

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.

ORDER ON DISCOVERY DISPUTE

JUNIPER NETWORK, INC.,

Defendant.


On October 4, defendant Juniper Network, Inc., filed a discovery dispute letter requesting to amend the stipulated protective order (Dkt. No. 149) such that it may use an interrogatory response in the related IPR proceeding (Dkt. No. 199). On October 9, plaintiff Finjan, Inc., filed a response to show cause as to why the amendment should not be granted (Dkt. No. 205). Finjan argues, *inter alia*, that there is a heightened risk of public disclosure in IPR proceedings and that the interrogatory response at issue is irrelevant to the related IPR proceeding, as Finjan does not (and will not) contest the fact that its licensees do not admit to infringement.

This order finds that Finjan has not sufficiently shown cause as to why permission should not be granted. The undersigned judge finds that the potential harm due to public disclosure of the information at issue is minimal. Accordingly, Juniper's request to amend the stipulated protective order is **GRANTED** with respect to the interrogatory response at issue only.

1 Finjan's request to order Juniper to first obtain express assurance from the PTAB that the
2 interrogatory response will be filed under seal and will not be publicly disclosed is **DENIED**.

3
4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5
6 Dated: October 9, 2018.

7 
8 _____
9 WILLIAM ALSUP
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28