```
Pages 1-24
 1
                      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                     NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 2
                         SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
 3
 4
    FINJAN, INC., a Delaware
                                    Case No. 17-cv-05659-WHA
    Corporation,
 5
                                    San Francisco, California
                Plaintiff,
                                     Courtroom A, 15th Floor
 6
                                     Wednesday, May 29, 2019
         v.
 7
    JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC., a
    Delaware Corporation,
9
                Defendant.
10
11
               TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONIC DISCOVERY HEARING
                 BEFORE THE HONORABLE THOMAS S. HIXSON
12
                     UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
13
14
   APPEARANCES:
   For Plaintiff:
15
                                 JAMES R. HANNAH, ESQ.
                                 LISA KOBIALKA, ESQ.
16
                                 Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel, LLP
                                 990 Marsh Road
17
                                 Menlo Park, California 94025
                                 (650) 752-1700
18
    For Defendant:
                                 HARRY A. MITTLEMAN, ESQ.
19
                                 Irell & Manella, LLP
                                 1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900
2.0
                                 Los Angeles, California 90067-4276
                                 (310) 277-1010
21
    Transcription Service:
                                 Peggy Schuerger
22
                                 Ad Hoc Reporting
                                 2220 Otay Lakes Road, Suite 502-85
23
                                 Chula Vista, California 91915
                                 (619) 236-9325
24
    Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript
   produced by transcription service.
```



the order. And the order said that it was "to give Juniper a fighting chance to review materials to prepare for the deposition."

And what happened is that we did not get the full production on Monday as delivered. We got a production at 7:00 p.m. that night which we thought would be well after the hours when (indiscernible). And then we got a second production the day after the first deadline. At a quarter to 5:00 p.m., another production came in which was both untimely in terms of the order as well as something that we could not practically begin to go through and review and make copies and then sit down for a deposition in Richmond.

Now, that deposition was scheduled in Richmond for tomorrow. But we don't have the materials and didn't have the materials necessary for that.

And, in addition, Your Honor, there's one other issue, which is that I spoke with one of the partners at the Kramer Levin firm yesterday and explained that for the first time in I think about 24 years where I've practiced law, I have a medical condition that has come up that makes it so I couldn't get on the plane today. I went to -- without getting into the details (indiscernible), I spent hours at the emergency room urgent care yesterday. I'm going back on Friday to see a cardiologist. And he prescribed a bunch of medications that are soporific in nature. And for all of these reasons -- because we didn't get the documents on the Court-

2.0

ordered deadline, and I'm not in a position to be in Richmond tomorrow because of my medical issue, we thought could we set the date for a different date. We offered I believe 21 different dates in June and July. None of the dates apparently have been acceptable to counsel for Ms. Bey, although it appears that she is available on a number of those dates.

And as a result, they are requesting that the deposition proceed without me and taking it tomorrow in Richmond. And it's for that reason, because that's (indiscernible), given the circumstances, and not consistent with the Court's order, I reluctantly sought the Court's intervention.

I just wanted to take one of the 21 other dates that we've chosen and just move on and get this done.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you for that explanation. Mr. Hannah, can I hear from your point of view?

MR. HANNAH: Your Honor, frankly, I'd like us to move on and go forward. So what we said was do the deposition by video conference or telephone.

So we were not notified for this change in the deposition due to this medical emergency until we were already on the plane. I'm sitting here in Richmond, Virginia right now.

And what happened was he called a partner -- he did call my partner and he said that he had, you know, this medical issue and that he didn't want to have to travel because he wanted to move up a doctor's appointment. My partner asked him, "Is it life-



2.2

threatening? Is there anything you'd like ..."

From what I understand, he said to my partner, he said, "No, it's not life-threatening." He said, "You know what? I can probably just tough it out."

So we get to -- we thought that issue was resolved. So we get to Richmond and then we get a lengthy email from one of the associates that, given to this medical condition and there's some -- at some point, there's something about three entries of the privileged log had cut-off words, which we promptly told them was the words "with client" in those three entries, so I'm not sure we talked about any documents produced late.

There was nothing that was produced late. There was something that -- I had a reformatting error that just had to work with -- with clients on there, and then there were four email chains that were not on the privileged log, and all of those were given to them today.

And so we're sitting here in Virginia and we said, Okay, we'll let's just move -- let's just move on with the deposition and do it by video conference or phone, and he just never responded to that. That's his typical practice.

They can -- you know, they can email the documents to a court reporting service here. The court reporter takes the exhibits. They hand them to the witness as the deposition -- as I'm sure Your Honor has done depositions this way before -- and we move on with the deposition.



2.0

DOCKET

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.

