

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED

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 ccurran@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  
 16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
 17 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
 18 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

19	FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,	)	Case No. 3:17-cv-05659-WHA
20	Plaintiff,	)	<b>DEFENDANT JUNIPER NETWORKS,</b>
21	vs.	)	<b>INC.'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY</b>
22	JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC., a Delaware	)	<b>JUDGMENT REGARDING CLAIM 9 OF</b>
23	Corporation,	)	<b>U.S. PATENT NO. 6,804,780</b>
24	Defendant.	)	

25  
 26  
 27  
 28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED

**NOTICE OF MOTION**

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on May 2, 2019, at 8:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in Courtroom 12, 19th Floor, of the San Francisco Courthouse, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California 94102, before the Honorable William Alsup, Defendant Juniper Networks, Inc. (“Juniper”) will and hereby does move for an order finding that claim 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,804,780 (“Claim 9” of “the ’780 Patent”) is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 101, that Juniper’s accused products do not infringe Claim 9, and that any damages available to plaintiff Finjan, Inc. (“Finjan”) are limited under 35 U.S.C. § 287. This motion is based on: this Notice of Motion; the Memorandum of Points and Authorities below; the Declaration of Rebecca Carson and exhibits attached thereto; the Declaration of Dr. Aviel D. Rubin attached hereto; the Declaration of Frank Jas attached hereto; all documents in the Court’s file, including the Declaration of Yuly Nerida Becerra Tenorio; and such other written or oral argument as may be presented at or before the time this motion is heard by the Court.

**STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED**

Juniper seeks an order holding that Juniper does not infringe Claim 9 based on any alleged making, using, selling, offering to sell, or importing SRX Series Services Gateway (“SRX”) products, the Sky Advanced Threat Prevention (“Sky ATP”) service, or ATP Appliance products (formerly sold under the Cyphort brand), individually or in combination with each other; that Claim 9 of the ’780 Patent is invalid as directed to unpatentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101; that damages for any potential infringement of Claim 9 by Juniper’s SRX and Sky ATP products are limited under 35 U.S.C. § 287 to those accrued based on acts of infringement occurring after September 29, 2017 (the filing of the complaint in this matter); and that no damages for any potential infringement of Claim 9 by the ATP Appliance are owed on account of Finjan’s failure to comply with 35 U.S.C. § 287 until after November 6, 2017 (the expiration date of the ’780 Patent).

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED

**STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED**<sup>1</sup>

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

1. Whether Juniper’s SRX products do not infringe Claim 9.
2. Whether Juniper’s Sky ATP service does not infringe Claim 9.
3. Whether Juniper’s ATP Appliance products do not infringe Claim 9.
4. Whether the combination of Juniper’s SRX products with the Sky ATP service or ATP Appliance products do not infringe Claim 9.
5. Whether Claim 9 is invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 101.
6. Whether damages for any potential infringement of Claim 9 by Juniper’s SRX product and Sky ATP service are limited under 35 U.S.C. § 287 to those accrued after September 29, 2017 (the filing of the complaint in this matter).
7. Whether the damages for any potential infringement of Claim 9 by Juniper’s ATP Appliance product are foreclosed on account of Finjan’s failure to comply with 35 U.S.C. § 287 until after November 6, 2017 (the expiration date of the ’780 Patent).

---

<sup>1</sup> Claim 9 of the ’780 Patent is also invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 in view of additional prior art not discussed herein but which Juniper timely identified in its invalidity contentions under P.L.R. 3-3. Moreover, the fundamental differences between Juniper’s accused products and the ’780 Patent may provide several additional non-infringement arguments beyond those specifically addressed in this motion. If there is a trial on Claim 9, Juniper may make other invalidity or non-infringement arguments not specifically addressed in this motion. Juniper may also raise one or more affirmative defenses not addressed specifically in this motion.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
1	
2	
3	I. INTRODUCTION..... 1
4	II. BACKGROUND..... 2
5	III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ..... 5
6	A. Previously Construed Term..... 5
7	B. Additional Term For Construction..... 5
8	IV. JUNIPER DOES NOT INFRINGE CLAIM 9 OF THE '780 PATENT ..... 8
9	A. Legal Standard..... 8
10	B. The SRX Does Not Infringe Claim 9. .... 8
11	C. Sky ATP Does Not Infringe Claim 9. .... 9
12	1. Sky ATP Does Not Meet The “Hashing” Limitation..... 10
13	2. Sky ATP Does Not Have an “ID Generator” That “Fetches” Software Components. .... 11
14	D. ATP Appliance Does Not Infringe Claim 9. .... 12
15	1. ATP Appliance Does Not Have An “ID Generator” That “Fetches.” ..... 13
16	2. ATP Appliance Does Not Meet The “Hashing” Limitation..... 14
17	E. Combining Sky ATP Or ATP Appliance With SRX Does Not Resolve The Deficiencies In Finjan’s Infringement Claims. .... 15
18	F. The Accused Products Do Not Infringe Under The Doctrine Of Equivalence. .... 16
19	
20	
21	V. CLAIM 9 IS UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101 ..... 17
22	A. Claim 9 Is Directed Towards An Abstract Idea. .... 18
23	B. Claim 9 Does Not Have A Transformative Inventive Concept. .... 20
24	VI. FINJAN’S FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH 35 U.S.C. § 287 LIMITS DAMAGES ..... 23
25	A. Finjan Failed To Provide Constructive Notice..... 24
26	B. Finjan Failed To Provide Actual Notice. .... 25
27	VII. CONCLUSION ..... 25
28	

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int'l</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014) .....	17, 18, 19, 20
<i>Amsted Indus., Inc. v. Buckeye Steel Castings Co.</i> , 24 F.3d 178 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	25
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1229 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	18
<i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prod. Inc.</i> , 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	23, 24
<i>Aventis Pharm. Inc. v. Amino Chem. Ltd.</i> , 715 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	5
<i>Becton, Dickinson &amp; Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Grp., LP</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	12
<i>Berkheimer v. HP Inc.</i> , 2018 WL 2437140 (Fed. Cir. May 31, 2018).....	17
<i>Blue Spike LLC v. Google Inc.</i> , 2015 WL 5260506 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2015).....	21
<i>buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc.</i> , 765 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	21
<i>Cal. Inst. of Tech. v. Hughes Commc'ns Inc.</i> , 59 F. Supp. 3d 974 (C.D. Cal. 2014).....	18
<i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i> , 477 U.S. 317 (1986) .....	8
<i>Cephalon, Inc. v. Abraxis Bioscience, LLC</i> , 618 Fed. Appx. 663 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	8
<i>Content Extraction &amp; Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, Nat'l Ass'n</i> , 776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	19
<i>Creo Products, Inc. v. Presstek, Inc.</i> , 305 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	16
<i>CyberFone Sys. LLC v. Lexmark Int'l, Inc.</i> , 137 F. Supp. 3d 648 (D. Del. 2015) .....	21

# 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.