1	PAUL ANDRE (State Bar No. 196585)	
2	pandre@kramerlevin.com	
3	LISA KOBIALKA (State Bar No. 191404) <a href="mailto:lkobialka@kramerlevin.com">lkobialka@kramerlevin.com</a>	
4	IAMES HANNAH (State Bar No. 237978)	
5	KRISTOPHER KASTENS (State Bar No. 254797)	
6	<u>kkastens@kramerlevin.com</u>   KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP	
7	990 Marsh Road Menlo Park, CA 94025	
8	Telephone: (650) 752-1700	
9	Facsimile: (650) 752-1800	
	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
10	FINJAN, INC.	
11	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
12	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
13	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
14		
15	FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,	Case No.: 3:17-cv-05659-WHA
16	Plaintiff,	PLAINTIFF FINJAN, INC.'S NOTICE TO
17	,	THE COURT
18	V.	
19	JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC., a Delaware Corporation,	
20		
21	Defendant.	
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		



1

2

4

56

7

8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

10

17

18

Dated: January 10, 2019

19

2021

22

23

24

25

2627

## **NOTICE TO THE COURT**

Pursuant to the Court's January 2, 2019, Post-Trial Order (Dkt. No. 348), Finjan hereby advises the Court that Juniper's equitable defenses and Section 101 defenses are not moot with respect to Claim 10 of U.S. Patent No. 8,677,494 ("'494 Patent"), as this claim is still at issue for Juniper ATP Appliance product, which the Court specifically excluded from the first showdown procedure. See Dkt. No. 85 at 4-5 ("This order ... further agrees that ATP Appliance cannot in fairness be included in early summary judgment procedure already well underway — although Finjan may of course include ATP Appliance in subsequent rounds of the early summary judgment procedure going forward.")

In regards to the status of the second showdown procedure, the second showdown should be stayed if the Court grants Finjan a Judgment as a Matter of Law ("JMOL") on Juniper's infringement of Claim 10 of the '494 Patent, as the issue of damages should first be properly held at trial. Similarly, the second showdown should be stayed if the Court grants Finjan's request for a new trial on the '494 Patent, so the issues from this case can first be resolved at trial before starting the second showdown. Finally, the entire case should be stayed pending appeal if the Court does not grant JMOL or a new trial for Finjan, but certifies issues from the first showdown procedure as final and ripe for interlocutory appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

By: <u>/s/ Lisa Kobialka</u>

Paul J. Andre (SBN 196585) Lisa Kobialka (SBN 191404)

James Hannah (SBN 237978) Kristopher Kastens (SBN 254797)

KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS

& FRANKEL LLP

990 Marsh Road

Menlo Park, CA 94025

Telephone: (650) 752-1700 Facsimile: (650) 752-1800

pandre@kramerlevin.com

<u>lkobialka@kramerlevin.com</u> <u>jhannah@kramerlevin.com</u>

kkastens@kramerlevin.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff FINIAN INC

