Exhibit 9

DR. ERIC B. COLE   June 21, 2018
FINJAN, INC. V JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC   1

```
 1              THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

 2              NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

 3                  SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

 4      ---------------------------X

 5   FINJAN, INC., a Delaware

 6   Corporation,

 7            Plaintiff,

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

 9   JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC., a

10   Delaware Corporation,

11            Defendant.

12      ---------------------------X

13              Videotaped Deposition of

14                 DR. ERIC B. COLE

15

16              Herndon, Virginia 20171

17              Thursday, June 21, 2018

18                   8:00 a.m.

19

20

21   Denise Dobner Vickery, RMR, CRR

22   JOB NO. J2328299
```

1   THE WITNESS: So what we're

2   saying that what infringes is ResultsDB.   ResultsDB

3   has two components.   It has a management component

4   and a database component.

5   And then if we go to page 21 line

6   14 at the end:

7   "The ResultsDB Database includes

8   database components, that are used together as a

9   database for the results of the analysis."   And

10   these databases include MySQL database, a Dynamo

11   database, and an S3 database.

12   Q.   Have you done any analysis to determine

13   whether any of these components -- the MySQL

14   database, DynamoDB, and S3 -- independently would

15   infringe Claim 10?

16   MR. KASTENS: Objection.   Form.

17   THE WITNESS: That analysis was

18   not performed.

19   BY MS. CARSON:

20   Q.   Could you take a look at paragraph --

21   strike that.

22   Could you take a look at paragraph 61.