

1 PAUL ANDRE (State Bar No. 196585)
 2 pandre@kramerlevin.com
 3 LISA KOBIALKA (State Bar No. 191404)
 4 lkobialka@kramerlevin.com
 5 JAMES HANNAH (State Bar No. 237978)
 6 jhannah@kramerlevin.com
 7 AUSTIN MANES (State Bar No. 284065)
 8 amanes@kramerlevin.com
 9 **KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS &
 10 FRANKEL LLP**
 11 990 Marsh Road
 12 Menlo Park, CA 94025
 13 Telephone: (650) 752-1700
 14 Facsimile: (650) 752-1800

15 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
 16 FINJAN, INC.

IRELL & MANELLA LLP
 Jonathan Kagan (166039)
jkagan@irell.com
 Joshua Glucoft (301249)
jglucoft@irell.com
 Casey Curran (305210)
ccurran@irell.com
 1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900
 Los Angeles, CA 90067
 Telephone: (650)752-1700
 Facsimile: (650)752-1800

Rebecca Carson (254105)
rcarson@irell.com
 Kevin Wang (318024)
kwang@irell.com
 840 Newport Center Drive, Suite 400
 Newport Beach, CA 92660
 Telephone: (949)760-0991
 Facsimile: (949)760-5200

Attorneys for Defendant
 JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 15 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

16 FINJAN, INC.
 17 Plaintiff,
 18 v.
 19 JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.
 20 Defendant.

Case No. 3:17-cv-05659-WHA
**STIPULATED [PROPOSED]
 PROTECTIVE ORDER [WITH
 COMPETING PROVISIONS]**

21
 22
 23 1. PURPOSES AND LIMITATIONS

24 Disclosure and discovery activity in this action are likely to involve production of
 25 confidential, proprietary, or private information for which special protection from public
 26 disclosure and from use for any purpose other than prosecuting this litigation may be warranted.
 27 This Order does not confer blanket protections on all disclosures or responses to discovery and
 28 the protection it affords from public disclosure and use extends only to the limited information or

1 items that are entitled to confidential treatment under the applicable legal principles. As set forth
2 in Section 14.4 below, this Protective Order does not entitle the Parties to file confidential
3 information under seal; Civil Local Rule 79-5 sets forth the procedures that must be followed and
4 the standards that will be applied when a party seeks permission from the court to file material
5 under seal.

6 2. DEFINITIONS

7 2.1 Challenging Party: a Party or Non-Party that challenges the designation of
8 information or items under this Order.

9 2.2 “CONFIDENTIAL” Information or Items: information (regardless of how it is
10 generated, stored or maintained) or tangible things that qualify for protection under Federal Rule
11 of Civil Procedure 26(c).

12 2.3 Counsel (without qualifier): Outside Counsel of Record and House Counsel (as
13 well as their support staff).

14 2.4 Designated House Counsel: House Counsel who seek access to “HIGHLY
15 CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY” information in this matter.

16 2.5 Designating Party: a Party or Non-Party that designates information or items that it
17 produces in disclosures or in responses to discovery as “CONFIDENTIAL,” “HIGHLY
18 CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY,” or “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – SOURCE
19 CODE.”

20 2.6 Disclosure or Discovery Material: all items or information, regardless of the
21 medium or manner in which it is generated, stored, or maintained (including, among other things,
22 testimony, transcripts, and tangible things), that are produced or generated in disclosures or
23 responses to discovery in this matter.

24 2.7 Expert: a person with specialized knowledge or experience in a matter pertinent to
25 the litigation who (1) has been retained by a Party or its counsel to serve as an expert witness or
26 as a consultant in this action, (2) is not a past or current employee of a Party **[Juniper’s proposal**
27

28

1 as found in Patent Local Rule 2-2 Interim Model Protective Order¹: or a Party's
2 competitor][Finjan's proposal: (3) is not a current employee of a Party's competitor or has not
3 been an employee of a Party's competitor for at least five years],² and (4) at the time of retention,
4 is not anticipated to become an employee of a Party or of a Party's competitor.

5 _____
6 ¹ **Juniper proposes** following the default Model Protective Order because Courts in this District
7 have already considered Finjan's arguments and determined that "Former employees of a party or
8 competitor shall not serve as experts." *Finjan, Inc. v. Bitdefender Inc.*, Case No. 4:17-cv-04790-
9 HSG, Dkt. No. 65 at p. 1 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 5, 2018); *see also Corley v. Google, Inc.*, 2016 WL
10 3421402, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Jun. 22, 2016) (finding "it would create an unnecessary risk of competitive
11 harm if the court permitted Plaintiffs to hire the former employees of Google's competitors as
12 experts"); *TVIIM, LLC v. McAfee, Inc.*, 2014 WL 2768641, at *2 (N.D. Cal. June 18, 2014) ("This
13 district **clearly requires** that an 'expert' under the Protective Order may not be 'a past or current
14 employee of a Party or of a Party's competitor...."). The substantial risk of potential disclosure by
15 individuals with relationships with party competitors is why the Model Protective Order includes
16 such a prohibition by default, and Finjan as "the party requesting to deviate from the Interim
17 Model Protective Order bears the burden of showing the specific harm and prejudice that will
18 result if its request is not granted." *Verinata Health, Inc. v. Ariosa Diagnostics, Inc.*, No. C 12-
19 05501 SI, 2013 WL 5663434, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 17, 2013); *see also Dynetix Design Solutions,*
20 *Inc. v. Synopsys, Inc.*, No. C-11-05973 PSG, 2012 WL 1232105, at *2 (N.D. Cal. April 12, 2012).
21 Juniper's position with regard to Dr. Cole will be set forth in full in its forthcoming opposition to
22 Finjan's letter brief on the issue (*see* Dkt. Nos. 49 and 50). To be sure, however, any alleged
23 burden to Finjan in excluding Dr. Cole from reviewing Juniper's confidential documents and
24 source code is belied by the fact that Finjan has already disclosed, and Juniper has not objected to,
25 three other experts, one of which has already reviewed Juniper's confidential source code.
26 Moreover, Finjan's contention that Dr. Cole could not participate in the case is unfounded, as he
27 can still serve as an expert on issues that do not require access to Juniper's confidential
28 documents and source code, such and invalidity or marking.

29 ² **Finjan's proposal** of a 5-year limitation on past employees of a competitor is reasonable and
30 supported by multiple Courts in this District, including, e.g. *Finjan v. SonicWall*, No. 17-cv-
31 04467-BLF, Dkt. No. 68 at *3 (N.D. Cal. 2018); *Finjan v. Cisco*, No. 15-cv-00072-BLF, Dkt. No.
32 97 at *2 (N.D. Cal. 2018). Barring *any* former employee of *any* competitor from becoming an
33 expert in this case, without regard to time, is unreasonable. Juniper admitted during meet and
34 confers on this topic that most experts in this field have worked for at least one competitor at
35 some point in their careers. This Court has noted the risk of preempting qualified experts with
36 industry experience from the field. *See Life Tech. Corp. v. Biosearch Techs., Inc.*, No. 12-00852-
37 WHA (JCS), 2012 WL 1604710, at *9 (N.D. Cal. May 7, 2012) (noting: "this concern is
38 especially important in high-technology patent infringement cases"). This Court has also noted
39 the risk of using this provision in the model order to preclude experts for illegitimate purposes.
40 *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. EMC Corp.*, 330 F. Supp. 2d 1087, 1092, 1095 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 10,
41 2004)) (noting parties "might be tempted to create a purported conflict for the sole purpose of
42 preventing their adversaries from hiring particular experts"). Juniper is attempting to use its
43 proposal to try and preclude Finjan from using its expert, Dr. Eric Cole, from participating in this
44 case merely because he worked for McAfee for one year nearly a decade ago. This is despite the
45 fact that Dr. Cole, a holder of multiple top-secret security clearances and an advisor to President
46 Obama, has proven trustworthiness and is bound by the confidentiality terms of Exhibit A to the
47 protective order, and disqualifying Dr. Cole would work substantial prejudice to Finjan. Finjan
48 filed a letter brief asking the Court to overrule Juniper's objections to Dr. Cole serving as an
49 expert on April 9, 2018 at Dkt. No. 49.

1 2.8 “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY” Information or
 2 Items: extremely sensitive “Confidential Information or Items,” disclosure of which to another
 3 Party or Non-Party would create a substantial risk of serious harm that could not be avoided by
 4 less restrictive means. If a Producing Party designates non-technical, purely financial or license
 5 information as “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY” the Receiving
 6 Party may challenge the non-technical portions of that Information or Items as
 7 “CONFIDENTIAL” (defined in Section 2.2) under Section 6 below.

8 2.9 “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – SOURCE CODE” Information or Items:
 9 extremely sensitive “Confidential Information or Items” representing computer code (code that is
 10 compiled or interpreted) and associated comments and revision histories, [**Juniper’s proposal as**
 11 **found in Patent Local Rule 2-2 Interim Model Protective Order**: formulas, engineering
 12 specifications, or schematics that define or otherwise describe in detail the algorithms or structure
 13 of software or hardware designs,]³⁴ disclosure of which to another Party or Non-Party would
 14 create a substantial risk of serious harm that could not be avoided by less restrictive means.

15 _____
 16 ³ **Juniper proposes** following the default Model Protective Order and Finjan as “the party
 17 requesting to deviate from the Interim Model Protective Order bears the burden of showing the
 18 specific harm and prejudice that will result if its request is not granted.” *Verinata Health, Inc. v.*
 19 *Ariosa Diagnostics, Inc.*, No. C 12-05501 SI, 2013 WL 5663434, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 17, 2013);
 20 *see also Dynetix Design Solutions, Inc. v. Synopsys, Inc.*, No. C-11-05973 PSG, 2012 WL
 21 1232105, at *2 (N.D. Cal. April 12, 2012). Finjan’s proposal deviates from the Model Protective
 22 Order because of an unsupported and vague allegation about the potential for “abuse” without
 23 providing any concrete examples or explanation of potential prejudice other than slight logistical
 24 inconvenience to Finjan. Finjan’s complaint about printing limits is also unfounded; Finjan has
 25 not identified a single page of source code or technical documentation that it must print, and the
 26 parties have stipulated under Section 9(e) below to a procedure by which Finjan can exceed the
 27 default 750-page printing limit if necessary.

28 ⁴ **Finjan’s Position**: Finjan’s proposal should be adopted because the definition of source code
 will impede the production of technical documents which do not contain any source code, but
 merely describe the operation of the products. Allowing such technical documents to be
 produced only on a stand-alone computer would severely prejudice Finjan given the accelerated
 nature of this case. Source code should be restricted to actual source code (code that is compiled
 or interpreted) and material that is typically included in the source code, such as comments or
 revision histories. Allowing for formulas, engineering specifications, or schematics is ripe for
 abuse, as these terms are not well defined and could allow standard development documents to be
 designated as source code, which could severely restrict the ease of accessing material that is
 routinely produced in patent cases involving software and regarding the design and development
 of the accused products. Furthermore, as design documents can be lengthy, this could potentially
 require additional pages of source code to be print in addition to the 750 pages currently agreed
 upon between the parties.

1 2.10 House Counsel: attorneys who are employees of a party to this action. House
2 Counsel does not include Outside Counsel of Record or any other outside counsel.

3 2.11 Non-Party: any natural person, partnership, corporation, association, or other legal
4 entity not named as a Party to this action.

5 2.12 Outside Counsel of Record: attorneys who are not employees of a party to this
6 action but are retained to represent or advise a party to this action and have appeared in this action
7 on behalf of that party or are affiliated with a law firm which has appeared on behalf of that party.

8 2.13 Party: any party to this action, including all of its officers, directors, employees,
9 consultants, retained experts, and Outside Counsel of Record (and their support staffs).

10 2.14 Producing Party: a Party or Non-Party that produces Disclosure or Discovery
11 Material in this action.

12 2.15 Professional Vendors: persons or entities that provide litigation support services
13 (e.g., photocopying, videotaping, translating, preparing exhibits or demonstrations, and
14 organizing, storing, or retrieving data in any form or medium) and their employees and
15 subcontractors.

16 2.16 Protected Material: any Disclosure or Discovery Material that is designated as
17 “CONFIDENTIAL,” “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY,” or
18 “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – SOURCE CODE.”

19 2.17 Receiving Party: a Party that receives Disclosure or Discovery Material from a
20 Producing Party.

21 3. SCOPE

22 The protections conferred by this Order cover not only Protected Material (as defined
23 above), but also (1) any information copied or extracted from Protected Material; (2) all copies,
24 excerpts, summaries, or compilations of Protected Material; and (3) any testimony, conversations,
25 or presentations by Parties or their Counsel that might reveal Protected Material. However, the
26 protections conferred by this Order do not cover the following information: (a) any information
27 that is in the public domain at the time of disclosure to a Receiving Party or becomes part of the
28 public domain after its disclosure to a Receiving Party as a result of publication not involving a

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.