

**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,  
19 Plaintiff,  
20 vs.  
21 JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC., a Delaware  
Corporation,  
22 Defendant.  
23

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

**DEFENDANT JUNIPER NETWORKS,  
INC.'S REPLY ISO MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT REGARDING  
CLAIM 1 OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,804,780**

24  
25  
26  
27  
28

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

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

I. FINJAN’S CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS IGNORE THE INTRINSIC RECORD..... 1

II. THE UNDISPUTED FACTS SHOW THAT JUNIPER DOES NOT INFRINGE .....4

    A. Finjan Does Not Even Oppose Juniper’s Motion On SRX.....4

    B. The SRX & Sky ATP Combination Does Not Infringe Claim 1. .... 5

        1. Dropped Files Are Not “Software Components Required To Be Executed By The Downloadable”..... 5

        2. Sky ATP Does Not “Fetch” Any Referenced Components ..... 6

        3. Sky ATP Does Not Hash Files “Together With” Any Fetched Components To Generate A Downloadable ID..... 7

III. CLAIM 1 IS UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101 ..... 9

    A. Claim 1 is Abstract..... 9

    B. Finjan’s Own Admissions Regarding Claim Scope Demonstrate That There Are No Disputed Facts Regarding The Inventive Concept Prong. .... 11

IV. FINJAN’S FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH § 287 BARS PRESUIT DAMAGES ..... 12

    A. Juniper’s Motion Under 35 U.S.C. § 287 Is Ripe For Adjudication..... 12

    B. There Is No Dispute That Finjan Failed To Provide Actual Notice Regarding Sky ATP and The ’780 Patent. .... 13

    C. The Undisputed Facts Show Finjan Failed To Provide Constructive Notice. .... 14

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

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Am. Med. Sys., Inc. v. Med. Eng'g Corp.</i> , 6 F.3d 1523 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	12, 14
<i>Amsted Indus., Inc. v. Buckeye Steel Castings Co.</i> , 24 F.3d 178 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	13
<i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prods. Inc.</i> , 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	15
<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , No. 2:15-cv-01047-RSP, Dkt. 275 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 29, 2016).....	14
<i>Berkheimer v. HP Inc.</i> , 890 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	11
<i>Beyene v. Coleman Sec. Servs., Inc.</i> , 854 F.2d 1179 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1988).....	6
<i>Blitzsafe Tex., LLC v. Honda Motor Co., Ltd.</i> , 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 58358 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 26, 2017) .....	15
<i>Corning Optical Commc'ns Wireless Ltd. v. SOLiD, Inc.</i> , 2015 WL 5723403 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 16, 2015).....	14
<i>Devices for Medicine, Inc. v. Boehl</i> , 822 F.2d 1062 (Fed. Cir. 1987).....	13
<i>Finjan Software, Ltd. v. Secure Comput. Corp.</i> , 1:06-cv-00369-GMS, Dkt. 226 (D. Del. Mar. 14, 2008) .....	15
<i>Finjan v. Blue Coat Sys., Inc.</i> , 879 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	10
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Systems, Inc.</i> , 2015 WL 3630000 (N.D. Cal. June 2, 2015) .....	3, 4, 8
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Sophos, Inc.</i> , 3:14-cv-01197-WHO, Dkt. 398 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 21, 2016) .....	15
<i>Gart v. Logitech, Inc.</i> , 254 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	14
<i>Hoover Universal, Inc. v. Graham Packaging Corp.</i> , 1997 WL 413600 (C.D. Cal. 1997).....	14

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

1 *Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Capital One Fin. Corp.*,  
850 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....11

2

3 *Johnstech Int’l Corp. v. JF Microtech. SDN BHD*,  
2016 WL 4242220 (N.D. Cal. 2016).....13

4 *Mformation Techs., Inc. v. Research in Motion Ltd.*,  
5 830 F. Supp. 2d 815 (N.D. Cal. 2011) .....12

6 *Nike, Inc. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*,  
7 138 F.3d 1437 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....13

8 *Nissan Fire & Marine Ins. Co. Ltd. v. Fritz Cos., Inc.*,  
9 210 F.3d 1099 (9th Cir. 2000).....5

10 *Palo Alto Networks, Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.*,  
IPR2016-00165, Paper No. 7 (April 21, 2016) .....3

11 *Radware, Ltd. v. F5 Networks, Inc.*,  
12 2016 WL 687979 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 19, 2016).....7

13 *Realtime Data, LLC, v. Actian Corp.*,  
2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 56950 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 4, 2017) .....15

14 *Semcon IP Inc. v. Huawei Device USA Inc.*,  
15 2017 WL 6343771 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 12, 2017).....15

16 *Soverain Software LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc.*,  
17 383 F. Supp. 2d 904 (E.D. Tex. 2005) .....13

18 *SRI Int’l, Inc. v. Adv. Tech. Labs., Inc.*,  
127 F.3d 1462 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....13

19 *Von Holdt v. A-1 Tool Corp.*,  
20 714 F. Supp. 2d 863 (N.D. Ill. 2010) .....12

21 **Statutes**

22 35 U.S.C. § 101 .....1, 9, 10, 12

23 35 U.S.C. § 287 .....1, 12, 13, 14

24

25

26

27

28

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

1 Finjan’s case against Claim 1 of the ’780 Patent is a lost cause. The undisputed factual  
 2 record supports summary judgment on four separate issues: (1) Juniper’s SRX devices do not  
 3 infringe; (2) Juniper’s Sky ATP service does not infringe; (3) Claim 1 is patent ineligible under  
 4 § 101; and (4) Finjan’s failure to comply with § 287 bars any pre-suit damages.

5 Finjan did not oppose Juniper’s motion for summary judgment of non-infringement on the  
 6 SRX alone. Moreover, Finjan’s infringement theory for Sky ATP does not rest on any disputed  
 7 issue of fact. Instead, Finjan simply asks this Court to adopt contorted claim constructions that are  
 8 inconsistent with the intrinsic record. Because claim construction is a matter of law, these issues  
 9 should also be resolved on summary judgment. Finjan’s infringement theory also conflicts with its  
 10 position on Juniper’s § 101 challenge. Finally, Finjan’s failure to comply with the marking  
 11 requirements of § 287 or provide notice that it believed Juniper’s Sky ATP service infringed the  
 12 ’780 Patent during pre-lawsuit discussions limits Finjan’s maximum damages period to less than  
 13 two months, even if damages were available (and they are not).

**I. FINJAN’S CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS IGNORE THE INTRINSIC RECORD**

Claim Term	Juniper’s Proposal	Finjan’s Proposal
software components <i>required</i> to be executed by the Downloadable	software components that are <i>needed</i> to execute the Downloadable	software components <i>referenced</i> by a Downloadable for execution

17 Finjan’s proposal for this term improperly seeks to recapture claim scope that Finjan ceded  
 18 during a series of amendments made to overcome prior art cited by the Examiner, and water down  
 19 the claim requirement that software components be “required” to merely being “referenced.”

20 During prosecution, Finjan expressly added the “required” limitation to avoid the Apperson  
 21 prior art. The Examiner noted that Apperson taught references to software components (i.e.,  
 22 “privileges or privilege categories”) that the Downloadable “*may* try to perform on the client  
 23 machine.” Ex. 2 at 3. To avoid this art, Finjan added a limitation that the components must not  
 24 only be referenced, but also “*required*” by the downloaded file, stating “the present invention  
 25 fetches software components *required* by the Downloadable, and performs a hashing function on  
 26 the Downloadable together with its fetched components.” Dkt. 96-6 at 4. Finjan cannot now ignore  
 27 the “required” limitation added during prosecution; the components that are required by the  
 28

# 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.