

1 PAUL ANDRE (State Bar No. 196585)  
2 [pandre@kramerlevin.com](mailto:pandre@kramerlevin.com)  
3 LISA KOBIALKA (State Bar No. 191404)  
4 [lkobialka@kramerlevin.com](mailto:lkobialka@kramerlevin.com)  
5 JAMES HANNAH (State Bar No. 237978)  
6 [jhannah@kramerlevin.com](mailto:jhannah@kramerlevin.com)  
7 KRISTOPHER KASTENS (State Bar No. 254797)  
8 [kkastens@kramerlevin.com](mailto:kkastens@kramerlevin.com)  
9 KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP  
10 990 Marsh Road  
11 Menlo Park, CA 94025  
12 Telephone: (650) 752-1700  
13 Facsimile: (650) 752-1800

14 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
15 FINJAN, INC.

16  
17 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
18 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
19 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**  
20

21 FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,

22 Plaintiff,

23 v.

24 JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC., a Delaware Corporation,

25 Defendant.

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

**PLAINTIFF FINJAN, INC.’S NOTICE OF MOTION AND RENEWED MOTION FOR JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. 50(B); MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL UNDER FED. R. CIV. P. 59; AND MOTION FOR CERTIFICATION FOR IMMEDIATE APPEAL IN THE ALTERNATIVE**

Date: TBD  
Time: TBD  
Courtroom: 12, 19th Floor  
Before: Hon. William Alsup

26  
27 **REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENTS FILED UNDER SEAL**  
28

**TABLE OF CONTENTS****Page**

|    |  |    |
|----|--|----|
| 1  |  |    |
| 2  |  |    |
| 3  | TABLE OF CONTENTS.....   | i  |
| 4  | NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION .....  | 1  |
| 5  | I. Introduction.....   | 3  |
| 6  | II. Finjan is entitled to JMOL that JUNIPER INFRINGES CLAIM 10 .....           | 4  |
| 7  | A. Finjan Presented Overwhelming Evidence that the Accused Products Store      |    |
| 8  | Downloadable Security Profile Data in a Database.....                          | 5  |
| 9  | B. Juniper Failed to Rebut Finjan’s Proof of Infringement.....                 | 7  |
| 10 | 1. Dr. Rubin Did not Rebut Dr. Cole’s Evidence that the ResultsDB Exists. .... | 7  |
| 11 | 2. Dr. Rubin Did not Rebut Finjan’s Evidence that the ResultsDB has a          |    |
| 12 | “Database Schema.”.....  | 9  |
| 13 | III. ALTERNATIVELY, FINJAN REQUESTS A NEW TRIAL UNDER Rule 59 .....            | 13 |
| 14 | A. The Court Allowing Should Grant a New Trial to Prevent a Miscarriage of     |    |
| 15 | Justice Regarding the Construction “Database Schema.”.....                     | 14 |
| 16 | B. Juniper Improperly Presented Evidence of Claim 1 to the Jury. ....          | 15 |
| 17 | C. Juniper Withheld and Misrepresented Damages for the Accused Products .....  | 16 |
| 18 | D. The Court Erred by Ruling that A Reasonable Royalty Cannot Exceed Revenues  |    |
| 19 | and Also That Finjan’s Reasonable Royalty Request Exceeded Juniper’s           |    |
| 20 | Revenues.....  | 19 |
| 21 | IV. REQUEST FOR A FINAL ORDER AND FOR CERTIFICATION FOR IMMEDIATE              |    |
| 22 | INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL, AND TO STAY THE CASE .....                               | 21 |
| 23 | A. A Controlling Question of Law is at Issue.....                              | 22 |
| 24 | B. Substantial Grounds for a Difference of Opinion Exists. ....                | 22 |
| 25 | C. An Order for Immediate Interlocutory Appeal Could Materially Speed Up the   |    |
| 26 | Termination of the Litigation.....   | 23 |
| 27 | D. The Judgment of No Infringement of the ‘780 Patent Is Properly Subject to   |    |
| 28 | Simultaneous Appeal .....  | 24 |
|    | V. THE CASE SHOULD BE STAYED IN ITS ENTIRETY PENDING NEW TRIAL OR              |    |
|    | APPEAL .....   | 24 |
|    | VI. CONCLUSION.....  | 25 |

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**Cases**

1

2

3

4 *800 Adept, Inc. v. Murex Securities, Ltd.*,

5 539 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 14

6 *Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC v. DIRECTV, LLC*,

7 838 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 15

8 *Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l*,

9 134 S.Ct. 2347 (2014)..... 15

10 *Apple Inc. v. Motorola, Inc.*,

11 757 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2014), overruled on other grounds by *Williamson v. Citrix*

12 *Online, LLC*, 792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015) ..... 22

13 *Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*,

14 No. 12-cv-00630-LHK, 2014 WL 660857 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 20, 2014) ..... 23

15 *Banneck v. Fed. Nat’l Mortg. Ass’n*,

16 No. 17-CV-04657-WHO, 2018 WL 5603632 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 29, 2018)..... 23

17 *Bascom Glob. Internet Servs., Inc. v. AT&T Mobility LLC*,

18 827 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 15

19 *Berkheimer v. HP Inc.*,

20 881 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2018)..... 15

21 *Carnegie Mellon Univ. v. Marvell Tech. Grp., Ltd.*,

22 807 F.3d 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 20

23 *In re Cement Antitrust Litig. (MDL No. 296)*,

24 673 F.2d 1020 (9th Cir. 1981) ..... 22

25 *Cent. Admixture Pharmacy Servs., Inc. v. Advanced Cardiac Sols., P.C.*,

26 482 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2007)..... 13

27 *Cordis Corp. v. Boston Sci. Corp.*,

28 561 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 12, 13

29 *Couch v. Telescope Inc.*,

30 611 F.3d 629 (9th Cir. 2010) ..... 22

31 *CytoLogix Corp. v. Ventana Med. Sys., Inc.*,

32 424 F.3d 1168 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 13, 23

|    |  |        |
|----|--|--------|
| 1  | <i>Douglas Dynamics, LLC v. Buyers Prods. Co.</i> ,<br>717 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....   | 20     |
| 2  |  |        |
| 3  | <i>Dow Chem. Co. v. Mee Indus., Inc.</i> ,<br>341 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....  | 22     |
| 4  |  |        |
| 5  | <i>Dukes v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> ,<br>No. 01-cv-02252 CRB, 2012 WL 6115536 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2012).....                           | 23     |
| 6  |  |        |
| 7  | <i>E.E.O.C. v. Go Daddy Software, Inc.</i> ,<br>581 F.3d (9th Cir. 2009) .....   | 4      |
| 8  |  |        |
| 9  | <i>Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Sys., Inc.</i> ,<br>773 F.3d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....  | 21     |
| 10 |  |        |
| 11 | <i>Experience Hendrix L.L.C. v. Hendrixlicensing.com Ltd</i> ,<br>762 F.3d 829 (9th Cir. 2014) .....                                     | 14     |
| 12 |  |        |
| 13 | <i>Fed. Deposit Ins. Corp. v. Jackson-Shaw Partners No. 46, Ltd.</i> ,<br>No. 92-20556 SW, 1995 WL 594866 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 4, 1995) ..... | 22     |
| 14 |  |        |
| 15 | <i>Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Systems, Inc.</i> ,<br>No. 13-cv-03999-BLF, 2014 WL 5361976 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 20, 2014).....                  | 24     |
| 16 |  |        |
| 17 | <i>Finjan, Inc. v. ESET, LLC</i> ,<br>No. 17-cv-00183-CAB-(BGS), 2017 WL 5501338 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 14, 2017) .....                         | 24     |
| 18 |  |        |
| 19 | <i>Finjan, Inc. v. Secure Computing Corp.</i> ,<br>626 F.3d 1197 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....   | 20     |
| 20 |  |        |
| 21 | <i>Landis v. North Am. Co.</i> ,<br>299 U.S. 248 (1936).....   | 24     |
| 22 |  |        |
| 23 | <i>McGonigle v. Combs</i> ,<br>968 F.2d 810 (9th Cir. 1992) .....  | 4      |
| 24 |  |        |
| 25 | <i>Moba, B.V. v. Diamond Automation, Inc.</i> ,<br>325 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....   | 12     |
| 26 |  |        |
| 27 | <i>Monsanto Co. v. Ralph</i> ,<br>382 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....  | 20     |
| 28 |  |        |
| 29 | <i>Reese v. BP Expl. (Alaska) Inc.</i> ,<br>643 F.3d 681 (9th Cir. 2011) .....   | 20, 23 |
| 30 |  |        |
|    | <i>Shurance v. Planning Control Int'l, Inc.</i> ,<br>839 F.2d 1347 (9th Cir. 1988) .....   | 22     |
|    |  |        |
|    | <i>TiVo, Inc. v. EchoStar Commc'ns Corp.</i> ,<br>516 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....  | 8      |

1 *Union Carbide Chems. & Plastics Tech. Corp. v. Shell Oil Co.*,  
 308 F.3d 1167 (Fed. Cir. 2002)..... 14

2 *Versata Software, Inc. v. SAP Am., Inc.*,  
 3 717 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 21

4 *In re Wilson*,  
 5 No. BR 13-11374 AJ, 2014 WL 122074 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 10, 2014)..... 22

6 *WundaFormer, LLC v. Flex Studios, Inc.*,  
 680 F. App'x 925 (Fed. Cir. 2017) ..... 9

7 *Zyme Solutions, Inc. v. InfoNow Corp.*,  
 8 No. C 13-04082 WHA, 2013 WL 6699997 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 19, 2013)..... 24

9 **Statutes**

10 28 U.S.C. § 1292..... *passim*

11 35 U.S.C. § 101..... 15

12 35 U.S.C. § 102..... 15

13 **Other Authorities**

14 Fed. R. Civ. P. 50..... 1, 4, 14, 20

15 Fed. R. Civ. P. 59..... 1, 13, 14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

# 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.