EXHIBIT 12

```
1
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 2
 3
     FINJAN, INC., a Delaware
     Corporation,
 4
              Plaintiff and Counter- )
                                        Case No. 17CV0183-CAB
 5
              Defendant,
 6
              vs.
 7
     ESET, LLC, a California Limited )
     Liability Corporation, and ESET )
 8
     SPOL. S.R.O., a Slovak Republic )
     Corporation,
 9
              Defendants and Counter-)
10
              Plaintiffs.
11
12
13
14
          Reporter's Transcript of Claims Construction Hearing
                           Volume 2, pages 1-198
15
                Before The Honorable Cathy Ann Bencivengo
                  Tuesday, September 26, 2017, 9:00 a.m.
                           San Diego, California
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
     Proceedings recorded by stenography, transcript produced by
     computer assisted software
23
24
                   Mauralee Ramirez, RPR, CSR No. 11674
                      Federal Official Court Reporter
25
                        ordertranscript@gmail.com
```



```
1
     Appearances:
 2
     For The Plaintiff:
 3
          Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel, LLP
          Paul Andre
          James Hannah
 4
          990 Marsh Road
 5
          Menlo Park, California 94025
 6
 7
     For The Defendants:
          Foley & Lardner LLP
 8
          Nicola A. Pisano
          Scott A. Penner
 9
          Wendy Cheung
          3579 Valley Center Drive, Suite 350
10
          San Diego, California 92130
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```



issues.

THE COURT: Well, I understand that I may not just be following their lead, but that's my fair reading of the patent, of the prosecution history, where the patent holder came in and said no, what's different about this patent is that it is not the work being done at the network gateway where it all had to be done before, it's being done prior to that by this investigator. That is, again, streamlining and creating an efficiency here.

And the words "investigator" were specifically included into that claim specifically with the language that this happens before it's made available, and it is consistent with the rest of the claims where subsequent investigation or review of the Downloadable is done where each of those -- it says that the Downloadable was linked to a Security Profile before the web server made it available to the web client.

And that's in the Network Gateway System claim 32. It's in 41, it's in 42.

And so that's one of the fun things about being a district judge, I can listen to what other district judges have to say, but I don't have to follow it. Until the Federal Circuit says it means something else, I'm on my own.

MR. ANDRE: That's correct. And I'm not saying there is anything binding from those other district court judges. I guess what I'm asking is -- I will respect your Honor's

