

1 PAUL ANDRE (State Bar No. 196585)
pandre@kramerlevin.com
2 LISA KOBIALKA (State Bar No. 191404)
lkobialka@kramerlevin.com
3 JAMES HANNAH (State Bar No. 237978)
jhannah@kramerlevin.com
4 KRISTOPHER KASTENS (State Bar No. 254797)
kkastens@kramerlevin.com
5 AUSTIN MANES (State Bar No. 284065)
amanes@kramerlevin.com
6 KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP
7 990 Marsh Road
8 Menlo Park, CA 94025
9 Telephone: (650) 752-1700
Facsimile: (650) 752-1800

10 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
11 FINJAN, INC.

12 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
13 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
14 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

15 FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 CHECK POINT SOFTWARE
19 TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a Delaware
20 Corporation; CHECK POINT SOFTWARE
21 TECHNOLOGIES LTD., an Israeli Limited
22 Company,

23 Defendants.

Case No.: 3:18-cv-02621-WHO

**PLAINTIFF FINJAN, INC.’S NOTICE OF
MOTION AND MOTION TO CERTIFY THE
COURT’S JANUARY 17, 2020, ORDER
(DKT. 247) FOR INTERLOCUTORY
APPEAL, TO STAY, AND TO PERMIT
LIMITED DISCOVERY; MEMORANDUM
OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

Date: April 22, 2020
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Location: Courtroom 2, 17th Floor
Judge: Hon. William H. Orrick

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION2

II. SUMMARY OF THE FACTS4

III. ARGUMENT7

 A. The Court Should Certify the Order for Interlocutory Appeal7

 1. The Order Raises a Controlling Question of Law7

 2. Substantial Grounds for a Difference of Opinion Exist.....8

 a) The Court required Source Code Pin-Cites for All Elements.....8

 b) Other Courts Do Not Require Source Code Pin-Cites for All Elements10

 3. An Interlocutory Appeal Will Materially Advance this Case.....13

 B. The Court Should Stay this Case Pending Interlocutory Appeal.....14

 C. The Court Should Permit Finjan to Take Limited Discovery Into
 Check Point’s Use of Source Code While the Case is Otherwise Stayed15

IV. CONCLUSION.....17

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Page(s)****Federal Cases**

1		
2		
3		
4	<i>Ahrenholz v. Bd. of Trustees of Univ. of Illinois,</i>	
5	219 F.3d 674 (7th Cir. 2000)	8
6	<i>Banneck v. Fed. Nat'l Mortg. Ass'n,</i>	
7	No. 17-CV-04657-WHO, 2018 WL 5603632 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 29, 2018).....	13, 14
8	<i>Baron Servs., Inc. v. Media Weather Innovations LLC,</i>	
9	717 F.3d 907 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	16, 17
10	<i>In re Cement Antitrust Litig.,</i>	
11	673 F.2d 1020 (9th Cir. 1982)	7, 8
12	<i>Couch v. Telescope Inc.,</i>	
13	611 F.3d 629 (9th Cir. 2010)	8
14	<i>Finjan v. Proofpoint,</i>	
15	No. 13-cv-05808-HSG, 2015 WL 9023166 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 16, 2015)	10, 11, 12
16	<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Sophos, Inc.,</i>	
17	No. 3:14-cv-01197-WHO, Dkt. 103 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 24, 2015)	3, 10
18	<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Zscaler, Inc.,</i>	
19	Case No. 17-cv-06946-JST, Dkt. 58 (N.D. Cal. June 26, 2018).....	10, 11
20	<i>Hilgraeve Corp. v. McAfee Associates, Inc.,</i>	
21	224 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	16
22	<i>Hunt v. Cromartie,</i>	
23	526 U.S. 541 (1999).....	16
24	<i>Landis v. North Am. Co.,</i>	
25	299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936).....	14
26	<i>Lexar Media, Inc. v. Fuji Photo Film USA, Inc.,</i>	
27	No. C03-00355 MJJ, 2007 WL 677166 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 1, 2007)	16
28	<i>Network Appliance, Inc. v. Bluearc Corp.,</i>	
	No. C 03-5665 MHP, 2005 WL 1513099 (N.D. Cal. June 27, 2005),	
	<i>aff'd</i> , 205 F. App'x 835 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	15
	<i>Network Caching Tech. LLC v. Novell Inc.,</i>	
	No. C-01-2079-VRW, 2002 WL 32126128 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 13, 2002).....	11

1 *Network Caching Tech., LLC v. Novell, Inc.*,
 No. C-01-2079 VRW, 2003 WL21699799 (N.D. Cal. March 21, 2003)3

2 *O2 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Monolithic Power Sys., Inc.*,
 3 467 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....7, 8

4 *Reese v. BP Exploration (Alaska) Inc.*,
 5 643 F.3d 681 (9th Cir. 2011)13

6 *Renesas Tech. Corp. v. Nanya Tech. Corp.*,
 No. C03-05709JF(HRL), 2005 WL2000926 (N.D. Cal. Aug 18, 2005)3

7 *Shurance v. Planning Control Int'l, Inc.*,
 8 839 F.2d 1347 (9th Cir. 1988)8

9 *Thomas Swan & Co. v. Finisar Corp.*,
 No. 2:13-CV-178-JRG, 2014 WL 12599221 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 16, 2014)12, 13

10 *Vasudevan Software, Inc. v. Int'l Bus. Machines Corp.*,
 11 No. C09-05897 RS HRL, 2011 WL 940263 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 18, 2011).....10

12 *Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. & Eng'g, Inc.*,
 13 200 F.3d 795 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....16

14 *Wi-Lan Inc. v. Sharp Elecs. Corp.*,
 15 1:15-cv-00379-LPS (Jan. 26, 2018 D. Del.)12

16 *In re Wilson*,
 No. BR 13-11374 AJ, 2014 WL 122074 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 10, 2014)8

17 *Zyme Solutions, Inc. v. InfoNow Corp.*,
 18 No. C 13-04082 WHA, 2013 WL 6699997 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 19, 2013).....14

19 **Federal Statutes**

20 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b)1, 7, 8

21 **Rules**

22 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 3716

23 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 56.....16

24 Patent Local Rule 3-1..... *passim*

25 Patent Local Rule 3-4.....2, 6, 9

26

27

28

Other

The History, Content, Application and Influence of the Northern District of California's Patent Local Rules, Santa Clara High Technology Law Journal, Vol. 25, Issue 4, Article 8 (James Ware, Brian Davy 2009).....4, 6, 12

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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.