

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

11 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
12 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
13 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

15 FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC., a Delaware  
19 Corporation,

20 Defendant.

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

**PLAINTIFF FINJAN, INC.’S OPPOSITION  
TO DEFENDANT JUNIPER NETWORKS,  
INC.’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY  
JUDGMENT**

Date: May 2, 2019  
Time: 8:00 a.m.  
Courtroom: Courtroom 12, 19<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Before: Hon. William Alsup

22  
23  
24  
25 **REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED**  
26  
27  
28

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

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

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES TO BE DECIDED.....	i
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. BACKGROUND .....	2
A. Overview of the ‘780 Patent and the Elements of Claim 9.....	2
B. Claim 9 of the ‘780 Patent .....	2
C. Claim Construction .....	3
1. “Performing a hashing function on the Downloadable and the fetched software components to generate a Downloadable ID” .....	3
2. “Fetching at least one software component identified by the one or more references” .....	4
D. Benefits of the ‘780 Patent.....	9
E. Overview of Juniper’s Accused Products .....	10
1. Juniper’s Acquisition of the ATP Appliance and Finjan’s Notice to Cyphort .....	10
2. Functionality of the ATP Appliance .....	12
III. JUNIPER’S MOTION FAILS BECAUSE ITS PRODUCTS INFRINGE CLAIM 9 .....	13
A. The ATP Appliance Infringes Claim 9 of the ‘780 Patent.....	13
1. Preamble – “A system for generating a Downloadable ID to identify a Downloadable, comprising:” .....	14
2. Element 9(a) – “a communications engine for obtaining a Downloadable that includes one or more references to software components required to be executed by the Downloadable” .....	14
3. Element 9(b) – “an ID generator coupled to the communications engine that fetches at least one software component identified by the one or more references, and for performing a hashing function on the Downloadable and the fetched software components to generate a Downloadable ID” .....	16
B. Juniper’s Non-Infringement Arguments .....	17
C. Doctrine of Equivalents .....	20

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

IV. CLAIM 9 IS ELIGIBLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101..... 20

    A. Claim 1 Is Directed to a Non-Abstract Idea at Step 1..... 21

        1. The '780 Patent Is Directed To Improvements In Computer  
           Functionality. .... 21

            a) Claim 9 Is A Specific Departure From Prior Techniques..... 24

            b) Juniper’s Arguments Mischaracterize the Invention of Claim 9. .... 25

    B. Claim 1 Contains Inventive Concepts..... 29

    C. Questions of Material Fact Preclude Juniper’s Section 101 Challenge of Claim 9..... 30

V. FINJAN COMPLIED WITH 35 U.S.C. § 287 AND IS ENTITLED TO PRE-SUIT  
DAMAGES..... 31

VI. CONCLUSION..... 36

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**Cases**

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

*24/7 Customer, Inc. v. LivePerson, Inc.*,  
No. 15-cv-02897-JST, 2017 WL 2311272 (N.D. Cal. May 25, 2017) .....25

*Aatrix Software, Inc. v. Green Shades Software, Inc.*,  
882 F.3d 1121 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....31

*Accent Packaging, Inc. v. Leggett & Platt, Inc.*,  
707 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....7

*Accuscan, Inc. v. Xerox Corp.*,  
No. 96 CIV. 2579(HB), 1998 WL 60991 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 11, 1998).....35

*Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank Int'l*,  
134 S.Ct. 2347 (2014).....20, 24, 25

*Ancora Techs., Inc. v. HTC Am., Inc.*,  
908 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....20, 24, 27, 29

*Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*,  
477 U.S. 242 (1986).....13

*Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prod. Inc.*,  
876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....31, 34, 35

*Bascom Global Internet Servs., Inc. v. AT&T Mobility LLC*,  
827 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....21, 30

*Berkheimer v. HP Inc.*,  
881 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....21, 30, 31

*Blitzsafe Texas, LLC v. Honda Motor Co.*,  
No. 2:15-cv-1274-JRG-RSP, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 58358 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 26,  
2017) .....35, 36

*Brocade Commc'ns Sys., Inc. v. A10 Networks, Inc.*,  
873 F. Supp. 2d 1192 (N.D. Cal. 2012) .....13

*Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v Wells Fargo Bank, Nat'l Ass'n*,  
776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....26

*Core Wireless Licensing S.A.R.L. v. LG Elecs., Inc.*,  
880 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....20

1	<i>Crane Security Techs., Inc. v. Rolling Optics AB,</i>	
	No. 14-12428-LTS, 2018 WL 575697 (D.Mass. Jan. 26, 2018) .....	33
2	<i>Creo Prods., Inc. v. Presstek, Inc.,</i>	
3	305 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	20
4	<i>DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.,</i>	
5	773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	23, 28
6	<i>Eastman Kodak Co. v. GAF Corp.,</i>	
	No. 75 Civ. 925, 1977 WL 22726 (S.D.N.Y. 2000) .....	33
7	<i>Elec. Power Group, LLC v. Alstom S.A.,</i>	
8	830 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	26
9	<i>Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.,</i>	
10	822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	23
11	<i>Exergen Corp. v. Kaz USA, Inc.,</i>	
	725 Fed. App'x 959 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	31
12	<i>Finjan Inc. v. Bitdefender, Inc.,</i>	
13	No. 17-cv-04790-HSG, Dkt. No. 101 (N.D. Cal. February 14, 2019).....	4, 6
14	<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Sys., Inc.,</i>	
15	879 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	<i>passim</i>
16	<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Sys., Inc.,</i>	
	No. 13-cv-03999-BLF, 2015 WL 3630000 (N.D. Cal. June 2, 2015) .....	4
17	<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Cisco, Inc.,</i>	
18	No. 17-cv-00072-BLF, Dkt. No. 134 (N.D. Cal July 22, 2018).....	6
19	<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Cisco Systems, Inc.,</i>	
20	No. 17-cv-00072-BLF, 2018 WL 3537142 (N.D. Cal July 23, 2018).....	4
21	<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Proofpoint, Inc.,</i>	
	No. 13-cv-05808-HSG, 2015 WL 7770208 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 3, 2005) .....	4, 8
22	<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Capital One Financial Corp.,</i>	
23	850 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	26
24	<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Erie Indemnity Co.,</i>	
25	200 F. Supp. 3d 565 (W.D. Penn. 2016).....	26, 27
26	<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Symantec Corp.,</i>	
	100 F. Supp. 3d 371 (D. Del. 2015), <i>reversed in part on other grounds by</i>	
27	<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 838 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	27

# 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.