

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

9 Rebecca Carson (SBN 254105)
 rcarson@irell.com
 10 Kevin Wang (SBN 318024)
 kwang@irell.com
 11 840 Newport Center Drive, Suite 400
 Newport Beach, California 92660-6324
 12 Telephone: (949) 760-0991
 Facsimile: (949) 760-5200

13 *Attorneys for Defendant*
 14 JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.

15 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 16 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
 17 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

18	FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,)	Case No. 3:17-cv-05659-WHA
19	Plaintiff,)	JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.’S
20	vs.)	OPPOSITION TO FINJAN, INC.’S
21	JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC., a Delaware)	MOTION FOR JUDGMENT AS A
22	Corporation,)	MATTER OF LAW (DKT. NO. 353)
23	Defendant.)	Judge: Hon. William Alsup
24)	

25
 26
 27
 28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1	
2	
3 I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
4 II. FINJAN IS NOT ENTITLED TO JMOL OF INFRINGEMENT	1
5 A. Legal Standard.....	1
6 B. Substantial Evidence Supports The Jury Verdict Of Non-	
7 Infringement.....	2
8 1. Finjan Mischaracterizes The Trial Record And Misapplies	
9 The Law.....	2
10 2. There Is Substantial Evidence That Juniper Does Not Store	
11 Security Profile Data In A “Database” As Construed.....	3
12 3. The Jury Was Justified In Rejecting Cole’s Testimony As	
13 Not Credible	6
14 III. Finjan Is Not Entitled To A New Trial Under Rule 59.....	12
15 A. Legal Standard.....	12
16 B. Dr. Rubin’s Testimony On The “Database” Limitation Was	
17 Appropriate.....	12
18 C. Evidence Regarding The PTAB’s Obviousness Finding Regarding	
19 Claim 1 Was Relevant To Juniper’s § 101 Defense.....	12
20 D. Finjan’s Allegations That Juniper Withheld And Misrepresented	
21 Damages For The Accused Products Are Baseless.....	14
22 1. Juniper Timely Produced Accurate And Complete Revenue	
23 Information For The Accused Products.	15
24 2. Juniper’s Representations Concerning Damages Were	
25 Accurate.	17
26 E. Finjan Misrepresents The Court’s <i>Daubert</i> Order.	21
27 F. Finjan’s Request For An Interlocutory Appeal Is Premature.....	23
28 G. Juniper Does Not Oppose Finjan’s Request To Stay This Case As	
To The ’844, ’926, ’154, ’633 And ’731 Patents.	25
IV. CONCLUSION	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>ADC Telecomms., Inc. v. Switchcraft, Inc.</i> , 281 F. App'x 989 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	15
<i>AVM Techs., LLC v. Intel Corp.</i> , 334 F.Supp.3d 623 (D. Del. 2018)	15
<i>Bayer AG v. Sony Elecs., Inc.</i> , 229 F. Supp. 2d 332 (D. Del. 2002), <i>aff'd</i> , 83 F. App'x 334 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	8
<i>Castillo v. City & Cty. of S.F.</i> , 2006 WL 1305214 (N.D. Cal. May 11, 2006) (Alsup, J.), <i>aff'd</i> , 283 F. App'x 536 (9th Cir. 2008)	12
<i>Douglas Dynamics, LLC v. Buyers Prods. Co.</i> , 717 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	22
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Sys., Inc.</i> , No. 13-cv-03999-BLF, 2014 WL 5361976 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 20, 2014).....	25
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. ESET, LLC et al.</i> , No. 3:17-cv-00183 (S.D. Cal Oct. 9, 2017)	25
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Secure Computing Corp.</i> , 626 F.3d 1197 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	23
<i>G. David Jang, M.D. v. Bos. Sci. Corp.</i> , 872 F.3d 1275 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	2
<i>HTC Corp. v. IPCom GMBH & Co., KG</i> , 285 F.R.D. 130 (D.D.C. 2012).....	24
<i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGO Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	3
<i>Jang v. Bos. Sci. Corp.</i> , 767 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	24
<i>In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litig.</i> , 2009 WL 1351043 (C.D. Cal. May 1, 2009).....	20
<i>Key Pharm. v. Hercon Labs. Corp.</i> , 161 F.3d 709 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	6
<i>Medeva Pharma Suisse A.G. v. Par Pharm., Inc.</i> , 430 F. App'x. 878 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	24

1	<i>Monsanto Co. v. Ralph</i> ,	
	382 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	22
2		
3	<i>Motorola Inc. v. J.B. Rogers Mech. Contractors</i> ,	
	177 F. App'x 754 (9th Cir. 2006).....	13
4		
5	<i>Nazomi Comm'cns, Inc. v. Nokia Corp.</i> ,	
	739 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	23
6		
7	<i>Pena v. Meeker</i> ,	
	2014 WL 4684800 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 18, 2014).....	12
8		
9	<i>Prism Techs. LLC v. AT&T Mobility, LLC</i> ,	
	2014 WL 4843874 (D. Neb. Sept. 29, 2014)	6
10		
11	<i>Promega Corp. v. Life Techs. Corp.</i> ,	
	875 F.3d 651 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	25
12		
13	<i>Reeves v. Sanderson Plumbing Prods., Inc.</i> ,	
	530 U.S. 133 (2000)	2, 3
14		
15	<i>Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. Stiffel Co.</i> ,	
	376 U.S. 225 (1964)	20
16		
17	<i>Sentilles v. Inter-Caribbean Shipping Corp.</i> ,	
	361 U.S. 107 (1959)	12
18		
19	<i>Star Sci., Inc. v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.</i> ,	
	655 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	8
20		
21	<i>Telemac Cellular Corp. v. Topp Telecom, Inc.</i> ,	
	247 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	23
22		
23	<i>Transamerica Life Ins. Co. v. Lincoln Nat. Life Ins. Co.</i> ,	
	597 F. Supp. 2d 897 (N.D. Iowa 2009).....	6, 13
24		
25	<i>Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk Drilling USA, Inc.</i> ,	
	699 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	14, 15
26		
27	<i>TVIIM, LLC v. McAfee, Inc.</i> ,	
	851 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	3
28		
	<i>United States v. 4.0 Acres of Land</i> ,	
	175 F.3d 1133 (9th Cir. 1999).....	12
	<i>Wi-Lan, Inc. v. Apple, Inc.</i> ,	
	811 F.3d 455 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	2

1	Statutes	
2	35 U.S.C. § 101	<i>passim</i>
3	35 U.S.C. § 102	14
4	35 U.S.C. § 103	14
5	Rules	
6	Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6).....	19
7	Fed. R. Civ. P. 50(a).....	2, 22, 23, 24
8	Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b).....	1, 24
9	Fed. R. Civ. P. 59	12
10	Local Rule 3-4.....	16
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
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.