

1 PAUL J. ANDRE (State Bar No. 196585)  
2 [pandre@kramerlevin.com](mailto:pandre@kramerlevin.com)  
3 LISA KOBIALKA (State Bar No. 191404)  
4 [lkobialka@kramerlevin.com](mailto:lkobialka@kramerlevin.com)  
5 JAMES HANNAH (State Bar No. 237978)  
6 [jhannah@kramerlevin.com](mailto:jhannah@kramerlevin.com)  
7 KRISTOPHER KASTENS (State Bar No. 254797)  
8 [kkastens@kramerlevin.com](mailto:kkastens@kramerlevin.com)  
9 KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS  
10 & FRANKEL LLP  
11 990 Marsh Road  
12 Menlo Park, CA 94025  
13 Telephone: (650) 752-1700  
14 Facsimile: (650) 752-1800  
15  
16 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
17 FINJAN, INC.

13 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
14 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
15 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

17 FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,  
18 Plaintiff,  
19 v.  
20 JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC., a Delaware  
21 Corporation,  
22 Defendant.

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

**PLAINTIFF FINJAN, INC.'S OPPOSITION  
TO DEFENDANT JUNIPER NETWORKS,  
INC.'S MOTION TO STRIKE THEORIES  
FROM FINJAN'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY  
JUDGMENT, AND MOTION TO AMEND**

Date: May 2, 2019  
Time: 8:00 a.m.  
Judge: Hon. William Alsup  
Courtroom: 12, 19th Floor

26  
27 **REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED**  
28

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**Page**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. BACKGROUND ..... 2

III. ARGUMENT ..... 4

    A. Juniper’s Motion is Procedurally Improper ..... 4

    B. Finjan Disclosed its Infringement Contentions..... 5

        1. Finjan Disclosed an HTTP Function as a “first function.” ..... 6

        2. Finjan’s Infringement Contentions Disclose Juniper’s Use of a “Verdict” Engine as a Security Computer in Juniper’s Sky ATP Products. .... 9

        3. Finjan’s Infringement Contentions Disclose Juniper’s Use of Whitelisting as a “Second Function” in Juniper’s Sky ATP Products. .... 10

        4. Finjan’s Infringement Contentions Disclose Juniper’s Use of SmartCore as a “Content Processor” and “Chain Heuristics” in Juniper’s ATP Appliance Products..... 11

        5. Finjan’s Infringement Contentions Disclose Juniper’s Use of “Clean” and “End” Operations as a “Second Function” in Juniper’s ATP Appliance Products..... 12

        6. Finjan’s Infringement Contentions Allege Infringement of the Content Processor Limitation Under the Doctrine of Equivalents. .... 13

IV. CONCLUSION..... 14

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**Federal Cases**

4 *CreAgri, Inc. v. Pinnaclife Inc.*,  
5 No. 11-cv-06635-LHK, 2012 WL 5389775 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 2, 2012)..... 5

6 *Network Caching Tech. Corp. v. Novell, Inc.*,  
7 No. C-01-2079 VRW, 2003 WL 21699799 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 21, 2003) ..... 6

8 *Renesas Tech. Corp. v. Nanya Tech. Corp.*,  
9 No. C03-05709JFHRL, 2004 WL 2600466 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 10, 2004)..... 6

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 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Defendant Juniper Network's Motion to Strike Finjan's Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt.  
3 No. 391, "Motion") should not even be considered as it is procedurally improper and makes no sense  
4 in light of the unorthodox case schedule. Juniper is seeking to strike a summary judgment, not  
5 Finjan's Infringement Contentions, suggesting that Finjan should have either (i) somehow had  
6 Juniper's confidential information when it served its March 2018 Infringement Contentions, which  
7 Finjan could not have since Juniper produced such discovery recently in the past few months, and (ii)  
8 sought to supplement its Infringement Contentions serially as discovery is continuing. That argument,  
9 however, ignores the realities of this case and the "showdown" procedures. Discovery is still ongoing,  
10 even today. Finjan should not be required (and is, in fact, not required) to seek to supplement its  
11 Infringement Contentions every time new evidence during discovery is disclosed patent by patent,  
12 particularly as the parties are addressing individual claims of Finjan's Asserted Patents through  
13 multiple "showdowns." To do so is neither judicially efficient nor appropriate and motion practice  
14 would be endless. Today, Finjan is still undertaking discovery into Juniper's infringement of U.S.  
15 Patent No. 8,141,154 ("the '154 Patent). Thus, Juniper's Motion to strike Finjan's infringement  
16 positions and evidence, while discovery (and even claim construction) has yet to be completed, is  
17 unsound in light of the Court's case schedule addressing individual patent claims in separate  
18 individual "showdowns."

19 Moreover, there is nothing new in Finjan's Motion for Summary Judgment. Juniper's Motion  
20 hinges on the untenable position that Finjan's Motion for Summary Judgment does not use, word-for-  
21 word, the same language in its Infringement Contentions. For example, Juniper argues that Finjan did  
22 not disclose an "http" function as the "first function" in the claims, even though it concedes that  
23 Finjan's Infringement Contentions refers to the "http" function in connection with the "first function"  
24 of the content processor. Thus, Juniper's infirm argument amounts to Finjan never alleged  
25 infringement based on the "http" function because the exact "http://" prefix was not used in the  
26 Infringement Contentions, even though it agrees that Finjan identified the "http" function in its  
27

1 Infringement Contentions. Because Finjan’s Motion for Summary Judgment conforms to the  
2 infringement allegations in its Infringement Contentions, Juniper’s Motion should be denied.

## 3 **II. BACKGROUND**

4 The parties are currently in fact discovery for the case, and there is currently no cutoff date for  
5 the end of fact discovery. Dkt. Nos. 35, 348. Furthermore, the parties have briefed claim construction  
6 for terms for the ‘154 Patent, both in briefing according to the claim construction schedule (Dkt. Nos.  
7 219, 35, 191, and 193), as well as in their respective briefs for the ’154 Patent (Dkt. Nos. 369 and  
8 390). According to the showdown procedure established by the Court, the parties recently finished a  
9 trial in December on a single asserted claim, with post-trial briefing on this trial completed in  
10 February. The parties began the second showdown procedure on January 24, 2019, with opening  
11 briefs file on February 14th, and oppositions briefs were filed on March 14th. Finjan elected and  
12 briefed Claim 1 of the ‘154 Patent for this second round of the showdown procedure.

13 Juniper continues to provide new discovery in this case. First, it only made the source code for  
14 the ATP Appliance accessible starting in December, as it was before loaded on the source code review  
15 computer but was inaccessible because Juniper did not install the correct software to review the code.  
16 Declaration of Kristopher Kastens in Support of Finjan’s Opposition to Juniper’s Motion to Strike  
17 (“Kastens Decl.”) filed herewith, Ex. A at p. 1. Similarly, Juniper recently provided critical discovery  
18 into its [REDACTED]  
19 [REDACTED] despite Finjan requesting this information over a year ago. *Id.*, Ex. C at  
20 p. 10 (RFP No. 38); *id.*, Ex. D at p. 6 (RFP Nos. 87-91).

21 Claim 1 of the ‘154 Patent covers a system for protecting a computer from dynamically  
22 generated malicious content using a content processor, a transmitter, and a receiver. The content  
23 processor is capable of “(i) processing content received over a network, the content including a call to  
24 a first function, and the call including input, and (ii) for invoking a second function with the input,  
25 only if a security computer indicates that invocation is safe.”

26 Finjan’s Infringement Contentions for Claim 1 of the ‘154 Patent allege infringement based on  
27 a number of different content processors, transmitters and receivers contained in Juniper’s SRX  
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.