

EXHIBIT 6

**REDACTED VERSION OF
DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE
SEALED**

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED
HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

--oOo--

FINJAN, Inc., a Delaware
corporation

Plaintiff,

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

JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC., a
Delaware corporation

Defendant.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL, OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

30(b)(6) VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF

JOHN GARLAND

Thursday, May 24, 2018

Reported by:

COREY W. ANDERSON

CSR No. 4096

Job No. 2923791

Pages 1 - 258

Page 1

Veritext Legal Solutions

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

<p>1 THE WITNESS: It's really outside my 09:50:51 2 scope. 09:50:52 3 BY MS. CARSON: 09:50:52 4 Q. Before Finjan filed those lawsuits, did 09:50:58 5 Finjan do anything to confirm it had a reasonable 09:51:00 6 basis for asserting infringement of the patents that 09:51:02 7 were at issue in those lawsuits? 09:51:05 8 MS. KOBIALKA: Objection, form. 09:51:07 9 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I think that's outside 09:51:09 10 my scope where I'm handling licensing. But I can 09:51:10 11 say that Finjan complies with everything it's 09:51:14 12 required to comply with. 09:51:17 13 BY MS. CARSON: 09:51:18 14 Q. Is it Finjan's policy to only maintain 09:51:26 15 patent infringement claims in a lawsuit when it has 09:51:28 16 a reasonable basis for maintaining those claims? 09:51:30 17 MS. KOBIALKA: Objection, form. 09:51:33 18 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure, I -- I mean, I 09:51:36 19 can continue to answer these questions, but I'm 09:51:38 20 really questioning how we are talking about notice 09:51:40 21 for marking. The topic of the deposition is notice 09:51:45 22 and marking and I'm getting questions about 09:51:49 23 litigation where I'm a licensing executive. 09:51:51 24 BY MS. CARSON: 09:51:54 25 Q. Can you answer the question? 09:51:54</p> <p>Page 46</p>	<p>1 A. Can you be more specific? 09:52:50 2 [REDACTED] 3 [REDACTED] 4 [REDACTED] 5 [REDACTED] 6 [REDACTED] 7 [REDACTED] 8 [REDACTED] 9 [REDACTED] 10 [REDACTED] 11 [REDACTED] 12 [REDACTED] 13 [REDACTED] 14 [REDACTED] 15 [REDACTED] 16 [REDACTED] 17 [REDACTED] 18 [REDACTED] 19 [REDACTED] 20 [REDACTED] 21 [REDACTED] 22 [REDACTED] 23 [REDACTED] 24 [REDACTED] 25 [REDACTED] 09:54:19</p> <p>Page 48</p>
<p>1 MS. KOBIALKA: I'm going to object to 09:51:56 2 form. 09:51:57 3 THE WITNESS: I need the question 09:51:58 4 repeated. 09:51:58 5 (Whereupon, the reporter read back 09:51:58 6 the record as follows: 09:51:58 7 "Is it Finjan's policy to only 09:51:59 8 maintain patent infringement claims 09:51:59 9 in a lawsuit when it has a 09:51:59 10 reasonable basis for maintaining 09:51:59 11 those claims?") 09:51:59 12 MS. KOBIALKA: I object to the form of 09:52:16 13 that question. 09:52:18 14 THE WITNESS: I -- I can't answer the 09:52:21 15 question. 09:52:21 16 BY MS. CARSON: 09:52:22 17 Q. You don't know one way or another? 09:52:22 18 MS. KOBIALKA: Objection to form. 09:52:24 19 THE WITNESS: I think, you know, you are 09:52:26 20 starting to get into privilege and we are starting 09:52:29 21 to get into, you know, beyond my scope of 09:52:30 22 responsibilities. 09:52:34 23 BY MS. CARSON: 09:52:35 24 Q. Does Finjan have standard terms for its 09:52:44 25 licenses? 09:52:48</p> <p>Page 47</p>	<p>1 [REDACTED] 2 [REDACTED] 3 [REDACTED] 4 [REDACTED] 5 [REDACTED] 6 [REDACTED] 7 [REDACTED] 8 [REDACTED] 9 [REDACTED] 10 [REDACTED] 11 [REDACTED] 12 [REDACTED] 13 [REDACTED] 14 [REDACTED] 15 [REDACTED] 16 [REDACTED] 17 [REDACTED] 18 [REDACTED] 19 [REDACTED] 20 BY MS. CARSON: 09:55:10 21 Q. Does Finjan know whether any of its 09:55:13 22 licensees practice the patents-in-suit? 09:55:17 23 MS. KOBIALKA: Objection to form. 09:55:25 24 THE WITNESS: It would depend. 09:55:27 25 BY MS. CARSON: 09:55:29</p> <p>Page 49</p>

Pages 46 to 49

Veritext Legal Solutions

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

<p>1 no or you don't know. 15:59:49</p> <p>2 I'm not trying to direct his answer, but 15:59:50</p> <p>3 I'm trying to work through the privilege. If you 15:59:52</p> <p>4 are going to object, Counsel, I'll just stop and 15:59:53</p> <p>5 I'll just make an instruction. 15:59:57</p> <p>6 MS. CARSON: So I'm just trying to think 16:00:02</p> <p>7 through the issue because if he took like 16:00:03</p> <p>8 contemporaneous notes with a phone call he had with 16:00:05</p> <p>9 Juniper, I'm not sure how that would fall within the 16:00:08</p> <p>10 scope of privilege. 16:00:11</p> <p>11 MS. KOBIALKA: If his question's for 16:00:13</p> <p>12 counsel, absolutely. I think absolutely if you 16:00:14</p> <p>13 would take notes for purposes of getting legal 16:00:17</p> <p>14 advice, I do think that those notes -- 16:00:19</p> <p>15 MS. CARSON: Hmm. 16:00:24</p> <p>16 MS. KOBIALKA: -- would be privileged, 16:00:24</p> <p>17 especially like if these are the issues I need to 16:00:25</p> <p>18 talk about with counsel. 16:00:27</p> <p>19 MS. CARSON: Okay. Well, we'll just start 16:00:29</p> <p>20 with a yes or no, do they exist. 16:00:30</p> <p>21 MS. KOBIALKA: She is just asking whether 16:00:32</p> <p>22 or not they exist. You can answer that yes or no if 16:00:33</p> <p>23 you know one way or the other, you don't know, and 16:00:35</p> <p>24 then we'll take from it there. I don't want you to 16:00:38</p> <p>25 expound on it, is -- because I think that does get 16:00:40</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 222</p>	<p>1 THE WITNESS: That call's pretty bright. 16:01:37</p> <p>2 That call's pretty bright, unique. 16:01:39</p> <p>3 BY MS. CARSON: 16:01:41</p> <p>4 Q. So that wasn't an answer to the question. 16:01:41</p> <p>5 Did reviewing your notes from the call 16:01:43</p> <p>6 refresh your recollection as to what occurred on the 16:01:45</p> <p>7 call? 16:01:48</p> <p>8 MS. KOBIALKA: Objection to form. 16:01:48</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: Yes. Given it's November of 16:01:52</p> <p>10 2015, yes. 16:01:54</p> <p>11 MS. CARSON: Okay. So Counsel, we would 16:01:56</p> <p>12 request that that be produced given that it 16:01:57</p> <p>13 refreshed the recollection of the Rule 30(b)(6) 16:01:58</p> <p>14 witness. 16:02:01</p> <p>15 MS. KOBIALKA: He just said his memory was 16:02:02</p> <p>16 very bright from the call. He didn't say -- 16:02:04</p> <p>17 MS. CARSON: But he also said yes, it did 16:02:06</p> <p>18 refresh his recollection. We can take it up 16:02:08</p> <p>19 after -- after the deposition. 16:02:10</p> <p>20 Q. Are you aware of any evidence that Juniper 16:02:52</p> <p>21 had notice of the '780 patent prior to Finjan filing 16:02:54</p> <p>22 this lawsuit? 16:02:59</p> <p>23 MS. KOBIALKA: Objection to form. 16:03:00</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: I need the question again, 16:03:06</p> <p>25 sorry. 16:03:07</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 224</p>
<p>1 into privilege issues. 16:00:43</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: I documented the summary of 16:00:52</p> <p>3 that call -- 16:00:53</p> <p>4 MS. KOBIALKA: Well, okay, so now, I want 16:00:54</p> <p>5 you to very careful because it starts to get into 16:00:56</p> <p>6 privilege issues. 16:01:00</p> <p>7 So you can answer the question yes or no 16:01:00</p> <p>8 or if you don't know, one way or the other. But I 16:01:03</p> <p>9 don't want to get -- 16:01:06</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: I'm not going to get into 16:01:08</p> <p>11 substance, but just -- 16:01:09</p> <p>12 MS. KOBIALKA: She is only asking does it 16:01:10</p> <p>13 exist. Otherwise I'm going to instruct you not to 16:01:11</p> <p>14 answer. 16:01:14</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: Yes, it exists. 16:01:17</p> <p>16 MS. KOBIALKA: Okay. 16:01:18</p> <p>17 BY MS. CARSON: 16:01:18</p> <p>18 Q. Did you review it before your deposition 16:01:18</p> <p>19 today? 16:01:20</p> <p>20 MS. KOBIALKA: Objection to form. 16:01:26</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: Uh-huh. 16:01:29</p> <p>22 BY MS. CARSON: 16:01:30</p> <p>23 Q. Did it refresh your recollection as to 16:01:30</p> <p>24 what occurred on the call? 16:01:31</p> <p>25 MS. KOBIALKA: Objection to form. 16:01:33</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 223</p>	<p>1 (Whereupon, the reporter read back 16:03:07</p> <p>2 the record as follows: 16:03:07</p> <p>3 "Are you aware of any evidence that 16:03:07</p> <p>4 Juniper had notice of the '780 16:03:07</p> <p>5 patent prior to Finjan filing this 16:03:07</p> <p>6 lawsuit?") 16:03:07</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: Only Mr. Coonan's 16:03:23</p> <p>8 representation that he had done an invalidity 16:03:24</p> <p>9 analysis on the entire Finjan portfolio and as 16:03:29</p> <p>10 mentioned in the interrogatory about the '968 and 16:03:33</p> <p>11 the relationships of the patents. 16:03:35</p> <p>12 BY MS. CARSON: 16:03:40</p> <p>13 Q. You are not aware of any instance where 16:03:40</p> <p>14 Finjan told Juniper either orally or in writing 16:03:43</p> <p>15 about the '780 patent and its infringement 16:03:46</p> <p>16 contentions related to that. 16:03:48</p> <p>17 Correct? 16:03:51</p> <p>18 A. Correct. 16:03:52</p> <p>19 MS. KOBIALKA: Objection to form. 16:03:53</p> <p>20 BY MS. CARSON: 16:03:54</p> <p>21 Q. Are you aware of any evidence that Juniper 16:04:00</p> <p>22 had notice of the '926 patent prior to this lawsuit 16:04:01</p> <p>23 being failed? 16:04:04</p> <p>24 MS. KOBIALKA: Objection, form. 16:04:06</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: Only what's in the 16:04:13</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 225</p>

Pages 222 to 225

Veritext Legal Solutions