

EXHIBIT 18

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CERTIFIED COPY

Before The Honorable WILLIAM H. ALSUP, Judge

FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,)	Motions for Judgment as a Matter of Law
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	NO. C 17-05659 WHA
)	
JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC., A Delaware Corporation,)	Pages 1 - 33
)	
Defendant.)	San Francisco, California
)	Thursday, February 21, 2019

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff: Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP
990 Marsh Road
Menlo Park, California 94025

BY: PAUL ANDRE,
KRISTOPHER B. KASTENS,
LISA KOBIALKA, ATTORNEYS AT LAW

For Defendant: Irell & Manella
840 Newport Center Drive, Suite 500
Newport Beach, California 92660-6324

BY: REBECCA L. CARSON, ATTORNEY AT LAW

Irell & Manella LLP
1800 Avenue of the Stars
Suite 900
Los Angeles, California 90067-4275

BY: JONATHAN S. KAGAN, ATTORNEY AT LAW

Reported By: Raynee H. Mercado, CSR No. 8258

Proceedings reported by electronic/mechanical stenography;
transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

RAYNEE H. MERCADO, CSR, RMR, CRR, FCRR, CCRR (510) 565-7228

1 are. We've gone through a trial and hit at every turn,
2 everyone has got to litigate everything to the nth degree.
3 And there's just not time in the universe for all of that.

4 I could have decided this on the papers and just either
5 granted it or denied it, but I'm giving you each a shot at
6 something.

7 And then we got to -- we got case management to talk about
8 after that. You all want to certify it to the Court of
9 Appeals. Then you're going to want to go to the International
10 Court of the Hague. At some point, this has got to stop.

11 All right. So who wants to go first?

12 **MR. KASTENS:** Your Honor --

13 **THE COURT:** Let's hear from you, Finjan.

14 **MR. KASTENS:** Finjan would like to discuss its JMOL
15 request for a finding of infringement. We've -- we've --

16 **THE COURT:** What's your point?

17 **MR. KASTENS:** The point is that the arguments that
18 their expert made of -- regarding non-infringement are legally
19 irrelevant, contradicted by their own documents, and did not
20 address --

21 **THE COURT:** Not true. That is not true. I want you
22 to know this: It is true that along the way, I thought
23 that -- I thought that you had a strong case on infringement.
24 I was wrong about that.

25 Mr. Kagan gave one of the best closing arguments, and it

RAYNEE H. MERCADO, CSR, RMR, CRR, FCRR, CCRR (510) 565-7228

1 was not theatrics, but it was just calm, dispassionate
2 explanation of a -- of points that I had not focused on that
3 were your burden of proof, but he pointed it out. And I was
4 very convinced at the end of that that he was right and that
5 you had been wrong from the get-go on infringement.

6 So those statements that I made along the way about how
7 I -- that was just -- I was just drawn in by your smoke and
8 mirrors. That's all that happened on that.

9 And Mr. Kagan, I compliment him for an excellent closing
10 argument. I thought he was -- he was -- his one of the best
11 I've heard in the U. S. District Court in a long time. And it
12 wasn't because it was emotional. It was just good, calm
13 explanation of something that was complicated. And then
14 finally the scales fell from my eyes. So I don't agree with
15 you on that point.

16 I am not going to grant that motion. I'm just going to
17 save you some time. You're not going to win that motion.

18 All right. What is the point you want to raise.

19 **MS. CARSON:** Sure, Your Honor.

20 So we're asking a judgment as a matter of law on the
21 notice issue. The notice issues that were tried were not
22 decided by verdict because the jury found no infringement.
23 However, the notice issue implicates many of the other patents
24 in this case.

25 **THE COURT:** Yeah, but we only tried the one patent.

RAYNEE H. MERCADO, CSR, RMR, CRR, FCRR, CCRR (510) 565-7228