

1 STEFANI E. SHANBERG (SBN 206717)
 sshanberg@mofo.com
 2 NATHAN B. SABRI (SBN 252216)
 nsabri@mofo.com
 3 ROBIN L. BREWER (SBN 253686)
 rbrewer@mofo.com
 4 EUGENE MARDER (SBN 275762)
 emarder@mofo.com
 5 MADELEINE E. GREENE (SBN 263120)
 mgreene@mofo.com
 6 MICHAEL J. GUO (SBN 284917)
 mguo@mofo.com
 7 ALEX N. HADDUCK (SBN 312962)
 ahadduck@mofo.com
 8 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
 425 Market Street
 9 San Francisco, California 94105
 Telephone: (415) 268-7000
 10 Facsimile: (415) 268-7522

DARALYN J. DURIE (SBN 169825)
 ddurie@durietangri.com
 STEPHEN ELKIND (*Pro Hac Vice*)
 selkind@durietangri.com
 DURIE TANGRI LLP
 217 Leidesdorff Street
 San Francisco, CA 94111
 Telephone: (415) 362-6666
 Facsimile: (415) 236-6300

11 DAVID A. NELSON (*Pro Hac Vice*)
 davenelson@quinnemanuel.com
 12 NATHAN A. HAMSTRA (*Pro Hac Vice*)
 nathanhamstra@quinnemanuel.com
 13 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
 SULLIVAN LLP
 14 500 W. Madison Street, Suite 2450
 Chicago, Illinois 60661
 15 Telephone: (312) 705-7400
 Facsimile: (312) 707-7401

16 Attorneys for Defendant
 17 BLUE COAT SYSTEMS LLC

18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 19 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 20 SAN JOSE DIVISION

21 FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,
 22 Plaintiff,
 23 v.
 24 BLUE COAT SYSTEMS LLC, a Delaware
 Corporation,
 25 Defendant.
 26

Case No.: 15-cv-03295-BLF-SVK

**BLUE COAT SYSTEMS LLC'S
 OPPOSITION TO FINJAN'S PARTIAL
 RENEWED MOTION FOR
 JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW**

27
 28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1		
2		
3	I. LEGAL STANDARD	1
4	II. NONINFRINGEMENT	2
5	A. The Evidence Does Not Require a Finding of Infringement of the '844 Patent.....	2
6	B. The Evidence Does Not Require a Finding of Infringement of the '494 Patent.....	4
7	III. WILLFULNESS	5
8	A. Finjan's Primary Willfulness Argument is Unsupported by Law and Fact.	5
9	B. Finjan's Remaining Willfulness Arguments Are Unsupported, Conclusory, and Contrary to This Court's Orders.....	8
10	C. The Jury's Finding in <i>Blue Coat II</i> Underscores that Finjan Is Not Entitled to JMOL of Willfulness.	8
11	IV. DAMAGES	9
12	A. Finjan's Damages Claim for the '844 Patent Is Unsupported by Law or Fact.....	9
13	B. Finjan's Damages Claim for the '494 Patent Is Unsupported by Law or Fact.....	12
14	C. Finjan's Claim to Worldwide Damages is Unsupported by Law or Fact.	13
15	1. Finjan's collateral estoppel argument is waived and inapplicable.....	13
16	2. Finjan continues to apply the rejected "benefit and control" test.	14
17	3. Finjan's definition of "made" is incorrect.....	15
18	D. Finjan's Attacks on Blue Coat's Damages Expert Are Baseless.	17
19	IV. CONCLUSION	19
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Affinity Labs of Tex., LLC v. BMW N. Am, LLC</i> , 783 F. Supp. 2d 891 (E.D. Tex. 2011).....	6
<i>Air-Sea Forwarders, Inc. v. Air Asia Co.</i> , 880 F.2d 176 (9th Cir. 1989).....	1
<i>Ansel Commc'ns, Inc. v. Novell, Inc.</i> , No. C-97-21088, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22737 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 23, 1999).....	14
<i>Biscotti Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , No. 2:13-CV-01015-JRG-RSP, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 93166 (E.D. Tex. May 18, 2017)	10
<i>Centillion Data Sys. LLC v. Quest Commc'ns. Int'l</i> , 631 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	16
<i>Clark v. Bear Stearns & Co., Inc.</i> , 966 F.2d 1318 (9th Cir. 1992).....	14
<i>CNET Networks, Inc. v. Etilize, Inc.</i> , 528 F. Supp. 2d 985 (N.D. Cal. 2007)	16
<i>Cotton v. City of Eureka</i> , 860 F. Supp. 2d 999 (N.D. Cal. 2012)	13
<i>Decca Ltd. v. United States</i> , 210 Ct. Cl. 546 (1976)	15
<i>Deepsouth Packing Co. v. Laitram Corp.</i> , 406 U.S. 518 (1972).....	16
<i>Digital Reg of Tex., LLC v. Adobe Sys.</i> , No. 12-1971, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 161044 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 17, 2014)	2
<i>Eolas Techs. Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , No. 99 C 626, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13482 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 1, 2003).....	16
<i>Ericsson Inc. v. TCL Commc'n Tech. Holdings, Ltd.</i> , No. 2:15-cv-00011-RSP, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 183216 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 4, 2017)	8
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Cisco Sys.</i> , Case No. 17-cv-00072-BLF, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 87657 (N.D. Cal. June 7, 2017)	7

1	<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Sophos, Inc.</i> ,	
2	No. 14-cv-01197-WHO, 2016 U.S. Dist. Lexis 107831 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 15,	
	2016)	12, 13
3	<i>Gilead Scis., Inc. v. Natco Pharma Ltd.</i> ,	
4	753 F.3d 1208 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	6, 12
5	<i>Good Tech. Corp. v. Mobileiron, Inc.</i> ,	
6	Case No. 5:12-cv-05826-PSG, 2015 WL 4090431 (N.D. Cal. July 5, 2015).....	10
7	<i>Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.</i> ,	
	136 S. Ct. 1923 (2016).....	5, 6, 7
8	<i>Imperium IP Holdings (Cayman), Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> ,	
9	No. 4:14-cv-371, 2017 WL 4038884 (E.D. Tex. Sep. 13, 2017).....	6
10	<i>Kern v. Levolor Lorentzen, Inc.</i> ,	
11	899 F.2d 772 (9th Cir. 1990).....	1
12	<i>KW Plastics v. U.S. Can Co.</i> ,	
	131 F. Supp. 2d 1289 (M.D. Ala. 2001)	10, 11
13	<i>LaserDynamics, Inc. v. Quanta Comput., Inc.</i> ,	
14	694 F.3d 51, 67 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	9
15	<i>Levi Strauss & Co. v. Blue Bell, Inc.</i> ,	
16	778 F.2d 1352 (9th Cir. 1985).....	14
17	<i>Little v. United States</i> ,	
	794 F.2d 484 (9th Cir. 1986).....	14
18	<i>Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.</i> ,	
19	580 F.3d 1301 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	9
20	<i>Microsoft Corp. v. AT&T Corp.</i> ,	
21	550 U.S. 437 (2007).....	16
22	<i>Monolithic Power Sys., Inc. v. Silergy Corp.</i> ,	
	127 F. Supp. 3d 1071 (N.D. Cal. 2015)	6
23	<i>NTP, Inc. v. Research in Motion, Ltd.</i> ,	
24	418 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	15
25	<i>Oiness v. Walgreen Co.</i> ,	
	88 F.3d 1025 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	9
26	<i>Radware, Ltd. v. F5 Networks, Inc.</i> ,	
27	No. 5:13-cv-02024-RMW, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 112504 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 22,	
28	2016)	6

1 *ResQNet.com, Inc. v. Lansa, Inc.*,
 2 594 F.3d 860 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....12

3 *Roy-G-Biv Corp. v. ABB, Ltd.*,
 4 Case No. 6:11-cv-622, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 188699 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 1,
 2014)10

5 *Simple Air, Inc. v. Google Inc.*,
 6 204 F. Supp. 3d 908 (E.D. Tex. 2016).....6, 12, 18

7 *Texas Instruments, Inc. v. Cypress Semiconductor Corp.*,
 8 90 F.3d 1558 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....4

9 *Tortu v. Las Vegas Metro. Police Dep’t*,
 556 F.3d 1075 (9th Cir. 2009).....13

10 *Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*,
 11 632 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....10

12 *VirnetX, Inc. v. Cisco Sys.*,
 767 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....11

13 **Statutes**

14 35 U.S.C. § 271(a)14, 15, 16

15 35 U.S.C. § 271(g)16

16 35 U.S.C. § 28412

17 **Other Authorities**

18 Rule 50(a).....13

19 Rule 50(b)13

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.