

1 PAUL J. ANDRE (State Bar No. 196585)
pandre@kramerlevin.com
2 LISA KOBIALKA (State Bar No. 191404)
lkobialka@kramerlevin.com
3 JAMES HANNAH (State Bar No. 237978)
jhannah@kramerlevin.com
4 KRISTOPHER KASTENS (State Bar No. 254797)
kkastens@kramerlevin.com
5 KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP
6 990 Marsh Road
7 Menlo Park, CA 94025
8 Telephone: (650) 752-1700
Facsimile: (650) 752-1800

9 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
10 FINJAN, INC.

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

14 FINJAN, INC.,
15
16 Plaintiff,
17 v.
18 JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.,
19 Defendant.

Case No.: 3:17-cv-05659-WHA

**FINJAN, INC.’S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
ITS MOTION TO DISMISS DEFENDANT
JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.’S THIRD,
FOURTH, FIFTH, AND SIXTH
COUNTERCLAIMS AND TO STRIKE
JUNIPER’S TENTH, ELEVENTH,
TWELFTH, AND FOURTEENTH
AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

Date: July 26, 2018
Time: 8:00 a.m.
Courtroom: Courtroom 12, 19th Floor
Before: Hon. William Alsup

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION.....	1
ARGUMENT	2
I. JUNIPER’S PROSECUTION LACHES ALLEGATIONS ARE CONCLUSORY AND FACIALLY IMPLAUSIBLE.....	2
II. JUNIPER’S INEQUITABLE CONDUCT ALLEGATIONS REGARDING THE ‘494 AND ‘154 PATENTS ARE FACIALLY IMPLAUSIBLE	4
A. The ‘494 Patent.....	5
1. Juniper’s Inequitable Conduct Counterclaim and Affirmative Defense Based on the File History and Prior Litigation Documents Are Not Facially Plausible.....	5
2. Juniper Does Not Allege Facts Supporting Materiality of Purported Misrepresentation.....	7
3. Juniper Alleges no Facts Supporting Finjan’s Specific Intent to Deceive the Patent Office.	8
B. The ‘154 Patent.....	9
1. Juniper Does Not Sufficiently Plead Misrepresentation, Material Misrepresentation.....	9
2. Juniper’s Inequitable Conduct Counterclaim Does Not Sufficiently Plead Intent	10
III. JUNIPER’S UNCLEAN HANDS ALLEGATIONS ARE FACIALLY IMPLAUSIBLE	10
IV. JUNIPER’S TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE FOR ENSNAREMENT FAILS TO PROVIDE FAIR NOTICE	12
V. FINJAN’S MOTION TO DISMISS AND TO STRIKE IS TIMELY	13
VI. JUNIPER SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED LEAVE TO AMEND.....	15
CONCLUSION	15

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

1		
2		
3	Cases	
4	<i>Advanced Cardiovascular Sys., Inc. v. Medtronic, Inc.</i> ,	
5	No. C-96-0942 DLJ, 1996 WL 467273 (N.D. Cal. July 24, 1996).....	13
6	<i>Advanced Cardiovascular Sys., Inc. v. Medtronic, Inc.</i> ,	
7	41 U.S.P.Q.2d 1770 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	8
8	<i>Amarretto Ranch Breedables, LLC v. Ozimals, Inc.</i> ,	
9	No. C 10-cv-05696 CRB, 2011 WL 2690437 (N.D. Cal. July 8, 2011).....	14
10	<i>In re Apple iPhone Antitrust Litig.</i> ,	
11	846 F.3d 313 (9th Cir. 2017)	13
12	<i>ASUSTeK Computer Inc. v. AFTG-TG LLC</i> ,	
13	No. 5:CV 11-00192-EJD, 2011 WL 6845791 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 29, 2011).....	12
14	<i>Cancer Research Tech. Ltd. v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> ,	
15	625 F.3d 724 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	2
16	<i>Capella Photonics, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> ,	
17	77 F. Supp. 3d 850 (N.D. Cal. 2014)	8
18	<i>Chiron Corp. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> ,	
19	268 F. Supp. 2d 1139 (E.D. Cal. 2002).....	4
20	<i>Collaboration Properties, Inc. v. Tandberg ASA</i> ,	
21	No. C 05-01940 MHP, 2007 WL 205065 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 25, 2007)	12
22	<i>Core Optical Techs., LLC v. Fujitsu Network Commc'ns, Inc.</i> ,	
23	No. SACV 16-00437-AG-JPRX, 2016 WL 7496742 (C.D. Cal. July 8, 2016)	12
24	<i>Cover v. Windsor Surry Co.</i> ,	
25	No. 14-cv-05262-WHO, 2016 WL 520991 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 10, 2016)	14
26	<i>Dunn v. Castro</i> ,	
27	621 F.3d 1196 (9th Cir. 2010)	11
28	<i>Elvig v. Calvin Presbyterian Church</i> ,	
29	375 F.3d 951 (9th Cir. 2004)	15
30	<i>Evans v. Arizona Cardinals Football Club, LLC</i> ,	
31	231 F. Supp. 3d 342 (N.D. Cal. 2017)	14

1 *Exergen Corp. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*,
575 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 4, 5

2 *Fed. Agr. Mortg. Corp. v. It’s a Jungle Out There, Inc.*,
3 No. C 03-3721 VRW, 2005 WL 3325051 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 7, 2005)..... 14

4 *Feit Elec. Co. v. Beacon Point Capital, LLC*,
5 No. 13-cv-09339, 2015 WL 557262 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 9, 2015)..... 3

6 *Fiskars, Inc. v. Hunt Mfg. Co.*,
221 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2000)..... 12

7 *Galindo v. Ocwen Loan Servicing, LLC*,
8 282 F. Supp. 3d 1193 (N.D. Cal. 2017) 13

9 *Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Merck & Co.*,
10 88 F.3d 1231 (Fed. Cir. 2018)..... 10

11 *In re Gilead Scis. Sec. Litig.*,
536 F.3d 1049 (9th Cir. 2008) 6, 11

12 *Grid Sys. Corp. v. Texas Instruments Inc.*,
13 771 F. Supp. 1033 (N.D. Cal. 1991)..... 12

14 *Honeywell Int’l Inc. v. Universal Avionics Sys. Corp.*,
15 488 F.3d 982 (Fed. Cir. 2007)..... 8

16 *Hynix Semiconductor Inc. v. Rambus Inc.*,
No. CV-00-20905-RMW, 2007 WL 4209386 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 26, 2007)..... 4

17 *Int’l Test Sols., Inc. v. Mipox Int’l Corp.*,
18 No. 16-cv-00791-RS, 2017 WL 2118314 (N.D. Cal. May 16, 2017) 7, 8

19 *Inter-Tel, Inc. v. W. Coast Aircraft Eng’g, Inc.*,
20 No. 804CIV2224T17MSS, 2006 WL 890010 (M.D. Fla. Mar. 31, 2006)..... 14

21 *Kaar v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*,
No. C 16-01290 WHA, 2016 WL 3068396 (N.D. Cal. June 1, 2016)..... 2

22 *Keystone Driller Co. v. Gen. Excavator Co.*,
23 290 U.S. 240 (1933)..... 10

24 *Kimberly-Clark Worldwide, Inc. v. First Quality Baby Prod., LLC*,
No. 09-C-0916, 2010 WL 3386599 (E.D. Wis. Aug. 25, 2010)..... 11

25 *Network Caching Tech., LLC v. Novell, Inc.*,
26 No. C-01-2079-VRW, 2001 WL 36043487 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 31, 2001)..... 13

27

28

1	<i>Nomadix, Inc. v. Hosp. Core Servs. LLC</i> , No. CV 14-08256 DDP (VBKx), 2015 WL 3948804 (C.D. Cal. June 29, 2015)	3
2	<i>Oracle Corp. v. ORG Structure Innovations LLC</i> ,	
3	No. C 11-3549 SBA, 2012 WL 12951187 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 30, 2012)	2, 12
4	<i>PB Farradyne, Inc. v. Peterson</i> ,	
5	No. C 05-03447 SI, 2006 WL 132182 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 17, 2006).....	13
6	<i>Presidio Components, Inc. v. Am. Tech. Ceramics Corp.</i> ,	
7	No. 14-cv-2061-H (BGS), 2016 WL 7319533 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 10, 2016)	15
8	<i>Qarbon.com Inc. v. eHelp Corp.</i> ,	
9	315 F. Supp. 2d 1046 (N.D. Cal. 2004)	13
10	<i>Quad Env'tl. Techs. Corp. v. Union Sanitary Dist.</i> ,	
11	946 F.2d 870 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	9
12	<i>Reyn's Pasta Bella, LLC v. Visa USA, Inc.</i> ,	
13	442 F.3d 741 (9th Cir. 2006)	2
14	<i>Rowley v. McMillan</i> ,	
15	502 F.2d 1326 (4th Cir. 1974)	15
16	<i>Schreiber Distrib. Co. v. Serv-Well Furniture Co.</i> ,	
17	806 F.2d 1393 (9th Cir. 1986)	8
18	<i>SCVNGR, Inc. v. eCharge Licensing, LLC</i> ,	
19	No. 13-12418-DJC, 2014 WL 4804738 (D. Mass. Sept. 25, 2014).....	4
20	<i>SecurityProfiling, LLC v. Trend Micro Am., Inc.</i> ,	
21	No. 6:16-cv-01165-RWS-JDL, 2017 WL 5150682 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 21, 2017).....	9
22	<i>Shwarz v. United States</i> ,	
23	234 F.3d 428 (9th Cir. 2000)	5
24	<i>Sonos, Inc. v. D&M Holdings Inc.</i> ,	
25	No. 14-1330-RGA-MPT, 2016 WL 4249493 (D. Del. Aug. 10, 2016).....	3
26	<i>Sun Microsystems, Inc. v. Dataram Corp.</i> ,	
27	No. CIV. 96-20708 SW, 1997 WL 50272 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 4, 1997)).....	8
28	<i>Symantec Corp. v. Zscaler, Inc.</i> ,	
29	No. 17-cv-04426-JST, 2018 WL 1456678 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 23, 2018).....	13
30	<i>Symbol Techs, Inc. v. Lemelson Med., Educ. & Research Found., LP</i> ,	
	422 F.3d 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	2

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.