc. v. F5 Networks, Inc.</i> ,	
	No. 3:16-cv-06955-JSC (N.D. Cal. Dec. 2, 2016)	17

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.