

Exhibit 2

PAUL J. ANDRE (State Bar No. 196585)
pandre@kramerlevin.com
LISA KOBIALKA (State Bar No. 191404)
lkobialka@kramerlevin.com
JAMES HANNAH (State Bar No. 237978)
jhannah@kramerlevin.com
KRISTOPHER KASTENS (State Bar No. 254797)
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 Non-Party
DAWN-MARIE BEY

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

FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

JUNIPER NETWORK, INC., a Delaware
Corporation,

Defendant.

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

**NON-PARTY DAWN-MARIE BEY'S
RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO
DEFENDANT JUNIPER NETWORK, INC.'S
SUBPOENA**

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45, non-party Dawn-Marie Bey, by her attorneys Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP, hereby objects and responds to Defendant Juniper Network, Inc.'s ("Juniper" or "Defendant") subpoena to testify at deposition and to produce documents (the "Subpoena"), as follows:

GENERAL RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS

The following General Responses and Objections shall be applicable to, and included in, Ms. Bey's responses to each instruction, definition, document request, and request for deposition set forth in the Subpoena (each collectively, a "Request" or the "Requests"), whether or not mentioned expressly in any particular response. Ms. Bey does not waive any General Responses and Objections by stating specific responses and objections to any particular Request. Ms. Bey's objections and responses are based solely on her current knowledge and belief. Ms. Bey reserves the right to modify and supplement any of her responses or objections and to assert additional responses and objections as she deems necessary and/or appropriate. Ms. Bey asserts the following General Responses and Objections to the Subpoena and Requests:

1. Ms. Bey objects to the time provided to respond to the Requests as unreasonable and unduly burdensome.

2. Ms. Bey objects to the Requests to the extent the discovery sought is unreasonably cumulative or duplicative, or is obtainable or already has been obtained by Defendant from some other source that is more appropriate, more convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive. In particular, Ms. Bey objects to the Subpoena as unduly burdensome to the extent that Defendant is seeking the production of documents and deposition from a non-party that is obtainable from Finjan itself or from a public resource.

3. Ms. Bey objects to the Requests on the grounds that the issuing party failed to take reasonable steps to avoid imposing undue burden and expense on Ms. Bey. Specifically, Ms. Bey objects on the grounds that the issuing party failed to demonstrate that they have attempted to and could not obtain the requested documents from their party-opponent in the lawsuit.

1 4. Ms. Bey objects to the Requests as vague, ambiguous, overly broad and unduly
2 burdensome to the extent they extend beyond the scope of Finjan's infringement allegations, are
3 designed to seek information that is not relevant to the subject of or any claim or issue in the litigation,
4 are unlikely to lead to the discovery of relevant information, and/or are not proportional to the needs of
5 the case. In particular, Ms. Bey objects to the Requests as overly broad and unduly burdensome for a
6 non-party individual, particularly as to the number and extent of the Requests.

7 5. Ms. Bey objects to the Subpoena to the extent it seeks information that is protected by
8 attorney-client privilege, attorney work product immunity, any protective order or other court orders,
9 or any other application protection from discovery. Any such information will not be disclosed. To
10 the extent Ms. Bey agrees to provide responses to the Subpoena, Ms. Bey does so without waiver of
11 any such privilege, immunity or protection. Inadvertent disclosure of any such information or
12 documentation is not intended to and shall not constitute a waiver of any privilege or any other ground
13 for objecting to discovery with respect to such information, or with respect to the subject matter
14 thereof. Nor shall such inadvertent production or disclosure waive the right of Ms. Bey to object to the
15 use of any such information during this action or in any other subsequent proceedings.

16 6. Ms. Bey objects to the Subpoena to the extent it calls for information that is subject to
17 the privacy and/or confidentiality rights of any third party or third parties that Ms. Bey may not
18 disclose without the consent of such third party or third parties. Ms. Bey will not disclose such
19 information in responding to the Subpoena.

20 7. Ms. Bey objects to the Requests to the extent that they are vague, ambiguous, overly
21 burdensome, overly broad, confusing, or fail to identify with reasonable particularity the information
22 sought.

23 8. Ms. Bey objects to the Requests to the extent they request documents and things that do
24 not exist or are not in Ms. Bey's possession, custody, or control.

25 9. Ms. Bey objects to the Requests to the extent they are unconstrained as to time.

26 10. Ms. Bey objects to the Requests to the extent they call for a legal and/or expert
27 conclusion.

1 11. Ms. Bey objects to the “DEFINITIONS” and “INSTRUCTIONS” to the extent that they
2 impose burdens, obligations and expense on Ms. Bey greater than, inconsistent with or different from
3 those authorized under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Federal Rules of Evidence, the Local
4 Rules of the Northern District of California, the protective order or ESI order in the action, stipulations
5 between the parties, or any other applicable orders of the Court, and to the extent that they purport to
6 give meanings to words different from their ordinary understood English meaning or definitions set
7 forth in the applicable statutes or rules.

8 12. Ms. Bey objects to the definition of “Document” to the extent it is vague, overly broad
9 and unduly burdensome, and purport to place obligations on Ms. Bey greater than allowed for under,
10 broader than, or inconsistent with, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the local rules of this
11 Court.

12 13. Ms. Bey objects to the definition of “Finjan” as overly broad to the extent it includes
13 persons or entities not relevant to this litigation.

14 14. Ms. Bey objects to the definition of “Concerning” to the extent it is overly broad, vague,
15 and ambiguous.

16 15. Ms. Bey objects to the definition of “Communication” to the extent it is overly broad,
17 unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous and/or unintelligible, particularly as to the phrase “any
18 contact.”

19 16. Ms. Bey objects to the definition of “Patent” to the extent it is overbroad, unduly
20 burdensome and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, to the
21 extent it calls for legal conclusions, and to the extent it seeks to impose obligations greater or different
22 than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Federal Rules of Evidence, the Local
23 Rules of the Northern District of California, or any other applicable orders of the Court. Ms. Bey
24 further objects to this Definition, and to each Request that incorporates this term, to the extent it is
25 vague, ambiguous and/or unintelligible, particularly as to the phrase, “any United States, international,
26 or foreign classes or types of patents, utility models, design patents, applications (including provisional
27 applications), certificates of invention, reissues, divisionals, continuations, continuations-in-part,

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.