

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
1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900
5 Los Angeles, California 90067-4276
Telephone: (310) 277-1010
6 Facsimile: (310) 203-7199

7 Rebecca Carson (SBN 254105)
rcarson@irell.com
8 Ingrid M. H. Petersen (SBN 313927)
ipetersen@irell.com
9 Kevin Wang (SBN 318024)
kwang@irell.com
10 840 Newport Center Drive, Suite 400
Newport Beach, California 92660-6324
11 Telephone: (949) 760-0991
Facsimile: (949) 760-5200

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

14
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) **NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION**
vs.) **FOR SANCTIONS**
21)
JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC., a Delaware)
22 Corporation,) Date: May 2, 2019
Time: 8:00 AM
23 Defendant.) Courtroom: 12, 19th Floor
Before: Hon. William Alsup
24)
25
26
27
28

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

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 sanctioning Finjan, Inc. (“Finjan”). 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; 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 sanctioning Finjan based on its conduct during and as a result of the first round of early motions for summary judgment. Juniper believes that the amount of such sanction should be commensurate with the amount of resources Juniper and the Court were required to waste defending against improper infringement, validity, and damages positions, and it is prepared to submit a proposal to the Court if the Court believes such a proposal would be appropriate and useful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1	
2	
3 I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
4 II. LEGAL STANDARDS.....	2
5 III. FINJAN’S “STRONGEST CLAIM”—CLAIM 10 OF THE ’494	
6 PATENT—WAS MOOT FROM THE OUTSET	3
7 A. Finjan’s Misstatements Of Law And Fact Concerning 35 U.S.C.	
8 § 287 Warrant Sanctions.	3
9 1. Finjan Argued In Bad Faith That It Provided Constructive	
10 Notice Of Its Infringement Claim Under 35 U.S.C. § 287(a).	4
11 2. Finjan Made False Statements Regarding Alleged Actual	
12 Notice.	7
13 B. Finjan’s Unsupported Damages Theories Warrant Sanctions.....	9
14 IV. FINJAN’S ALLEGATIONS ON CLAIM 1 OF THE ’780 PATENT WERE	
15 BOGUS	12
16 1. Finjan Did Not Even Oppose Juniper’s Motion As To the	
17 SRX.	13
18 2. Finjan’s Infringement Theory For Sky ATP Was Based On	
19 An Unreasonable Interpretation Of The Claims.	14
20 3. Finjan Had No Legitimate Response To Juniper’s Section	
21 101 Defense.....	16
22 V. FINJAN’S OTHER FALSE STATEMENTS & UNREASONABLE	
23 LITIGATION CONDUCT DURING THE PATENT SHOWDOWN.....	17
24 A. Finjan Filed A § 282 Objection Based On False Statements.	17
25 B. Finjan Made Frivolous Privilege Claims During Discovery.....	18
26 VI. CONCLUSION	19
27	
28	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Amsted Indus. Inc. v. Buckeye Steel Castings Co.</i> , 24 F.3d 178 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	5
<i>Anderson v. Asset Acceptance, LLC</i> , 2010 WL 1752609 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 29, 2010)	2, 7
<i>Arctic Cat, Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prods. Inc.</i> , 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	3, 4
<i>B.K.B. v. Maui Police Dep't</i> , 276 F.3d 1091 (9th Cir. 2002), <i>as amended</i> (Feb. 20, 2002)	2
<i>Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.</i> , 501 U.S. 32 (1991)	2
<i>F.J. Hanshaw Enters., Inc. v. Emerald River Dev., Inc.</i> , 244 F.3d 1128 (9th Cir. 2001).....	2
<i>Finjan v. Blue Coat</i> , 879 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	10, 11
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Sys., Inc.</i> , No. CV-13-03999-BLF (N.D. Cal.)	15
<i>Funai Elec. Co., Ltd. v. Daewoo Elecs.</i> , 616 F. 3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	8
<i>Homkow v. Musika Rs., Inc.</i> , 2009 WL 721732 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 18, 2009)	16
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Erie Indem. Co.</i> , 200 F. Supp. 3d 565 (W.D. Penn. 2016)	16
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 100 F. Supp. 3d 371 (D. Del. 2015), <i>aff'd in relevant part, rev'd on other grounds</i> , 838 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	16
<i>LaFarge Corp. v. No. 1 Contracting Corp.</i> , 2008 WL 2120518 (M.D. Pa. May 19, 2008), <i>modified in part</i> , 2008 WL 3910673 (M.D. Pa. Aug. 20, 2008).....	13, 14, 15
<i>Lans v. Dig. Equip. Corp.</i> , 252 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	3, 4

1	<i>Mark Indus., Ltd. v. Sea Captain’s Choice, Inc.</i> ,	
	50 F.3d 730 (9th Cir. 1995).....	2
2		
3	<i>Maxwell v. J. Baker, Inc.</i> ,	
	86 F.3d 1098 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	4
4		
5	<i>Nike, Inc. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> ,	
	138 F.3d 1437 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	4
6		
7	<i>Phonometrics, Inc. v. Westin Hotel Co.</i> ,	
	350 F.3d 1242 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	3
8		
9	<i>Raniere v. Microsoft Corp.</i> ,	
	2016 WL 4626584 (N.D. Tex. Sept 2, 2016), <i>aff’d</i> , 887 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	2, 7
10		
11	<i>Shaw Family Archives, Ltd. v. CMG Worldwide, Inc.</i> ,	
	589 F. Supp. 2d 331 (S.D.N.Y. 2008).....	15
12		
13	<i>Symantec Corp. v. Finjan, Inc.</i> ,	
	IPR2015-01892	6, 12
14		
15	<i>Symantec Corp. v. Zscaler, Inc.</i> ,	
	2018 WL 1456678 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 23, 2018)	16
16		
17	<i>U.S. Ethernet Innovations, LLC v. Acer, Inc.</i> ,	
	2013 WL 4456161 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 16, 2013).....	3
18		
19	<i>Viola Sportswear, Inc. v. Mimun</i> ,	
	574 F. Supp. 619 (E.D.N.Y. 1983).....	13
20		
21	Statutes	
22	28 U.S.C. § 1927	3, 12
23	35 U.S.C. § 101	2, 13, 16
24	35 U.S.C. § 282	2, 17
25	35 U.S.C. § 287	1, 3, 4
26	35 U.S.C. § 287(a).....	3, 4
27		
28	Other Authorities	
	Rule 30(b)(6).....	18

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.