EXHIBIT 8

(FILED UNDER SEAL)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

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 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

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

PLAINTIFF FINJAN, INC.'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 1-10)

by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules of this Court, and/or orders of the Court governing these proceedings.

11. Finjan objects to each of Defendant's Definitions and Instructions Nos. 1-31 to the extent that they impose obligations inconsistent with the Amended Case Management Order entered at Dkt. No. 35 or the protective order or ESI order to be entered in this case.

12. Finjan objects to each of Defendant's Definitions and Instructions Nos. 1-31 to the extent that they are they are overbroad, unduly burdensome, not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and not proportional to the needs of the case.

13. Finjan objects to each of Defendant's Definitions and Instructions Nos. 1-31 to the extent that they are vague, ambiguous and/or unintelligible.

INTERROGATORY RESPONSES

Subject to and without waiving its general objections and objections to Definitions and Instructions set forth above, each of which is specifically incorporated into the specific Responses contained below, Finjan hereby responds to Defendant's Interrogatories as follows:

INTERROGATORY NO. 1:

For each Patent-in-Suit, identify all entities or persons which have or ever have had a direct or indirect ownership interest, license interest, or other interest in the Patents-in-Suit, including all dates of ownership, transfer of ownership, or license.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 1:

Finjan objects to this Interrogatory as overbroad, unduly burdensome, and oppressive to the extent it seeks information not relevant to any claim or defense of any party and/or not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Finjan objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it is compound because it is comprised of multiple discrete subparts. Finjan objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion. Finjan objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks confidential, business, financial, proprietary or sensitive information or trade secrets of third parties, which is subject to pre-existing protective order(s) and/or confidentiality agreements; Finjan will not disclose any information subject to a confidentiality agreement without the express consent of the

concerned third party. Finjan also objects to this Interrogatory as vague and ambiguous, including the terms "direct or indirect ownership interest" or "other interest."

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing general and specific objections, Finjan responds as follows:

Finjan is the owner of each of the Patents-in-Suit. The following parties have licensed the Patents-in-Suit:

- Microsoft
- Intel
- McAfee
- Symantec
- Blue Coat
- Webroot
- Panda
- M86 Security
- TrustWave
- FireEye
- Websense
- AVAST
- AVG
- Avira
- Barracuda
- F-5 Networks
- F-Secure
- Proofpoint
- Armorize Technologies
- Sophos
- Veracode
- Carbon Black
- Secure Computing

Finjan incorporates by reference the information set forth in Finjan's Initial Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions and Document Production Pursuant to Patent Local Rules 3-1 and 3-2 (served on March 8, 2018), and in particular the disclosures made pursuant to Patent Local Rules 3-2(F) and 3-2(G).

continuing until today (See https://www.finjanmobile.com/). Finjan marked the VitalSecurity Browser with the '494 Patent starting on or around October 2016. As it was impractical to mark the VitalSecurity Browser application, Finjan has marked its software for its product on its website (i.e., virtual patent markings), listing the patents that its software product practiced. Example documents related to this marking with the '154 and '494 Patents can be found at FINJAN-JN 045244-91.

Finjan incorporates by reference the information set forth in Finjan's Initial Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions and Document Production Pursuant to Patent Local Rules 3-1 and 3-2 (served on March 8, 2018), and in particular the disclosures made pursuant to Patent Local Rules 3-1(G) and 3-2(I). Furthermore, Finjan also identifies Yuval Ben-Itzhak and Phil Hartstein as having knowledge related to this Interrogatory.

Additional information responsive to this Interrogatory can be found in the August 9, 2007 Deposition of Yuval Ben-Itzhak, the August 10, 2007 Deposition of Yuval Ben-Itzhak, the November 2, 2007 Deposition of Yuval Ben-Itzhak, the March 14, 2012 Deposition of Yuval Ben-Itzhak and the March 15, 2012 Deposition of Yuval Ben-Itzhak, the December 17, 2014 Deposition of Yuval Ben-Itzhak., the November 12, 2015 Deposition of Phil Hartstein, the June 9, 2017 Deposition of Phil Hartstein, the November 10, 2015 Deposition of Michael Kim, all of which have either been produced or are in the process of being produced based on consent of third parties.

Contractual obligations for Finjan's licensees can be determined from their patent license. As such, Finjan incorporates by reference the information set forth in Finjan's Initial Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions and Document Production Pursuant to Patent Local Rules 3-1 and 3-2 (served on March 8, 2018), and in particular the disclosures made pursuant to Patent Local Rule 3-2(G), which identifies the licenses to the asserted patents.

Finjan's investigation of this matter is ongoing and it will comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(e) should additional information become known to it.

INTERROGATORY NO. 4:

For each Finjan Product or Licensee Product that was not marked, describe in detail (including identification of all relevant facts, documents, evidence, and persons with knowledge) whether any

DOCKET ALARM

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.