

1 PAUL J. ANDRE (State Bar No. 196585)
pandre@kramerlevin.com
2 LISA KOBIALKA (State Bar No. 191404)
lkobialka@kramerlevin.com
3 JAMES HANNAH (State Bar No. 237978)
jhannah@kramerlevin.com
4 KRISTOPHER KASTENS (State Bar No. 254797)
kkastens@kramerlevin.com
5 KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP
990 Marsh Road
6 Menlo Park, CA 94025
Telephone: (650) 752-1700
7 Facsimile: (650) 752-1800

8 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
FINJAN, INC.

9
10 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
11 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
12 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

13 FINJAN, INC.,
14 Plaintiff,
15 v.
16 JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.,
17 Defendant.

Case No.: 3:17-cv-05659-WHA

**FINJAN'S [PROPOSED] SPECIAL
VERDICT FORM**

Trial Date: December 10, 2018
Time: 7:30 a.m.
Place: Courtroom 12 – 19th Floor
Judge: Hon. William Alsup

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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

VERDICT FORM

When answering the following questions and filling out this Verdict Form, please follow the directions provided throughout this Verdict Form. Your answer to each question must be unanimous. Some of the questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained in detail in the Jury Instructions. Please refer to the Jury Instructions if you are unsure about the meaning or usage of any legal term that appears in the questions below.

We, the jury, unanimously agree to the answers to the following questions and return them under the instructions of this court as our verdict in this case.

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

QUESTION 1: Has Finjan proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Juniper’s SRX Gateways in combination with Sky ATP and/or Sky ATP alone literally infringe Claim 10 of the ’494 Patent?

Yes _____ **No** _____

If you answered “Yes” to Question 1, please skip to Question 3. If you did not answer “Yes” to Question 1, please answer Question 2.

QUESTION 2: Has Finjan proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Juniper’s SRX Gateways in combination with Sky ATP and/or Sky ATP alone infringe, under the doctrine of equivalents, Claim 10 of the ’494 Patent?

Yes _____ **No** _____

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

QUESTION 3: Has Juniper proven by clear and convincing evidence that Claim 10 of the '494 patent is invalid under 35 U.S.C. Section 101?

Yes _____

No _____

Answer Question 4 only if you have found Claim 10 to be infringed in Questions 1 or 2 above and not invalid in Question 3 above.

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

QUESTION 4: What sum of money do you find from a preponderance of the evidence would fairly and reasonably compensate Finjan for Juniper’s infringement of Claim 10?

\$ _____

You have now reached the end of the verdict form and should review it to ensure it accurately reflects your unanimous determinations. The Presiding Juror should then sign and date the verdict form in the spaces below and notify the Security Guard that you have reached a verdict. The Presiding Juror should retain possession of the verdict form and bring it when the jury is brought back into the courtroom.

DATED: _____, 2018

By: _____
Presiding Juror