

1 EDWARD G. POPLAWSKI (SBN 113590)
epoplawski@wsgr.com
2 OLIVIA M. KIM (SBN 228382)
okim@wsgr.com
3 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
4 Professional Corporation
633 West Fifth Street, Suite 1550
5 Los Angeles, CA 90071
Telephone: (323) 210-2900
6 Facsimile: (866) 974-7329

7 RYAN R. SMITH (SBN 229323)
rsmith@wsgr.com
8 CHRISTOPHER D. MAYS (SBN 266510)
9 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
Professional Corporation
10 650 Page Mill Road
11 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050
Telephone: (650) 493-9300
12 Facsimile: (650) 493-6811

13 *Attorneys for Defendant*
14 QUALYS INC.

15 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
16 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
17 **OAKLAND DIVISION**

18
19 FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,) CASE NO.: 4:18-cv-07229-YGR
20 Plaintiff,)
21 v.) **DEFENDANT QUALYS INC.'S**
22 QUALYS INC., a Delaware Corporation,) **SECOND AMENDED ANSWER TO**
23 Defendant.) **COMPLAINT AND**
24) **COUNTERCLAIMS**
25) **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**
26)
27)
28)

1 Defendant Qualys Inc. (“Qualys”), by and through its undersigned attorneys, hereby files
2 its second amended answer and asserted counterclaims in response to the Complaint filed by
3 Plaintiff Finjan, Inc. (“Finjan”) as follows:

4 **SECOND AMENDED ANSWER TO COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

5 **THE PARTIES**

6 1. Qualys admits that, upon information and belief, Finjan is a Delaware corporation,
7 with its principal place of business at 2000 University Ave., Suite 600, East Palo Alto, California
8 94303.

9 2. Qualys admits that it is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business
10 at 919 E. Hillsdale Boulevard, 4th Floor, Foster City, California 94404.

11 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

12 3. Qualys admits that Finjan’s Complaint purports to be an action for patent
13 infringement under the patent laws of the United States of America, Title 35 of the United States
14 Code. Qualys admits that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331
15 and 1338. Qualys denies any and all remaining allegations in paragraph 3 of the Complaint.

16 4. Qualys admits that venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C § 1400(b).
17 Qualys denies any and all remaining allegations in paragraph 4 of the Complaint.

18 5. Qualys admits that this Court has personal jurisdiction over Qualys. Qualys denies
19 any and all remaining allegations in paragraph 5 of the Complaint.

20 **INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

21 6. Qualys admits that pursuant to Civil L.R. 3-2(c), Intellectual Property Actions are
22 assigned on a district-wide basis.

23 **FINJAN’S ALLEGED INNOVATIONS**

24 7. Qualys is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
25 truth of the allegations of paragraph 7 of the Complaint, and accordingly denies the same.

26 8. Qualys is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
27 truth of the allegations of paragraph 8 of the Complaint, and accordingly denies the same.
28

FINJAN'S ASSERTED PATENTS

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

9. Qualys admits that Finjan purports that U.S. Patent No. 6,154,844 (“the ’844 Patent”), titled “System and Method for Attaching a Downloadable Security Profile to a Downloadable,” was issued to Shlomo Touboul and Nachshon Gal on November 28, 2000. Qualys admits that Finjan purports that a true and correct copy of the ’844 Patent is attached to the Complaint as Exhibit 1. Qualys denies any and all remaining allegations in paragraph 9 of the Complaint.

10. Qualys admits that Finjan purports that Finjan is the owner of the ’844 Patent with all rights, title, and interest to that patent and has been the sole owner of the ’844 Patent since its issuance. Qualys denies any and all remaining allegations in paragraph 10 of the Complaint.

11. Qualys denies the allegations contained in paragraph 11 of the Complaint.

12. Qualys admits that Finjan purports that U.S. Patent No. 8,677,494 (“the ’494 Patent”), titled “Malicious Mobile Code Runtime Monitoring System and Methods,” was issued to Yigal Mordechai Edery, Nimrod Itzhak Vered, David R. Kroll, and Shlomo Touboul on March 18, 2014. Qualys admits that Finjan purports that a true and correct copy of the ’494 Patent is attached to the Complaint as Exhibit 2. Qualys denies any and all remaining allegations in paragraph 12 of the Complaint.

13. Qualys admits that Finjan purports that Finjan is the owner of the ’494 Patent with all rights, title, and interest to that patent and has been the sole owner of the ’494 Patent since its issuance. Qualys denies any and all remaining allegations in paragraph 13 of the Complaint.

14. Qualys denies the allegations contained in paragraph 14 of the Complaint.

15. Qualys admits that Finjan purports that U.S. Patent No. 7,975,305 (“the ’305 Patent”), titled “Method and System for Adaptive Rule-Based Content Scanners for Desktop Computers,” was issued to Moshe Rubin, Moshe Matitya, Artem Melnick, Shlomo Touboul, Alexander Yermakov, and Amit Shaked on July 5, 2011. Qualys admits that Finjan purports that a true and correct copy of the ’305 Patent is attached to the Complaint as Exhibit 3. Qualys denies any and all remaining allegations in paragraph 15 of the Complaint.

1 16. Qualys admits that Finjan purports that Finjan is the owner of the '305 Patent with
2 all rights, title, and interest to that patent and has been the sole owner of the '305 Patent since its
3 issuance. Qualys denies any and all remaining allegations in paragraph 16 of the Complaint.

4 17. Qualys denies the allegations contained in paragraph 17 of the Complaint.

5 18. Qualys admits that Finjan purports that U.S. Patent No. 8,225,408 (“the '408
6 Patent”), titled “Method and System for Adaptive Rule-Based Content Scanners,” was issued to
7 Moshe Rubin, Moshe Matitya, Artem Melnick, Shlomo Touboul, Alexander Yermakov, and Amit
8 Shaked on July 17, 2012. Qualys admits that Finjan purports that a true and correct copy of the
9 '408 Patent is attached to the Complaint as Exhibit 4. Qualys denies any and all remaining
10 allegations in paragraph 18 of the Complaint.

11 19. Qualys admits that Finjan purports that Finjan is the owner of the '408 Patent with
12 all rights, title, and interest to that patent and has been the sole owner of the '408 Patent since its
13 issuance. Qualys denies any and all remaining allegations in paragraph 19 of the Complaint.

14 20. Qualys denies the allegations contained in paragraph 20 of the Complaint.

15 21. Qualys admits that Finjan purports that U.S. Patent No. 6,965,968 (“the '968
16 Patent”), titled “Policy-Based Caching,” was issued to Shlomo Touboul on November 15, 2005.
17 Qualys admits that Finjan purports that a true and correct copy of the '968 Patent is attached to the
18 Complaint as Exhibit 5. Qualys denies any and all remaining allegations in paragraph 21 of the
19 Complaint.

20 22. Qualys admits that Finjan purports that Finjan is the owner of the '968 Patent with
21 all rights, title, and interest to that patent and has been the sole owner of the '968 Patent since its
22 issuance. Qualys denies any and all remaining allegations in paragraph 22 of the Complaint.

23 23. Qualys denies the allegations contained in paragraph 23 of the Complaint.

24 24. Qualys admits that Finjan purports that U.S. Patent No. 7,418,731 (“the '731
25 Patent”), titled “Method and System for Caching at Secure Gateways,” was issued to Shlomo
26 Touboul on August 26, 2008. Qualys admits that Finjan purports that a true and correct copy of
27 the '731 Patent is attached to the Complaint as Exhibit 6. Qualys denies any and all remaining
28 allegations in paragraph 24 of the Complaint.

1 25. Qualys admits that Finjan purports that Finjan is the owner of the '731 Patent with
2 all rights, title, and interest to that patent and has been the sole owner of the '731 Patent since its
3 issuance. Qualys denies any and all remaining allegations in paragraph 25 of the Complaint.

4 26. Qualys denies the allegations contained in paragraph 26 of the Complaint.

5 27. Qualys admits that Finjan purports that U.S. Patent No. 8,141,154 (“the '154
6 Patent”), titled “System and Method for Inspecting Dynamically Generated Executable Code,”
7 was issued to David Gruzman and Yuval Ben-Itzhak on March 20, 2012. Qualys admits that
8 Finjan purports that a true and correct copy of the '154 Patent is attached to the Complaint as
9 Exhibit 7. Qualys denies any and all remaining allegations in paragraph 27 of the Complaint.

10 28. Qualys admits that Finjan purports that Finjan is the owner of the '154 Patent with
11 all rights, title, and interest to that patent and has been the sole owner of the '154 Patent since its
12 issuance. Qualys denies any and all remaining allegations in paragraph 28 of the Complaint.

13 29. Qualys denies the allegations contained in paragraph 29 of the Complaint.

14 30. Qualys admits that the patents in paragraphs 9-29 of the Complaint are collectively
15 referred to as the “Asserted Patents” in the Complaint. Qualys denies any and all remaining
16 allegations in paragraph 30 of the Complaint.

17 **FINJAN’S ALLEGED NOTICE OF INFRINGEMENT TO DEFENDANT**

18 31. Qualys admits only that Finjan sent a letter dated November 12, 2015, attached as
19 Exhibit 23 to the Complaint, to Qualys, which identified the '844, '494, '305, '968, and '154
20 Patents. Qualys denies any and all remaining allegations in paragraph 31 of the Complaint.

21 32. Qualys admits only that Finjan sent a letter dated December 7, 2017, attached as
22 Exhibit 24 to the Complaint, to Qualys, which identified the '844, '494, '305, and '968 Patents.
23 Qualys denies any and all remaining allegations in paragraph 32 of the Complaint.

24 33. Qualys denies the allegations in paragraph 33 of the Complaint.

25 **QUALYS’S ALLEGEDLY INFRINGING PRODUCTS AND TECHNOLOGIES**

26 34. Qualys admits that it sells and offers to sell products and services relating to
27 “Vulnerability Management,” “Threat Protection,” “Continuous Monitoring,” “Indicators of
28 Compromise,” “Container Security,” “Web App Firewall,” “Web App Scanning,” and

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.