

Exhibit E

Caridis, Alyssa

From: Kastens, Kris <KKastens@KRAMERLEVIN.com>
Sent: Monday, April 8, 2019 11:52 AM
To: Caridis, Alyssa; Hannah, James; Andre, Paul; Kobialka, Lisa; Manes, Austin
Cc: Roberts, Clement; Cheever, Frances; Brewer, Evan; Burleigh, Miwako
Subject: RE: Finjan v Check Point -- Motion Practice re: Amended Infringement Contentions

Hi Alyssa,

We're honestly confused by your claimed deficiencies. Are you available tomorrow afternoon to go over these in person? We're having a hard time responding to your request to postpone claim construction and a 30(b)(6) deposition without more details on exactly what you actually believe is deficient.

Additionally, Finjan would also like to go over the deficiencies in Check Point Invalidity Contentions during this meeting as well. In particular, Check Point has failed to: (1) identify what in the art it claims meets each element, (2) has not adequately identified its obviousness theories (insufficient identified of what and how art is combined), and (3) has not provided citations to source code for its products.

I suggest that we meet sometime tomorrow afternoon at our office to go over these issues. We'll bring a copy of Check Point Invalidity contentions tagged at the sections we want to discuss, and you can bring a copy of Finjan's infringement contentions. Let us know if this works or if you have an alternative proposal.

- Kris

Kris Kastens

Partner

Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP

990 Marsh Road, Menlo Park, California 94025

T 650.752.1715 F 650.752.1815

kkastens@kramerlevin.com

[Bio](#)

This communication (including any attachments) is intended solely for the recipient(s) named above and may contain information that is confidential, privileged or legally protected. Any unauthorized use or dissemination of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by return e-mail message and delete all copies of the original communication. Thank you for your cooperation.

From: Caridis, Alyssa
Sent: Friday, April 5, 2019 4:52 PM
To: Hannah, James ; Andre, Paul ; Kobialka, Lisa ; Kastens, Kris ; Manes, Austin
Cc: Roberts, Clement ; Cheever, Frances ; Brewer, Evan ; Burleigh, Miwako
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Finjan v Check Point -- Motion Practice re: Amended Infringement Contentions

Counsel,

Check Point is in receipt of Finjan's Amended Infringement Contentions, dated April 1, 2019. Though our review is ongoing, it is already apparent that these contentions fail to comply with Patent Local Rule 3-1(c), the Court's Order Re Case Narrowing and Infringement Contentions, and the Court's Order requiring Finjan to amend its original infringement contentions. Examples of the deficiencies include:


- Failing to organize the contentions on an instrumentality-by-instrumentality or specifically identified combination-by-combination basis;
- The use of open ended contentions;
- Failing to cite any code for various purportedly accused instrumentalities; and
- Including new products without good cause.

Check Point intends to seek relief from the Court. Given the upcoming claim construction deadlines (and in light of the Court's recognition that claim construction should not proceed until appropriate contentions are exchanged (*see* 2.3.19 Transcript at 17:11-13)), Check Point requests that Finjan agree to a stipulation extending the currently-set claim construction deadlines for 45 days to allow time for the Court to hear and rule on our anticipated motion. Please let us know by April 9, 2019 whether Finjan will agree to such a stipulation. If it does not, we will file an opposed motion with the Court while we seek to resolve the underlying issues.

In addition, to the extent Finjan believes that it needs a 30(b)(6) deposition to correct the above identified deficiencies please provide a list of the 30(b)(6) questions that Finjan contends would be necessary and a date next week when we can meet and confer on that topic. As per the Court's order (*see* 2.3.19 Transcript at 14:9-17), to the extent we cannot agree on either the specific questions or whether a 30(b)(6) deposition is relevant to the identified deficiencies, the Court has ordered us to submit a 5 page letter brief on the issue.

Best,
Alyssa Caridis

Alyssa Caridis
Intellectual Property
Partner

Orrick
[Los Angeles](#) 
T 2136122372
acaridis@orrick.com



NOTICE TO RECIPIENT | This e-mail is meant for only the intended recipient of the transmission, and may be a communication privileged by law. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately of the error by return e-mail and please delete this message from your system. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

For more information about Orrick, please visit <http://www.orrick.com>.

In the course of our business relationship, we may collect, store and transfer information about you. Please see our privacy policy at <https://www.orrick.com/Privacy-Policy> to learn about how we use this information.