

IRELL & MANELLA LLP
Jonathan S. Kagan (SBN 166039)
kagan@irell.com
Alan Heinrich (SBN 212782)
aheinrich@irell.com
Joshua Glucoft (SBN 301249)
glucoft@irell.com
Casey Curran (SBN 305210)
ccuran@irell.com
Sharon Song (SBN 313535)
ssong@irell.com
1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900
Los Angeles, California 90067-4276
Telephone: (310) 277-1010
Facsimile: (310) 203-7199

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.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,)	Case No. 3:17-cv-05659-WHA
)	
Plaintiff,)	DEFENDANT JUNIPER NETWORKS,
)	INC.’S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
vs.)	JUNIPER NETWORK’S MOTION TO
)	EXCLUDE THE TESTIMONY OF
JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC., a Delaware)	MR. KEVIN M. ARST
Corporation,)	
)	Date: November 29, 2018
Defendant.)	Time: 8:00 a.m.
)	Courtroom: Courtroom 12, 19th Floor
)	Before: Hon. William Alsup

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. FINJAN CANNOT DEFEND MR. ARST'S OPINION UNDER THE CORRECT DAMAGES BASE	2
II. FINJAN'S PUFFERY ABOUT THE VALUE OF CLAIM 10 IS UNSUPPORTED	4
III. MR. ARST'S DEPARTURE FROM FINJAN'S OWN LICENSING POLICY IS UNSUPPORTED	4
IV. MR. ARST FAILS TO APPLY A RELIABLE METHODOLOGY	5
V. MR. ARST'S COST SAVINGS ANALYSIS IS UNRELIABLE	7
VI. MR. ARST SHOULD NOT BE GIVEN LEAVE TO DO A NEW ANALYSIS	8

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

<i>Enplas Display Device Corp., v. Seoul Semiconductor Co., Ltd.</i> , 2018 WL 6033533 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 19, 2018)	4
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Secure Computing Corp.</i> , 626 F.3d 1197 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	3
<i>Metaswitch Networks Ltd. v. Genband US LLC</i> , 2016 WL 874737 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 5, 2016)	5
<i>Microsoft Corporation v. Corel Corp.</i> , 2017 WL 6492468 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 19, 2017)	6, 7
<i>Monolithic Power Sys., Inc. v. O2 Micro Int'l Ltd.</i> , 476 F. Supp. 2d 1143 (N.D. Cal. 2007), <i>clarified on denial of reconsideration</i> , 2007 WL 1108615 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 11, 2007)	7
<i>Nazomi Comm., Inc. v. Nokia Corp.</i> , 739 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	3
<i>Network Prot. Scis., LLC v. Fortinet, Inc.</i> , 2013 WL 5402089 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 26, 2013)	8
<i>Tights, Inc. v. Kayser-Roth Corp.</i> , 442 F. Supp. 159 (M.D.N.C. 1977)	5

1 Mr. Arst’s proposed \$60-\$70 million “reasonable royalty” on accused revenues of less than
2 \$1.8 million is economically nonsensical. Rather than attempt to defend Mr. Arst’s absurd math,
3 Finjan’s Opposition seeks to inflate the amount of accused revenues to [REDACTED] by expanding
4 the scope of its infringement claim to encompass SRX devices alone. But while Finjan accused
5 “Sky ATP alone,” it only accused SRX devices “used in combination with Sky ATP.” Dkt. 98
6 (Finjan’s MSJ) at 1-2. For good reason. Despite Finjan’s misleading argument in its Opposition,
7 Finjan’s own technical expert admitted that SRX devices alone [REDACTED]
8 [REDACTED] even under Finjan’s infringement theory—something Juniper could have
9 easily demonstrated during summary judgment had Finjan accused the SRX alone of infringement.

10 Finjan does not dispute that the revenues from the “Accused Products” as Finjan itself
11 defined them—“Sky ATP alone” and SRX devices “used in combination with Sky ATP,” *id*—
12 were less than \$1.8 million. Nor does Finjan challenge the fact that only [REDACTED] SRX devices could
13 have been used with Sky ATP during the damages period. Given these facts, Mr. Arst’s opinion
14 clearly flunks the requirements of *Daubert* for at least the following reasons:

- 15 • It would have been economically irrational for Juniper to pay a royalty of \$60-\$70 million
16 dollars on accused revenues of \$1.8 million.
- 17 • Mr. Arst’s proposed royalty, which amounts to an effective royalty of almost 4,000%, is
18 orders of magnitude more than the rates at which Finjan itself *begins* negotiations (8% for
19 hardware, 16% for software) under its own licensing policy.
- 20 • Mr. Arst did not apply a proper “cost savings” analysis, which requires consideration of
21 the defendant’s next best alternative. Even Finjan’s own technical expert did not consider
22 the alternative Mr. Arst used (“sandboxing” every file) to be commercially viable.
- 23 • Mr. Arst does not account at all for Juniper’s alternative of waiting 14 months until the
24 ’494 Patent expired before releasing Sky ATP. No economically rational actor would have
25 done otherwise if the alternative would have been to incur an additional \$60-\$70 million in
26 costs (or pay the identical amount to Finjan) to generate \$1.8 million in revenue.
- 27 • Mr. Arst’s calculation of Juniper’s alleged “cost savings” by multiplying Juniper’s
28 Amazon Web Services (“AWS”) costs by 359-419 is arbitrary and unreliable.

1 Finjan cannot rescue Mr. Arst's damages theory by changing the scope of its infringement
2 claim. Mr. Arst's damages opinion is unsupported by the facts, and should be excluded.

3 **I. FINJAN CANNOT DEFEND MR. ARST'S OPINION UNDER THE CORRECT**
4 **DAMAGES BASE**

5 In its Opposition, Finjan fails to acknowledge that it expressly defined "Accused Products"
6 as "(1) Juniper's SRX Gateways used in combination with Sky ATP, and (2) Sky ATP alone
7 ('Accused Products')." Dkt. 98 (Finjan's MSJ) at 1-2. These Accused Products generated less than
8 \$1.8 million in revenues during the damages period. Finjan does not even attempt to defend
9 Mr. Arst's \$60-\$70 million damages opinion in light of the actual damages base at issue.

10 Instead, throughout its Opposition, Finjan attempts to sneak into its infringement claim a
11 new, third category of products—SRX devices alone.¹ See, e.g., Opp. at 3 ("accused SRX
12 products"), *id.* at 11 ("accused SRX gateways"). Based on this new infringement theory, Finjan
13 claims that the damages base is actually around [REDACTED] Opp. at 1. This is Finjan's only
14 response to Juniper's argument that Mr. Arst's opinion should be excluded because it defies basic
15 economics. Opp. § III.A. Finjan's new infringement theory fails for at least two reasons.

16 First, Finjan's new theory is untimely. While Finjan accused "Sky ATP alone" of
17 infringing Claim 10, Finjan never accused SRX devices alone. Dkt. 98 (Finjan MSJ) at 1-2. Finjan
18 cannot change course now, after expert discovery and on the eve of trial.

19 Second, Finjan has no colorable infringement claim against SRX devices alone. The only
20 argument Finjan advances is its contention that [REDACTED]

21 [REDACTED] Opp. at 12-14, n.14. This is misleading, if not completely false. [REDACTED]
22 [REDACTED]
23 [REDACTED]

24 [REDACTED] as Finjan's own technical expert admitted. [REDACTED]
25 [REDACTED]
26 [REDACTED]

27 ¹ Contrary to Finjan's suggestion, the Court explicitly limited its summary judgment
28 holding to "SRX Gateways *used in combination with Sky ATP*" and held that the issue of "the
extent of damages" would be decided at trial. See Dkt. 189 at 3, 21 (emphasis added).

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.