

**IRELL & MANELLA LLP**

A REGISTERED LIMITED LIABILITY LAW PARTNERSHIP  
INCLUDING PROFESSIONAL CORPORATIONS

1800 AVENUE OF THE STARS, SUITE 900  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067-4276  
TELEPHONE (310) 277-1010  
FACSIMILE (310) 203-7199

840 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 400  
**NEWPORT BEACH, CALIFORNIA 92660-6324**

TELEPHONE (949) 760-0991  
FACSIMILE (949) 760-5200  
WEBSITE: [www.irell.com](http://www.irell.com)

**WRITER'S DIRECT**  
TELEPHONE (949) 760-5222  
[RCarson@irell.com](mailto:RCarson@irell.com)

June 14, 2019

Hon. William Alsup  
U.S. District Court, Northern District of California

Re: *Finjan, Inc. v. Juniper Networks, Inc.*,  
Case No. 3:17-cv-05659-WHA (N.D. Cal.)

Dear Judge Alsup:

In an effort to clarify issues and avoid enlarging motion practice before the upcoming trial, Juniper respectfully suggests that it would be helpful to the parties if the Court could issue its Orders on outstanding issues for the '494 and '154 Patents raised in the first and second rounds of the Court's early summary judgment procedure at its earliest convenience *See* Dkt. No. 189 at 18-20 (Order finding that Claim 10 of the '494 Patent is directed to an abstract idea under *Alice* Step One but deferring to rule on *Alice* Step Two); Dkt. No. 491 at 19 (Order to show cause as to why summary judgment should not be granted in favor of Juniper on Claim 1 of the '154 Patent).

Finjan recently confirmed that it intends to pursue Claim 10 of the '494 Patent and Claim 1 of the '154 Patent at trial. *See* Dkt. No. 516 (Finjan's Notice of Claims). Accordingly, the two outstanding Orders regarding (1) whether Claim 10 of the '494 Patent is invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 101, and (2) whether Juniper does not infringe Claim 1 of '154 Patent as a matter of law will both have a material impact on the scope of the upcoming trial, and may help avoid duplicative motion practice.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Rebecca Carson  
Rebecca Carson  
IRELL & MANELLA LLP  
*Attorneys for Defendant*  
Juniper Networks, Inc.