## **EXHIBIT 2**

1 2 3 4 5	IRELL & MANELLA LLP Jonathan S. Kagan (SBN 166039) jkagan@irell.com Joshua Glucoft (SBN 301249) jglucoft@irell.com Casey Curran (SBN 305210) ccurran@irell.com 1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900 Los Angeles, California 90067-4276	
6	Telephone: (310) 277-1010 Facsimile: (310) 203-7199	
7 8 9 10 11	Rebecca Carson (SBN 254105) rcarson@irell.com Kevin Wang (SBN 318024) kwang@irell.com 840 Newport Center Drive, Suite 400 Newport Beach, California 92660-6324 Telephone: (949) 760-0991 Facsimile: (949) 760-5200  Attorneys for Defendant JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.	
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
14	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
15	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
16	FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,	Case No. 3:17-cv-05659-WHA
17	Plaintiff,	DEFENDANT JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF FINJAN, INC.'S THIRD SET OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION (NOS.
18	VS.	
19 20	JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC., a Delaware Corporation,	87-97)
20	Defendant.	
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		



action, the amount in controversy, the parties' relative access to relevant information, the parties' resources, the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues, and whether the burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit. In particular, the parties have agreed in their stipulation regarding the discovery of ESI that the following sources of information are not reasonably accessible: backup media including disaster recovery systems, digital voicemail, instant messaging, systems no longer in use, and automatically saved versions of documents. Additionally, Juniper will not search through non-network drives, regardless of whether those drives are owned by Juniper or personally by its employees and regardless of whether those drives are internal or external, as such searches are not reasonably accessible and any information contained therein is likely to be cumulative to and/or duplicative of information maintained on active network servers. Additionally, Juniper will not search through hard copy files as such searches are not reasonably accessible and any information contained therein is likely to be cumulative to and/or duplicative of information maintained on active network servers.

Juniper also specifically objects to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome, oppressive, vague and ambiguous, and seeks irrelevant information and information that is not proportional to the needs of the case, including with respect to Finjan's overly broad definition of "related to." Juniper will not search for documents that do not directly pertain to the claims and defenses at issue in this matter that are dated from within the statutory damages period.

Subject to these specific objections and the General Objections incorporated herein,

Juniper responds that it will produce licenses with Kaspersky.

## **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO.95:**

All Documents identifying the number and location of servers, including but not limited to cloud servers (e.g., Amazon Web Services), utilized by the Accused Instrumentalities.

## **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 95:**

Juniper incorporates herein by reference all General Objections set forth above.

Juniper also specifically objects to the definition of "Accused Instrumentalities" as including previous or currently-contemplated versions, revision, releases, or continuations of any Juniper products or services other than those specifically identified (including by model number)



in Finjan's Infringement Contentions and also in the operative complaint. Juniper will interpret this Request as limited to only those instrumentalities specifically identified in both the operative complaint and Finjan's Infringement Contentions and also made, used, sold, offered for sale, or imported into the U.S. within the statutory damages period.

Juniper also specifically objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks information or documents that are subject to the attorney-client privilege, that evidence or constitute attorney work product, or that otherwise are not discoverable or are the subject of any other applicable privilege or immunity, whether based upon statute or recognized at common law.

Juniper also specifically objects to this Request as seeking discovery that is not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the importance of the issues at stake in the action, the amount in controversy, the parties' relative access to relevant information, the parties' resources, the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues, and whether the burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit. In particular, the parties have agreed in their stipulation regarding the discovery of ESI that the following sources of information are not reasonably accessible: backup media including disaster recovery systems, digital voicemail, instant messaging, systems no longer in use, and automatically saved versions of documents. Additionally, Juniper will not search through non-network drives, regardless of whether those drives are owned by Juniper or personally by its employees and regardless of whether those drives are internal or external, as such searches are not reasonably accessible and any information contained therein is likely to be cumulative to and/or duplicative of information maintained on active network servers. Additionally, Juniper will not search through hard copy files as such searches are not reasonably accessible and any information contained therein is likely to be cumulative to and/or duplicative of information maintained on active network servers.

Juniper also specifically objects to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome, oppressive, vague and ambiguous, and seeks irrelevant information and information that is not proportional to the needs of the case, including with respect to Finjan's overly broad definition of "related to." Juniper will not search for documents that do not directly pertain to the claims and defenses at issue in this matter that are dated from within the statutory damages period.



Juniper also specifically objects to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome, oppressive, and seeks irrelevant information and information that is not proportional to the needs of the case because Finjan has not accused all servers that may be utilized of infringement nor indicated in its improperly vague and ambiguous damages contentions how such information may be relevant to damages. Juniper will limit the scope of its search to documentation related to servers that host or directly interface with specifically accused features of the deployed or sold products at issue in this litigation (if any, and subject to, among other things, the qualification above regarding the scope of the term "Accused Instrumentalities").

Subject to these specific objections and the General Objections incorporated herein,

Juniper responds that it will produce invoices from Amazon reflecting data usage of Amazon Web Services by Sky ATP.

### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 96:**

All Documents identifying the amount of incoming and outgoing network traffic on servers, including but not limited to cloud servers (e.g., Amazon Web Services), utilized by the Accused Instrumentalities.

#### **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 96:**

Juniper incorporates herein by reference all General Objections set forth above.

Juniper also specifically objects to the definition of "Accused Instrumentalities" as including previous or currently-contemplated versions, revision, releases, or continuations of any Juniper products or services other than those specifically identified (including by model number) in Finjan's Infringement Contentions and also in the operative complaint. Juniper will interpret this Request as limited to only those instrumentalities specifically identified in both the operative complaint and Finjan's Infringement Contentions and also made, used, sold, offered for sale, or imported into the U.S. within the statutory damages period.

Juniper also specifically objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks information or documents that are subject to the attorney-client privilege, that evidence or constitute attorney work product, or that otherwise are not discoverable or are the subject of any other applicable privilege or immunity, whether based upon statute or recognized at common law.



# DOCKET

## 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.

