

DUANE MORRIS LLP
Patrick S. Salceda (CA SBN 247978)
psalceda@duanemorris.com
Spear Tower
One Market Plaza, Suite 2200
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: 415.957.3000
Facsimile: 650.618.2713

DUANE MORRIS LLP
Joseph A. Powers
Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
japowers@duanemorris.com
Jarrad M. Gunther
Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
jmgunther@duanemorris.com
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: 215.979.1000
Facsimile: 215.979.1020

Attorneys for Defendant
SONICWALL INC.

DUANE MORRIS LLP
Matthew C. Gaudet
Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
mcgaudet@duanemorris.com
Robin L. McGrath
Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
rlmcgrath@duanemorris.com
David C. Dotson
Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
dcdotson@duanemorris.com
Jennifer H. Forte
Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
jhforte@duanemorris.com
1075 Peachtree Street, Ste. 2000
Atlanta, GA 30309
Telephone: 404.253.6900
Facsimile: 404.253.6901

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SONICWALL INC., a Delaware
Corporation

Defendant.

Case No.: 5:17-cv-04467-BLF-VKD

**DEFENDANT SONICWALL INC.'S
MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER
SUPPLEMENTAL INFRINGEMENT
CONTENTIONS**

Date: March 12, 2019
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Dept: Courtroom 2, Fifth Floor
Judge: Mag. Virginia K. DeMarchi

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

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. INTRODUCTION 1

II. THE PARTIES’ MEET-AND-CONFER..... 3

III. LEGAL STANDARD..... 3

IV. ARGUMENT..... 4

 A. Overarching Deficiencies..... 4

 1. Finjan Fails to Identify the Accused Instrumentalities With Specificity 4

 2. Finjan Relies on Unexplained Screen Shots 8

 B. Deficiencies Regarding Specific Patents 9

 1. Finjan’s Contentions for the ’305 Patent Fail to Provide Reasonable
 Notice of Finjan’s Infringement Theory 9

 a. The “Computer Comprising a Network Interface” 10

 b. “An Internet Application Running on a Computer” 11

 c. “A rule based content scanner” 11

 d. Rule Update Manager 12

 e. Parser and Analyzer Rules Describing Exploits as “Patterns of
 Types of Tokens” 13

 2. Finjan’s Contentions for the ’926 Patent Fail to Provide Reasonable
 Notice of Finjan’s Infringement Theory 13

 a. Database Manager..... 14

 b. “Database of Downloadable security profiles indexed
 according to Downloadable IDs” 15

 3. Finjan’s Infringement Contentions for the ’408 Patent Are Deficient 16

 a. Multi-lingual language detector 17

 b. Scanner Instantiator 17

 c. A Scanner for the Specific Programming Language 17

 d. The “rules accessor” within the scanner 18

 e. “Analyzer for dynamically detecting” 18

 f. Notifier 19

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

4. Finjan’s Contentions for the ’844 Patent Fail to Provide Reasonable Notice of Finjan’s Infringement Theory 19

 a. “inspector”19

 b. “First Content Inspection Engine” (Claim 15).....21

5. Finjan’s Contentions for the ’780 Patent Fail to Provide Reasonable Notice of Finjan’s Infringement Theory 21

6. Finjan’s Infringement Contentions for the ’154 Patent Are Deficient 23

 a. “transmitting the input to the security computer for inspection, when the first function is invoked”23

 b. “invoking a second function with the input, only if a security computer indicates that such invocation is safe”23

 c. Claim 10.....24

 d. Claim 3.....24

7. Finjan’s Infringement Contentions for The ’968 Patent are Deficient 25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

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(s)

Federal Cases

Alacritech Inc. v. CenturyLink, Inc.
No. 2:16-CV-00693-JRG-RSP, 2017 WL 3007464 (E.D. Tex. July 14, 2017)7

Bender v. Maxi Integrated Prods.
2010 WL 1135762 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 22, 2010).....4

Comcast Cable Commc’ns, LLC v. OpenTV, Inc.
No. C 16-06180 WHA, 2017 WL 2630088 (N.D. Cal. June 19, 2017).....7

DCG Sys. V. Checkpoint Techs., LLC
2012 WL 1309161 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 16, 2012)4, 17

Digital Reg of Texas, LLC v. Adobe Sys. Inc.
No. 12-cv-01971-CW, 2013 WL 3361241 (N.D. Cal. July 3, 2013).....4

Finjan, Inc. v. Cisco Systems, Inc.
No. 5:17-cv-00072-BLF (SVK) (N.D. Cal. Oct. 12, 2017), Dkt. No. 832

Finjan, Inc. v. Proofpoint, Inc.
No. 13-CV-05808-HSG, 2015 WL 1517920 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 2, 2015)..... 1-2, 4, 8

Finjan, Inc. v. Sophos, Inc.
No. 14-CV-01197-WHO, 2015 WL 5012679 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 24, 2015)2

Finjan, Inc. v. Zscaler, Inc.
Case No. 17-cv-06946-JST, 2018 WL 4181906 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 31, 2018)..... 1-2

GN Resoune A/S v. Callpod, Inc.
No. 11-cv-04673-SBA, 2013 WL 1190651 (N.D. Cal. Mar 21, 2013)4

InterTrust Tech. Corp. v. Microsoft Corp.
2003 WL 23 120174 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 1, 2003).....3

Network Caching Tech., LLC v. Novell Inc.
2002 WL 321261284

Nova Measuring Instruments Ltd. v. Nanometrics, Inc.
417 F. Supp. 2d 1121 (N.D. Cal. 2006)3

Rules

Patent L.R. 3-12-4, 6-8, 12, 17

Patent L.R. 3-1(a).....3

Patent L.R. 3-1(c).....4

1 **NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION**

2 TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD HEREIN:

3 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on March 12, 2019, at 10:00 a.m. or as soon thereafter as this matter
4 may be heard, in the courtroom of the Honorable Virginia K. DeMarchi, at 280 S. 1st St, San Jose,
5 CA 95113, Defendant SonicWall Inc. (“SonicWall”) will and hereby does move for an order
6 compelling Plaintiff Finjan, Inc. (“Finjan”) to provide further supplemental infringement contentions
7 that place SonicWall on notice of how its products specifically infringe the patent claims at issue
8 within 30 days.

9 This motion is based on this notice of motion and motion, the supporting memorandum of
10 points and authorities set forth below, the accompanying declaration of Robin L. McGrath
11 (“McGrath Decl.”), the pleadings and papers on file with the Court and all other matters properly
12 before this Court.

13 **STATEMENT OF RELIEF SOUGHT**

14 SonicWall seeks an Order from the Court compelling Finjan to serve further supplemental
15 Infringement Contentions that comply with the Patent Local Rules by remedying the deficiencies
16 described below.

17 **STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE TO BE DECIDED**

18 Whether Finjan’s Infringement Contentions fail to meet the standards set forth in the Patent
19 Local Rules and fail to provide SonicWall with adequate notice of Finjan’s theories of infringement.

20 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

21 **I. INTRODUCTION**

22 In other cases in this District, on many of the same patents, Finjan has been ordered to
23 provide more specific infringement contentions. *See, e.g., Finjan, Inc. v. Zscaler, Inc.*, Case No. 17-
24 cv-06946-JST, 2018 WL 4181906, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 31, 2018) (finding Finjan failed to meet its
25 “obligation to map specific elements of Defendant[’]s[] alleged infringing products onto the
26 Plaintiff’s claim construction”) (citing *Finjan, Inc. v. Proofpoint, Inc.*, No. 13-CV-05808-HSG, 2015
27 WL 1517920, at *6 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 2, 2015)). Indeed, even after Finjan provided Court-ordered
28 amended infringement contentions in *Zscaler*, the court there agreed that the amended contentions

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.