

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FINJAN, INC.,

No. C 17-05659 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

**QUESTIONS RE ORAL  
ARGUMENT**

JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.,

Defendant.

**United States Patent No. 6,804,780**

1. As of the time of the patent application, if you hashed two components separately, would then the combination of those hash values be necessarily the same as if you hashed the combined components together?

2. Do the accused products ever run a hash function against the final executable form (as would be run by the client computer)?


**United States Patent No. 8,677,494**

2. Do the accused products derive a list of all operations in the Downloadable code that could ever be deemed potentially hostile? What specifically in the summary judgment record proves this one way or another?

3. Regarding “list of suspicious computer operations,” the sentence relied upon by the PTAB for its claim construction comes from United States Patent No. 6,092,194 at 5:50–53, which appears in the preferred embodiment. Is there any other reference to the “list” in any

1 Please do not offer any thick hand-outs during oral arguments. All hand-outs shall be  
2 limited to twelve pages per side. Please have a set for the judge and another for the law clerk.

3  
4  
5 Dated: July 25, 2018.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28