

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.  
 12860 El Camino Real, Suite 400  
 7 San Diego, CA 92130  
 Phone: (858) 678-5070 /Fax: (858) 678-5099  
 8

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

9 Aamir A. Kazi (*pro hac vice*)  
 kazi@fr.com  
 10 Lawrence R. Jarvis (*pro hac vice*)  
 jarvis@fr.com  
 11 Fish and Richardson P.C.  
 1180 Peachtree Street Ne 21st Floor  
 12 Atlanta, GA 30309  
 Phone: (404) 879-7238/ Fax: 404-892-5002  
 13  
 14

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  
 Company,

21  
 22 Plaintiff,

23 v.

24 QUALYS INC., a Delaware Corporation,

25 Defendant.  
 26  
 27  
 28

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

**FINJAN LLC’S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF  
 MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT  
 AND OPPOSITION TO QUALYS INC.’S  
 CROSS-MOTION FOR SUMMARY  
 JUDGMENT  
 [REDACTED VERSION OF  
 DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE FILED  
 UNDER SEAL]**

DATE: July 6, 2021  
 TIME: 2:00 P.M.  
 JUDGE: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers  
 PLACE: Zoom

**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

I. REPLY IN SUPPORT OF FINJAN’S SUMMARY JUDGMENT MOTION..... 1

A. Qualys Has Not Shown that DSAVT Is Authentic or Was Publicly Accessible..... 1

    1. Qualys has not shown DSAVT is authentic ..... 1

    2. Qualys has not shown DSAVT was publicly accessible..... 2

B. Qualys Has Not Shown Mounji and Thomson Are Authentic and Were Publicly Accessible..... 4

    1. Qualys has not shown Mounji and Thomson are authentic ..... 4

    2. Qualys has not shown Mounji and Thomson were publicly accessible..... 5

    3. The untimely Stubblebine Declaration does not cure these deficiencies..... 5

II. OPPOSITION TO QUALYS’S MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT ..... 6

A. Summary Judgment of Noninfringement for the ’408 Patent Is Not Appropriate.... 6

    1. Qualys’s “same computer” argument fails legally ..... 7

        a) The ’408 Patent does not expressly require that all claimed steps be performed by the same computer ..... 7

        b) Collateral estoppel from the *SonicWall* case does not apply..... 7

    2. Qualys’s “same computer” argument fails factually ..... 9

    3. Qualys’s accused products indicate “potential exploits” .....11

        a) Qualys’s claim construction argument is untimely and wrong.....11

        b) Qualys infringes even under its interpretation of “indicators of potential exploits” .....12

    4. Qualys’s accused products “dynamically build” while receiving the incoming stream.....13

B. Summary Judgment is Not Appropriate for the ’844 and ’494 Patents .....16

    1. Qualys manipulates the Court’s claim constructions.....16

    2. Collateral estoppel does not apply .....18

    3. Qualys ignores Dr. Cole’s opinions and the accused products .....18

    4. Disputes of material fact exist between the experts.....20

II. OPPOSITION TO QUALYS’S MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF NO DAMAGES For the ’844 and ’494 patents .....21

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

1		
2		
3	<b>Cases</b>	
4	<i>Allen Eng'g Corp. v. Bartell Indus.</i> ,	
5	299 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	7
6	<i>Amdocs (Isr.), Ltd. v. Openet Telecom, Inc.</i> ,	
7	761 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	15
8	<i>Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> ,	
9	No. 12-CV-00630-LHK, 2014 WL 252045 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 21, 2014).....	12, 18, 21, 22
10	<i>Arista Networks, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> ,	
11	No. 16-CV-00923-BLF, 2017 WL 6102804 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 10, 2017).....	8
12	<i>Bettcher Indus., Inc. v. Bunzl USA, Inc.</i> ,	
13	661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	11
14	<i>In re Bill of Lading Transms'n &amp; Procs'g Sys. Patent Litig.</i> ,	
15	681 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	22, 23
16	<i>Chrimar Systems v. Ruckus Wireless, Inc.</i> ,	
17	No. 16-cv-00186-SI, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 136656 (N.D. Cal. July 31, 2020).....	23
18	<i>CNET Networks, Inc. v. Etilize, Inc.</i> ,	
19	584 F. Supp. 2d 1260 (N.D. Cal. 2008).....	2
20	<i>Ecolab, Inc. v. FMC Corp.</i> ,	
21	569 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	12
22	<i>Foster v. Adams &amp; Assocs., Inc.</i> ,	
23	No. 18-CV-02723-JSC, 2020 WL 3639648 (N.D. Cal. July 6, 2020).....	1
24	<i>Fresenius Med. Care Holdings, Inc. v. Baxter Int'l, Inc.</i> ,	
25	No. C. 03-1431, 2006 WL 1330001, at *3 (N.D. Cal. May 15, 2006).....	2
26	<i>Fujifilm Corp. v. Motorola Mobility</i> ,	
27	2015 WL 757575 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 20, 2015).....	20
28	<i>Funai Elec. Co. v. Daewoo Elecs. Corp.</i> ,	
	616 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	6, 22, 23
	<i>Gart v. Logitech, Inc.</i> ,	
	254 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	22
	<i>IMS Tech., Inc. v. Haas Automation, Inc.</i> ,	
	206 F.3d 1422 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	6, 11

1 *Jackson Jordan, Inc. v. Plasser Am. Corp.*,  
 2 747 F.2d 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1984) ..... 18

3 *JVW Enterprises, Inc. v. Interact Accessories, Inc.*,  
 4 424 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2005) ..... 7

5 *Massachusetts Inst. of Tech. v. Shire Pharms., Inc.*,  
 6 839 F.3d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2016) ..... 12

7 *Minks v. Polaris Industries, Inc.*,  
 8 546 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2008) ..... 6, 22

9 *Nalco Co. v. Chem-Mod, LLC*,  
 10 883 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2018) ..... 23

11 *Omegaflex, Inc. v. Parker-Hannifin Corp.*,  
 12 243 F. App'x 592 (Fed. Cir. 2007) ..... 7

13 *Ralston Purina Co. v. Far-Mar-Co., Inc.*,  
 14 772 F.2d 1570 (Fed. Cir. 1985) ..... 22

15 *SRI Int'l v. Internet Sec. Sys.*,  
 16 511 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2008) ..... 2, 3, 23

17 *SRI International, Inc. v. Advanced Technology Laboratories, Inc.*,  
 18 127 F.3d 1462 (Fed. Cir. 1997) ..... 23

19 *STV Asia Ltd. v. PRN Corp.*,  
 20 No. C06-1664 JCS, 2007 WL 521236 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 15, 2007) ..... 18

21 *TecSec, Inc. v. Int'l Bus. Machines Corp.*,  
 22 731 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013) ..... 18

23 *Trivascular, Inc. v. Samuels*,  
 24 812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016) ..... 12

25 **Statutes**

26 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 6 ..... 16, 17

27 35 U.S.C. § 287 ..... 6, 21, 22, 23

28 **Other Authorities**

7 Chisum on Patents § 20.03[7][c][iv] (2020 ed.) ..... 23

Fed. R. Civ. P. 26 ..... 3

Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2) ..... 1

Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)(4) ..... 4

1 Fed. R. Evid. 703.....4  
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.