

1 Juanita R. Brooks (CA SBN 75934)
 brooks@fr.com
 2 Roger A. Denning (CA SBN 228998)
 denning@fr.com
 3 Jason W. Wolff (CA SBN 215819)
 wolff@fr.com
 4 Megan A. Chacon (CA SBN 304912)
 chacon@fr.com
 5 K. Nicole Williams (CA SBN 291900)
 nwilliams@fr.com
 6 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
 7 12860 El Camino Real, Suite 400
 San Diego, CA 92130
 8 Phone: (858) 678-5070 /Fax: (858) 678-5099
 9
 10 Aamir A. Kazi (*pro hac vice*)
 kazi@fr.com
 11 Lawrence R. Jarvis (*pro hac vice*)
 jarvis@fr.com
 12 Fish and Richardson P.C.
 1180 Peachtree Street Ne 21st Floor
 13 Atlanta, GA 30309
 14 Phone: (404) 879-7238/ Fax: 404-892-5002

Philip W. Goter (*pro hac vice*)
 goter@fr.com
 Robert P. Courtney (CA SBN 248392)
 courtney@fr.com
 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
 3200 RBC Plaza
 60 South 6th Street
 Minneapolis, MN 55402
 Phone: (612) 335-5070 /Fax: (612) 288-9696

 Proshanto Mukherji (*pro hac vice*)
 mukherji@fr.com
 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
 One Marina Park Drive
 Boston, MA 02210
 Phone: (617) 542-5070/ Fax (617) 542-8906

15 **Attorneys for Plaintiff**
 16 **FINJAN LLC**

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 18 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 19 (OAKLAND DIVISION)

20 FINJAN LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability
 21 Company,

22 Plaintiff,

23 v.

24 QUALYS INC., a Delaware Corporation,

25 Defendant.
 26

Case No. 4:18-cv-07229-YGR (TSH)

**FINJAN LLC’S OPPOSITION TO
 QUALYS INC’S RENEWED MOTION TO
 STRIKE PORTIONS OF PLAINTIFF
 FINJAN LLC’S INFRINGEMENT
 EXPERT REPORTS**

**[REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT
 SOUGHT TO BE SEALED]**

DATE: June 8, 2021
 TIME: 2:00 PM
 JUDGE: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers
 PLACE: Zoom Teleconference

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

	Page
I. Introduction	1
II. Background	2
III. Legal Standard.....	3
IV. Argument.....	3
A. Qualys’s New Motion is Not a Renewal of its Prior Motion	3
B. Finjan’s Infringement Contentions Disclose Dr. Medvidovic’s Theory for the “Receiving” Limitation	4
C. Qualys Cannot Show That Vulnerability Scanning is Not Based on Requests from a Client Device	4
D. Qualys’s New Arguments Regarding Cloud Agents Should Be Rejected.....	7
V. Conclusion.....	8

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Qualys's renewed motion is flawed procedurally and substantively. In its "renewed"
3 motion, Qualys expands the reach of the Court's Order and piles in additional portions of
4 Dr. Medvidovic's report, raising issues beyond the Court left open for renewal. And for those
5 issues the Court denied without prejudice, it fails to address the issue identified by the Court's
6 Order: whether the "receiving" limitation occurred "based" on requests from a client device.

7 To reframe the issue from Qualys's original motion to strike, at issue was whether
8 Dr. Medvidovic's infringement theory exceeded the scope of Finjan's infringement contentions for
9 the "receiving . . ." limitation. The relevant limitation requires "receiving, by a computer, an
10 incoming stream of program code." There is no limitation that specifies what requested the
11 incoming stream, though obviously a stream would not be received unless something requested it.
12 Dr. Medvidovic's infringement theory and Finjan's infringement contentions are in alignment:
13 both refer to the same component (e.g., a scanner) performing the same function (receiving data
14 from a client device), and Qualys raises no issues concerning the identity of what receives the
15 incoming stream of program code.

16 Instead, Qualys's renewed motion turns on whether Dr. Medvidovic's infringement report
17 expressly discusses, as part of his infringement analysis, whether infringement depends on
18 superfluous language in the contentions (that received data is "based" on a request by a client
19 device). Although Qualys faults Dr. Medvidovic's report for not importing limitations into the
20 claims, he had no reason to provide an opinion on whether an unclaimed step was required.
21 Notably, Qualys's expert did not provide any infringement opinions regarding whether
22 vulnerability scanning is "based" on requests for content by a client device either. *See* Exh. A
23 (Rubin Reb. Rpt.) at ¶¶ 169-179.

24 But what is critically ignored in Qualys's motion is that Qualys has not "demonstrate[d]
25 that vulnerability scanning is not 'based' on requests for content by the client device," which was
26 a prerequisite for renewal. ECF No. 188 at 7. Qualys identifies no evidence that suggests the
27 receiving limitation does not follow a request for content by a client device. Qualys cannot
28 because vulnerability scanning is based on requests for content from a client device. Qualys's

1 own documentation states that its vulnerability scanning “by default” evaluates “*all* traffic” on a
2 network. *See* Exh. B (QUALYS00453094) at 107 (emphasis added). And network traffic
3 necessarily involves requests by client devices.

4 For these and the reasons that follow, the Court should deny Qualys’s motion.

5 **II. BACKGROUND**

6 Qualys previously filed a motion to strike Dr. Medvidovic’s report for at least seven
7 different reasons. *See* ECF No. 156-4. One of Qualys’s arguments was that Dr. Medvidovic’s
8 infringement theory for limitation 1(a) (“receiving, by a computer, an incoming stream of program
9 code”) was not properly disclosed in Finjan’s infringement contentions. *Id.* at 12-13. After
10 considering Finjan’s infringement contentions, the Court concluded that (1) Finjan’s infringement
11 contentions refer to the receipt of content based on a request from a client device; and (2) Finjan’s
12 expert espoused a theory where the accused products may receive content from a client device:

13 Finjan’s contentions state that the accused products receive content “based on a client
14 device requesting the content from a source computer, such as the Internet” and
15 “when a particular client device requests content provided by a source computer.”
16 (Contentions at 2-4.) Dr. Medvidovic, however, opines that the accused
17 “Vulnerability Features” perform their network scans to detect vulnerabilities and
18 policy compliance regardless of content requests and may receive data from client
19 devices on the same network. (*See* Medvidovic Report ¶¶ 184-97.)

20 ECF No. 188 at 7:8-13.

21 The Court then stated, after reviewing the cited portions of Dr. Medvidovic’s report, it
22 “cannot determine that they present a new theory.” *Id.* at 7:14-15. The Court denied Qualys’s
23 motion, but left open one specific issue: whether the accused vulnerability scanning is “based” on
24 requests for content by a client device. *Id.* at 7:18-20.

25 While Qualys’s motion is purportedly a “renewal” of its motion to strike, it seeks to
26 expand its mandate, adding new grieves and new portions of Dr. Medvidovic’s report it did not
27 originally move on, namely ¶¶ 184, 186, 188-194, which were not at issue in its prior motion.

1 **III. LEGAL STANDARD**

2 The Court is familiar with the legal standards for a motion to strike infringement
3 contentions, which are set forth in Finjan’s opposition to Qualys’s original motion and
4 incorporated by reference herein. *See* ECF No. 163-3. For the issue underlying this motion,
5 Qualys does not cite a single case where a court has struck an infringement report because the
6 report failed to expressly opine on unclaimed features mentioned in the party’s PLR contentions

7 **IV. ARGUMENT**

8 **A. Qualys’s New Motion is Not a Renewal of its Prior Motion**

9 Qualys’s prior motion sought to strike *six paragraphs* (¶¶ 185, 187, 195-197 and 214) of
10 Dr. Medvidovic’s Report relating to the “receiving . . .” limitation. ECF No. 156 at 12:4-5. The
11 Court denied Qualys’ motion to strike “without prejudice to renewal should Qualys demonstrate
12 that vulnerability scanning is not ‘based’ on requests for content by the client device.” ECF No.
13 188. Under the guise of a “renewed” motion, Qualys’s new motion seeks to strike *thirteen*
14 *paragraphs* from Dr. Medvidovic’s report for the “receiving . . .” limitation—*only four* of which
15 were included in Qualys’s original motion: ¶¶ 185, 187, 195, 196. ECF No. 194 at 5:21-24. This
16 is not a “renewal” of Qualys’s prior motion—it is a new motion as to the paragraphs not cited in
17 the original motion (¶¶ 184, 186, 188-194). And for the paragraphs that Qualys now seeks to
18 strike referring to Cloud Agents (some or all of ¶¶ 185, 187, 195-196), Qualys’s basis for seeking
19 to strike those paragraphs was that Finjan did not accuse Cloud Agents *at all*. ECF No. 156 at 5
20 (“Finjan’s infringement contentions for the ’408 Patent do not accuse the Cloud Agent of
21 practicing any limitation of any asserted claim of the ’408 Patent.”). The Court rejected that
22 argument already, and Qualys should not be allowed a “do over”—the issue was already resolved.

23 Thus, Qualys’s motion as to paragraphs ¶¶ 184, 186, 188-196 should be denied for
24 improperly expanding the scope of the original underlying motion. As to the portions of ¶¶ 185,
25 187, 195-196 that refer to Cloud Agents, Qualys’s motion should be denied as beyond the scope of
26 the Court’s Order on an issue where Qualys was already heard.

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.