

PAUL ANDRE (State Bar No. 196585)  
[pandre@kramerlevin.com](mailto:pandre@kramerlevin.com)  
LISA KOBIALKA (State Bar No. 191404)  
[lkobialka@kramerlevin.com](mailto:lkobialka@kramerlevin.com)  
JAMES HANNAH (State Bar No. 237978)  
[jhannah@kramerlevin.com](mailto:jhannah@kramerlevin.com)  
KRISTOPHER KASTENS (State Bar No. 254797)  
[kkastens@kramerlevin.com](mailto:kkastens@kramerlevin.com)  
KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP  
990 Marsh Road  
Menlo Park, CA 94025  
Telephone: (650) 752-1700  
Facsimile: (650) 752-1800

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
FINJAN, INC.

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

FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC., a Delaware Corporation,

Defendant.

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

**PLAINTIFF FINJAN, INC.'S REPLY IN  
SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION FOR RELIEF  
FROM JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO FED. R.  
CIV. P. 60(B)**

Date: May 9, 2019  
Time: 8:00 a.m.  
Courtroom: 12, 19th Floor  
Before: Hon. William H. Alsup

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY**  
**REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENTS FILED UNDER SEAL**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS****Page**

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	FACTUAL BACKGROUND .....	2
III.	ARGUMENT .....	3
A.	Juniper's Withholding of Relevant Documents Responsive to Finjan's 2018 Document Requests Is Newly Discovered Evidence.....	3
1.	Juniper Omitted Responsive Joe Sandbox Documents from Its Production. ....	3
2.	Juniper Cannot Identify that It Produced a Single Document Describing the Relevant Database.....	5
3.	Finjan Diligently Pursued the Joe Sandbox Documents.....	8
4.	Juniper's Concealed Discovery Is Sufficiently Material That It Would Change the Outcome of this Case.....	10
B.	Juniper's Concealment of the Joe Sandbox Documentation Constitutes Discovery Misconduct Which Prejudiced Finjan. ....	14

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES****Page(s)****Federal Cases**

<i>Belinda K. v. Baldovinos</i> , No. 10-CV-02507-LHK, 2012 WL 3249481 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 7, 2012).....	14
<i>Berger v. Rossignol Ski Co.</i> , No. C05-2523 CR B, 2006 WL 2038324 (N.D. Cal. July 17, 2006)) .....	13
<i>Casey v. Albertson's Inc.</i> , 362 F.3d 1254 (9th Cir. 2004) .....	15
<i>Cusano v. Klein</i> , 485 Fed. Appx. 175 (9th Cir. 2012).....	10
<i>De Saracho v. Custom Food Mach., Inc.</i> , 182 F.R.D. 601 (N.D. Cal. 1998).....	15
<i>DeVera v. Japan Airlines</i> , No. 92 CIV. 6698 (JES), 1994 WL 698330 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 13, 1994).....	10
<i>Haworth, Inc. v. Herman Miller, Inc.</i> , 998 F.2d 975 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	10
<i>Immersion Corp. v. Sony Computer Entm't Am., Inc.</i> , No. C 02-0710 CW, 2006 WL 618599 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 8, 2006) .....	15
<i>Jones v. Aero/Chem Corp.</i> , 921 F.2d 875 (9th Cir. 1990) .....	14, 15
<i>Prism Techs., LLC v. Sprint Spectrum L.P.</i> , No. 8:12CV123, 2015 WL 12803695 (D. Neb. Dec. 9, 2015), <i>aff'd</i> , 849 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	13
<i>Srinivasan v. Devry Inst. of Tech.</i> , 53 F.3d 340, 1995 WL 242307 (9th Cir. 1995) .....	13
<i>Venture Indus. Corp. v. Autoliv ASP, Inc.</i> , 457 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	15
<i>Willis v. Mullins</i> , 809 F. Supp. 2d 1227 (E.D. Cal. 2011).....	14

**Other Authorities**

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 34(b)(2)(C) .....	5, 14
--	-------

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 60 .....*passim*

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 Finjan is entitled to relief from the jury verdict entered on December 14, 2018 (Dkt. No. 333,  
3 “Verdict”) and this Court’s subsequent order denying Finjan’s Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law  
4 on March 11, 2019 (Dkt. No. 387, “Order”) because but for Juniper’s fraudulent concealment of key  
5 evidence that proved that Sky ATP had a “database” as recited in Claim 10 of U.S. Patent No.  
6 8,677,494 (“the ‘494 Patent”), which was the pivotal issue at the December 2018 trial, the jury would  
7 have found infringement. Finjan repeatedly requested such information in discovery for months before  
8 trial, but Juniper misrepresented that it had completed its production and stymied Finjan’s diligent  
9 efforts to obtain this evidence. Juniper thus prevented the jury from carrying out its civic duty to  
10 consider all the evidence before it, interfered with the Court’s ability to dispense justice, and deprived  
11 Finjan of a fair trial on the merits of its infringement claim. Incredibly, Juniper filed a Motion for  
12 Sanctions (Dkt. No. 409), but its unsupported complaints are swallowed by Juniper’s *months* of  
13 discovery misconduct. In fact, Juniper does not reasonably dispute that Finjan requested specific  
14 documents from Juniper about Joe Security and Joe Sandbox, that Juniper had them and did not provide  
15 them because it said its production was complete, and that the database evidenced in these documents  
16 stores dynamic analysis results in the *exact* manner Juniper’s expert testified was required.

17 Juniper offers a handful of citations that are devoid of the technical information found in the  
18 documents Finjan had long requested, in order to allege that Finjan could have intuited what Juniper  
19 was withholding and thus sought it through subpoena or court intervention. These citations, however,  
20 do not eliminate Juniper’s discovery obligations to truthfully, completely, and accurately respond to  
21 Finjan’s discovery requests. Further, none of the documents Juniper cited show *how* Joe Sandbox (i)  
22 stores the results of the dynamic analysis or (ii) uses a database with a clear schema. In fact, all but one  
23 of the documents were produced on November 6, 2018, buried among over 460,000 pages of  
24 documents produced that day. Finjan timely followed up in December 2018. The single document  
25 Juniper cites that was produced before November 2018 appears only to reference a publicly available  
26 database within a schedule of third-party licenses. Not only does this appear to be a different database,  
27 but there is no technical information whatsoever in the licensing information. Thus, Juniper cannot

# 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.