

1 Juanita R. Brooks (CA SBN 75934), brooks@fr.com
Frank J. Albert (CA SBN 247741), albert@fr.com
2 Oliver J. Richards (CA SBN 310972), ojr@fr.com
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
3 12860 El Camino Real, Suite 400
4 San Diego, CA 92130
Telephone: (858) 678-5070 / Fax: (858) 678-5099

5 Robert Courtney (CA SBN 248392), courtney@fr.com
6 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
60 South Sixth Street, Suite 3200
7 Minneapolis, MN 55402
8 Tel: (612) 335-5070 / Fax: (612) 288-9696

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff, FINJAN, INC.

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

12 FINJAN, INC.,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.,

16 Defendant.

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

FINJAN, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO JUNIPER
NETWORKS, INC.'S MOTION FOR
ATTORNEYS' FEES PURSUANT TO 35
U.S.C. § 285

Date: January 7, 2021

Time: 8:00 a.m.

U.S. District Judge William H. Alsup
Courtroom 12

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1			
2	INTRODUCTION		1
3	BACKGROUND		2
4	I. FINJAN AND THE ASSERTED PATENTS		2
5	II. THIS CASE’S HISTORY		4
6	III. FINJAN’S APPEAL		5
7	LEGAL STANDARD		5
8	ARGUMENT		6
9	I. JUNIPER IS NOT ENTITLED TO ATTORNEYS FEES		6
10	A. Finjan’s Infringement Case Was Rooted in the Evidence		
11	and the Law, and No Part of It Was “Exceptional” Under §		
	285		7
12	1. As to the ’494 Patent, Finjan won on all but one		
13	limitation at summary judgment, and presented		
14	reasonable evidence that the accused Juniper		
	products met the last limitation.		7
15	a) Finjan’s good faith prosecution of its		
16	infringement case turned on a single		
	limitation that went to the jury.....		7
17	b) Nothing about Finjan’s ’494 infringement		
	case warrants fee-shifting.....		9
18	2. Finjan’s infringement case for the ’780 Patent was		
19	based on a claim construction adopted by other		
	district courts, which this Court rejected.....		10
20	3. Finjan’s ’154 case was based on a reasonable		
21	construction of the claim language.....		11
22	a) Finjan’s ’154 loss resulted from the Court		
23	deciding two reasonably disputed issues of		
	claim construction.		12
24	b) Nothing about Finjan’s ’154 infringement		
	case warrants fee shifting.		13
25	B. Finjan’s Damages Case Had Ample Legal and Factual		
26	Support, and No Part of It Was “Exceptional” Under § 285		14
27	1. Finjan’s reliance on its damages expert was		
28	reasonable and, after the Court excluded that expert		
	a week before trial, Finjan’s presentation of a fact-		
	only damages case was also reasonable		15

1 a) There is no basis for fee-shifting in
 2 Finjan’s reliance on Mr. Arst’s damages
 model prior to its exclusion..... 16

3 b) There is no basis for fee-shifting in Finjan’s
 4 attempt to establish ’494 damages at trial on
 a fact-only basis 17

5 2. As to ’780 damages, Finjan’s plan to rely on actual
 6 and constructive notice to establish pre-expiration
 damages was reasonable. 19

7 a) Finjan’s pre-complaint notice case
 8 reasonably relied on undisputed
 9 communications with Juniper’s predecessor
 that named both the patent and the accused
 10 product, and there was no dispute of
 Finjan’s pre-complaint marking. 19

11 b) Finjan’s case for actual notice under the ’780
 Patent was reasonable and good-faith..... 20

12 c) Finjan’s case for constructive notice under
 13 the ’780 Patent was reasonable and good-
 faith..... 21

14 C. Finjan’s Dismissal of Remaining Claims Promoted
 15 Efficiency, Conferred a Windfall to Juniper, and Reflects
 Neither a Lack of Merit Nor Bad Faith 22

16 D. Juniper’s Claims of Procedural Wastage are Meritless 23

17 E. Finjan’s Appeal Was Not “Exceptional” Under § 285 24

18 IV. JUNIPER’S CALCULATION OF FEES IS UNREASONABLE..... 24

19 V. ANY DETERMINATION OF FEES MUST INVOLVE
 20 FINJAN’S PRIOR COUNSEL..... 25

21 CONCLUSION..... 25

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

1

2

3

4 *Auto. Techs. Int’l, Inc. v. Siemens VDO Auto. Corp.*,

5 744 F. Supp. 2d 646 (E.D. Mich. 2010).....23

6 *Blue Coat Sys., Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.*,

7 IPR2016-00492 (PTAB June 8, 2016).....3

8 *Checkpoint Sys., Inc. v. All-Tag Sec. S.A.*,

9 858 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....9

10 *Deepsouth Packing Co. v. Laitram Corp.*,

11 406 U.S. 518 (1972).....15

12 *Eon-Net LP v. Flagstar Bancorp.*,

13 653 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....13

14 *Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat System, Inc.*,

15 2015 WL 3630000 (N.D. Cal. June 2, 2015)11, 12

16 *Finjan Software, Ltd. v. Secure Computing Corp.*,

17 (D. Del. Mar. 28, 2008).....3

18 *Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Sys., Inc.*, No. 13-cv-3999, slip op. (N.D. Cal. Aug. 19,

19 2016),3

20 *Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Sys., LLC*, No. 15-cv-03295, slip op. (N.D. Cal. Dec. 13,

21 2016), ECF #1563

22 *Finjan, Inc. v. Secure Computing Corp.*,

23 626 F.3d 1197 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....16

24 *Finjan, Inc. v. Secure Computing Corp.*,

25 879 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2018)2, 22

26 *Finjan, Inc. v. Sophos Inc.*, No. 14-cv-1197,

27 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 31, 2016).....3, 4, 5

28 *Forest Laboratories, Inc. v. Abbott Laboratories.*,

339 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....6

Gart v. Logitech, Inc.,

254 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....21

Juniper Networks, Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.,

IPR2019-00031 (PTAB Mar. 25, 2019).....3

1	<i>Maxwell v. J. Baker, Inc.</i> ,	
2	86 F.3d 1098 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	22
3	<i>Monsanto Co. v. Bowman</i> ,	
4	657 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2011), <i>aff'd</i> , 569 U.S. 278 (2013)	21
5	<i>Nat'l Presto Indus., Inc. v. West Bend Co.</i> ,	
6	76 F.3d 1185 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	5
7	<i>Octane Fitness, LLC v. ICON Health & Fitness, Inc.</i> ,	
8	572 U.S. 545 (2014).....	5, 6, 19
9	<i>Powell v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc.</i> ,	
10	663 F.3d 1221 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	16
11	<i>Palo Alto Networks, Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00159 (PTAB Apr. 11, 2017),	
12	<i>aff'd</i> , 777 F. App'x 501 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	3, 19
13	<i>Palo Alto Networks, Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.</i> ,	
14	IPR2015-01979 (PTAB Mar. 15, 2017)	3
15	<i>Palo Alto Networks, Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.</i> ,	
16	IPR2016-00151 (PTAB Mar. 15, 2017).....	3
17	<i>Palo Alto Networks, Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.</i> ,	
18	IPR2016-00165 (PTAB Apr. 21, 2016).....	3
19	<i>Prism Techs. LLC v. Sprint Spectrum L.P.</i> ,	
20	849 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	16
21	<i>ResQNet.com, Inc. v. Lansa, Inc.</i> ,	
22	594 F.3d 860 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	9
23	<i>SRI Int'l, Inc. v. Advanced Tech. Labs., Inc.</i> ,	
24	127 F.3d 1462 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	20
25	<i>State Indus., Inc. v. Mor-Flo Indus., Inc.</i> ,	
26	883 F.2d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	17, 18
27	<i>Symantec Corp. v. Finjan, Inc.</i> , No. IPR2015-01892, slip op. (PTAB Mar. 15,	
28	2017), <i>aff'd</i> , 777 F. App'x 501 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	3
	<i>Thorner v. Sony Computer Entm't Am. LLC</i> ,	
	669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	13
	<i>Tech. for Energy Corp. v. Hardy</i> ,	
	2018 WL 8460252 (E.D. Tenn. Feb. 15, 2018)	23
	<i>Wedgetail Ltd. v. Huddleston Deluxe, Inc.</i> ,	
	576 F.3d 1302 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	6

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.