EXHIBIT 7



27

Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, Defendant Qualys Inc. ("Qualys") hereby supplements its responses and objections to Plaintiff Finjan, Inc.'s Second Set of Interrogatories to Qualys (Nos. 7-11).

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The following responses are made solely for the purpose of, and in relation to, this action. Each response is provided subject to all appropriate objections (including, without limitation, objections concerning competency, relevancy, materiality, propriety, and admissibility) that would require the exclusion of any statement contained herein if the statement were made by a witness present and testifying in court. All such objections and grounds are therefore reserved and may be interposed at the time of trial.

The following responses are based on the facts and information presently known and available to Qualys. Discovery, investigation, research, and analysis are ongoing in this case and may disclose the existence of additional facts, add meaning to known facts, establish entirely new factual conclusions or legal contentions, or possibly lead to additions, variations, and changes to these responses. Qualys reserves the right to change or supplement these responses as additional facts are discovered, revealed, recalled, or otherwise ascertained.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

In addition to any specifically stated objections, each of Qualys's responses herein is subject to and incorporates the following general objections:

- 1. Qualys objects to each interrogatory and each definition to the extent it purports to impose obligations greater or more extensive than those required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, or other applicable law.
- 2. Qualys objects to each interrogatory and definition to the extent it purports to request information that cannot be found in the course of a reasonable search.



- 3. Qualys's partial response to any interrogatory is not a waiver of its objection or right to object to the interrogatory, or any part thereof, or to any additional, supplemental, or further interrogatory or part thereof, but is instead offered in an effort to resolve a potential discovery dispute.
- 4. Qualys objects to each interrogatory to the extent it seeks information that is neither relevant to any party's claim or defense nor proportional to the needs of the case.
- 5. Qualys objects to each interrogatory to the extent it is unreasonably cumulative or duplicative of other discovery requests, or seeks information that is obtainable from some other source that is more convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive.
- 6. Qualys objects to each interrogatory to the extent it is overly broad, fails to reasonably identify the information sought, is unduly burdensome, and is posed for improper purposes, including, without limitation, embarrassment, undue annoyance, harassment, oppression, delay, or to increase the expense of litigation or to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion or opinion.
- 7. Qualys objects to each interrogatory to the extent it seeks information for which the burden or expense of obtaining and disclosing outweighs its likely benefit in resolving the issues of this action.
- 8. Qualys objects to each interrogatory to the extent it fails to describe with reasonable particularity the information requested.
- 9. To the extent that any interrogatory may be construed as calling for information which is subject to a claim of privilege, including, without limitation, the attorney-client privilege and attorney work-product doctrine, Qualys hereby claims such privilege and objects to the disclosure of the information. Such information as may hereafter be provided in response to the interrogatory should not include any information subject to such privileges and doctrines, but the inadvertent disclosure of privileged information shall not constitute a waiver of any applicable privilege.
 - 10. Qualys objects to each interrogatory to the extent it is vague or ambiguous.
- 11. Qualys objects to each interrogatory to the extent it seeks confidential, commercially sensitive, trade secret, and/or proprietary information of a non-party or information covered by a



confidentiality agreement, or information that is otherwise protected from disclosure pursuant to Rule 26(c)(1)(G) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or Rule 501 of the Federal Rules of Evidence. Qualys will not produce such information unless the non-party agrees to the terms of the protective order entered in this case or consents in writing to the disclosure of that information to Finjan.

- 12. Qualys objects each interrogatory to the extent it seeks information that is not in Qualys's possession, custody, or control.
- 13. Qualys objects to any interrogatory that seeks information, documents, or things subject to confidentiality agreements, protective orders, and/or any other obligation pursuant to which Qualys is required to protect and/or maintain the confidentiality of any third party's documents. Should an interrogatory call for such information, documents, or things, Qualys will act reasonably to obtain the consent of the third party to produce the information.
- 14. Qualys objects generally to the interrogatories to the extent that they prematurely call for discovery concerning, among other things, Qualys products, downstream products, and facts and contentions relating to claim construction, non-infringement, invalidity, and other claims and defenses pursuant to Patent Local Rule 2-5.

OBJECTIONS TO DEFINITIONS

- 1. Qualys objects to Finjan's definition of "You," "Your," and "Defendant" as overly broad and unduly burdensome. For purposes of these interrogatories, reference to "You," "Your," and "Defendant" shall refer to Defendant Qualys Inc. only.
- 2. Qualys objects to Finjan's definition of "Finjan" as overly broad and unduly burdensome. For purposes of these interrogatories, reference to "Finjan" shall refer to Plaintiff Finjan, Inc. only.
- 3. Qualys objects to Finjan's definition of "Accused Instrumentalities" as overly broad and unduly burdensome. For purposes of these interrogatories, reference to the "Accused Instrumentalities" shall refer to the Qualys products and services that Finjan has specifically identified in its Complaint and Infringement Contentions.



DOCKET

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.

