

April 17, 2020

**VIA ELECTRONIC FILING**

The Honorable Judge Virginia K. DeMarchi  
Federal Court of the Northern District of California

Re: *Finjan, Inc. v. SonicWall Inc.*  
United States District Court Case No. 5:17-cv-04467-BLF-VKD  
Joint Discovery Letter

Dear Magistrate DeMarchi:

Defendant SonicWall Inc. (“Defendant” or “SonicWall”) and Plaintiff Finjan, Inc. (“Plaintiff” or “Finjan”) (collectively “the Parties”) submit this Joint Discovery Letter.

**I. Joint Statement of Disputed Issue**

SonicWall disputes Finjan’s claim of work product immunity and privilege as to portions of and exhibits to deposition transcripts of Yoav Samet, Philip Hartstein, Yuval Ben-Itzhak, and Daniel Chinn regarding Finjan’s intellectual property (the “Disputed Documents”) that were produced in another Finjan patent litigation, *Finjan, Inc. v. Cisco Systems, Inc.*, No. 5:17-cv-00072-BLF-SVK (N.D. Cal.) (“Cisco Action”). The Disputed Documents are identified in Finjan’s privilege log, attached as Ex. A.<sup>1,2</sup>

**II. Defendant’s Position and Proposed Resolution**

As a threshold matter, Finjan’s argument that SonicWall has not established the relevance of the Disputed Documents is a non-sequitur, as SonicWall does not have access to the withheld portions of the Disputed Documents. These documents were the subject of four depositions in a case between Finjan and Cisco involving five of the same asserted patents. Finjan already produced these transcripts and redacted versions of the documents in response to discovery requests, and then withheld certain portions on the basis of privilege, not relevance.

Finjan alleges that the Disputed Documents are protected by attorney-client and work product privilege. However, the deposition transcripts themselves are available to (and were taken by) Cisco (Finjan’s adversary) in the Cisco Action. Each of the deposition exhibits was produced by Cisco (not Finjan) in the Cisco Action. Finjan, despite asserting privilege over the exhibits in this case, did not even have them in its possession. Instead, the source of the exhibits was a former Cisco employee, Yoav Samet, as evidenced by the documents’ Bates numbers in the Cisco Action (i.e., Cisco-Finjan-YS). Finjan’s privilege log does not even list Samet as a

---

<sup>1</sup> SonicWall is not challenging Finjan’s privilege claim for Finjan-RPD 414376.

<sup>2</sup> Per the Court’s standing order, materials cited herein are not attached as exhibits, but are available if requested by the Court.

recipient of most documents – instead listing Finjan’s Board of Directors, employees and outside lawyers.

Mr. Samet possessed these documents even though he was *not* a Finjan employee or member of Finjan’s Board. Instead, Cisco was an *investor* in Finjan with a contractual right to “observe” portions of Finjan’s board meetings. Samet Dep., 23:17-24: 20; Chinn Dep., 38:8-39:17. Cisco designated Mr. Samet as its board observer. Samet Dep. 60:16-23. This is unlike the former director in *Montgomery*, upon which Finjan relies. That court found that possessing an interest in a company (which is the correct characterization of Cisco’s relationship with Finjan) does *not* allow access to privileged documents. 548 F. Supp. 2d at 1187. Moreover, Mr. Samet is not a lawyer. Samet Dep. 16:12-18. Finjan thus sent these exhibits beyond the audience identified in its log, to a party (Cisco) and non-lawyer (Samet), who merely had a contractual relationship with Finjan. Finjan (who bears the burden) has no evidence that there was a shared privilege between these parties – much less a confirmation between them of a shared privilege. Further, Finjan’s claim that “many, if not most” of Finjan’s interactions with Cisco related to patent matters is contradicted by the testimony of both Samet and Finjan’s Chairman. Samet Dep. 64:2-65:13; 68:12-16 ( [REDACTED] ); Chinn Dep. 219:1-15; 221:9-222:11 [REDACTED].

Indeed, these very deposition transcripts were created in an *adverse* matter between these parties (i.e., they did not exist when Cisco had an investment in Finjan). All of the Disputed Documents (the transcripts and exhibits) relate to the subject matter of the Cisco Action, and likely will be presented to the trier of fact in that case.

No Privilege Existed. The “attorney-client privilege is ‘strictly construed,’ and the party claiming the privilege bears the burden of establishing its claim.” *In re Napster v. Beretelsman AG*, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11497, at \*8 (N.D. Cal. 4/11/ 05). Communications between attorneys and clients “made in the presence of, or shared with, third-parties destroys the confidentiality of the communications and the privilege protection that is dependent upon that confidentiality.” *Nidec Corp. v. Victor Co. of Japan*, 249 F.R.D. 575, 578 (N.D. Cal. 2007). An exception to waiver of privilege exists when the parties share a common *legal* interest regarding the subject matter of the communication. *Napster*, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11497, at \*12. There must be “a common legal, as opposed to commercial, interest” and such communications must be “designed to further *that* legal effort.” *Nidec*, 249 F.R.D. at 579. “[A] shared desire to see the same outcome in a legal matter is insufficient.” *In re Pac.*, 679 F.3d at 1129.

Finjan claims the Disputed Documents are privileged based on its “specific, unique relationship” with Cisco. This relationship was defined by the Investors’ Rights Agreement (“IRA”), whereby Cisco obtained the right to send an observer to Finjan’s board meetings. Section 2.7. Finjan argues that Cisco’s board observer received these documents subject to a “strict NDA,” but Finjan has not shown that such an NDA exists. The NDA Finjan produced in this case is *Cisco’s* “standard mutual NDA.” This NDA predates the IRA, was not executed by Finjan, and relates only to [REDACTED].

██████████<sup>3</sup> *Id.* The presence of a generic NDA is not enough to establish a common legal interest. *Rembrandt Patent Innovations, LLC v. Apple Inc.*, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13749, at \*26-27 (N.D. Cal. 2/4/16) (“The presence of a non-disclosure agreement covering these disclosures . . . is not conclusive” in finding a common legal interest); *see also SEC v. Berry*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 28301, at \*19 (N.D. Cal. 3/7/11) (work product waived despite confidentiality agreements). Nowhere do the IRA or the NDA say that Cisco would receive *privileged* information, or that the parties had a common *legal* interest, or that Cisco was required to maintain any *privilege* of Finjan (unlike the common interest NDA in *Devon*, upon which Plaintiff relies). The IRA says the opposite – it says that Finjan’s “██████████  
██████████” The primary purpose of the right to exclude is to preserve the company’s attorney-client privilege. *See* WestLaw Practical Law Glossary (“[B]oard observers usually can be excluded from meetings to preserve the company’s attorney client privilege, particularly when the board is discussing potential litigation . . .”). Thus, Finjan had a mechanism to maintain privileged information and chose not to.

Moreover, any generalized interest in Finjan’s litigation plans that Cisco had as an investor was merely a commercial interest or “shared desire” that is insufficient for privilege protection. *In re Pac.*, 679 F.3d at 1129. Likewise, there is no “shared litigation threat in which their interests are ‘identically aligned’” to support a finding of privilege. *Planned Parenthood Fed’n of Am., Inc. v. Ctr. for Med. Progress*, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 63638, at \*36-38 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 11, 2019); *Rembrandt*, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13749, at \*27-28 (“although the business opportunities contemplated arose from . . . analysis of the patent and broad identification of litigation targets”, such information is not privileged as it “focused on exploring a business relationship.”).

For work product immunity, “documents that merely set forth a general strategy or template that might relate to or be relevant to future litigation are not prepared in anticipation of a particular trial.” *Hatamian v. Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.*, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 60551, at \*21-22 (N.D. Cal. May 6, 2016). Finjan has not shown that the Disputed Documents were in preparation for any specific litigation.

Any Privilege or Work Product Protection Was Waived. Finjan sued Cisco on its intellectual property discussed in the Disputed Documents. By definition, Finjan and Cisco are adversaries specifically relating to the subject matter in the Disputed Documents. “[I]t would be absurd to extend the protection of the privilege to matters in which the two corporations’ legal interests were directly adverse to each other.” *Napster*, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11497, at 17.

Accordingly, even if the Court were to find that the Disputed Documents were initially privileged, such privilege was waived once the parties became adversaries. Similar to a joint representation, “the policy of encouraging confidential communications between a lawyer and

---

<sup>3</sup> Finjan points to the NDA referenced during Samet’s deposition. Samet Dep., 194:6-13. This NDA covers the parties’ pre-suit licensing discussions and was executed in 2014, nearly a decade *after* Finjan provided the Disputed Documents to Cisco. Cisco Action, Dkt. 1 at ¶ 9.

... clients would not be advanced by protecting those communications from disclosure after ... those clients have sued each over a matter falling within the scope of the attorney's representation." *Napster*, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11497, at 16. Additionally, "[o]nce a party has disclosed work product to one adversary, it waives work-product protection as to all other adversaries." *Waymo LLC v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 88411, at \*43 (N.D. Cal. June 5, 2017).

Likewise, work product protection is lost when disclosure to third parties "enables an adversary to gain access to the information." *Nidec*, 249 F.R.D. at 580. Here, the deposition transcript was created in the very case in which the parties are adversaries; it would be absurd to say a deposition transcript and the exhibits thereto are the protected work product of one of the adversaries.

### III. Defendant's View on a Hearing

Defendant requests a telephonic hearing on this dispute.

### IV. Plaintiff's Position and Proposed Resolution

The Disputed Documents are privileged and contain attorney work product because they are materials from Finjan's Board of Directors (from 9-15 years ago) containing the legal advice of counsel regarding patent litigation and enforcement matters — a dispositive fact that SonicWall does not dispute. Ex. A, 2-16.

Cisco's possession of these documents and *subsequent* adversity to Finjan more than a decade after the disclosure does not waive privilege or work-product immunity. Finjan only shared these documents with Cisco under the parties' specific, confidential, common-interest relationship where Cisco, which became a major Finjan investor in 2004, had an observer position on Finjan's Board. *Samet* Dep. 60:19-61:6. Subject to a strict NDA, limiting Cisco's use of any information obtained from Finjan, Cisco's observer had access to Finjan's most sensitive and confidential information through this special relationship with Finjan, receiving the documents with the expectation and contractual obligation to maintain such sensitive information as confidential and privileged. *Id.* 194:8-11. Cisco only obtained the Disputed Documents through this NDA and common-interest-relationship. At the time Finjan shared the materials, Finjan and Cisco were not adversaries and worked collaboratively to further their common legal interests to obtain favorable business and legal outcomes on multiple fronts (Cisco did not divest its significant stake in Finjan's stock until 2017, months after Finjan filed suit against Cisco). *Id.* 24:21-26:23; SEC filing.<sup>4</sup> Cisco's obligation to keep confidential the Disputed Documents

---

<sup>4</sup> SonicWall tries to confuse the record by referring to deposition testimony that Samet stopped regularly attending board meetings after Finjan's IP-litigation activities intensified. This deposition testimony refers to the **2008 to 2010** timeframe, which is *years after* Finjan provided all but one of the Disputed Documents to Cisco. *Samet* Dep. 63:3-64:14; *Chinn* Dep. 219:1-220:16; Ex. A.

continues to this day. Under these circumstances there is no waiver and SonicWall is not entitled to these privileged and work-product materials.<sup>5</sup>

The Court should further deny SonicWall's request because the Disputed Documents are irrelevant to this action. Cisco produced the Disputed Documents in its case because they related to Cisco's intimate knowledge of Finjan's patents and its litigation activities and, thus, served as evidence in that case of, among other things, Cisco's willful infringement of Finjan's patents. Here, SonicWall concedes it has no basis to conclude that these 14-year old documents are relevant to the issues in this case. Relevance is never a "non-sequitur" in a motion to compel, as SonicWall contends. It is the sine qua non. Indeed, the Disputed Documents do not reference SonicWall, and the only connection seems to be that the same counsel represents both Cisco and SonicWall. However, the Court already rebuffed SonicWall's attempt to import materials from another case. Dkt. 142 ("This request seems geared to manipulate the Patent Local Rules where counsel in this case is simultaneously representing a different defendant in a separate case involving the same patents. The Patent Local Rules do not condone this conduct and neither does this Court.").

#### **A. The Disputed Documents are Attorney Work Product**

The Disputed Documents include advice prepared by Finjan's outside counsel in anticipation of litigation. Ex. A, 2-16. As such they are immune from discovery as attorney work product. *Skynet Elec. Co., Ltd v. Flextronics Int'l, Ltd.*, 12-06317 WHA, 2013 WL 6623874, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 16, 2013) ("The work product doctrine protects from discovery documents ... prepared ... in anticipation of litigation."). Finjan's assertions of work product immunity are narrowly limited. For example, Finjan redacted only 13 pages out of a 118-page Board presentation. To the extent it will aid the Court's assessment of this dispute, Finjan will provide the Disputed Documents for *in camera* review.

Finjan did not waive work product immunity when it shared the Disputed Documents with Cisco's Board observer a decade before the parties became adversaries. Immunity is maintained when a document is prepared "in anticipation of litigation" and is only disclosed to third-parties "bound to maintain its confidence," as was the case here. *Skynet*, 2013 WL 6623874, at \*2-3 (waiver only occurs when a party discloses protected information to a third party not bound to maintain confidentiality). Here, Finjan provided the Disputed Documents under an NDA that limited Cisco's use of received information, precluding any waiver. *Samet Dep.* 194:8-10; *Mondis Tech., Ltd. v. LG Elecs., Inc.*, No. 2:07-CV-565-TJW-CE, 2011 WL 1714304, at \*3 (E.D. Tex. May 4, 2011) (documents prepared for future litigation are protected work product when only disclosed to third parties under an NDA).

That Cisco and Finjan subsequently became adversaries in litigation 13 years later, does not change the dispositive fact that, when Cisco obtained the Disputed Documents in 2004-2008, Cisco and Finjan enjoyed a positive, collaborative relationship and there was no indication they could become adversaries. *Mondis*, \*2 ("[d]isclosure of work-product waives the work-product protection only if work-product is given to adversaries or treated in a manner than substantially

---

<sup>5</sup> Finjan did not locate these documents, which are 9-15 years old, in its files, and only had them when Cisco produced them. Having obtained the documents through that action, Finjan duly identified them to SonicWall in its privilege log in this case.

# 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.