

1 Juanita R. Brooks (CA SBN 75934) brooks@fr.com  
Roger A. Denning (CA SBN 228998) denning@fr.com  
2 Jason W. Wolff (CA SBN 215819) wolff@fr.com  
John-Paul Fryckman (CA SBN 317591) fryckman@fr.com  
3 K. Nicole Williams (CA SBN 291900) nwilliams@fr.com  
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
4 12860 El Camino Real, Suite 400  
San Diego, CA 92130  
5 Telephone: (858) 678-5070 / Fax: (858) 678-5099

6 Proshanto Mukherji (*Pro Hac Vice*) mukherji@fr.com  
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
7 One Marina Park Drive  
Boston, MA 02210  
8 Phone: (617) 542-5070 / Fax: (617) 542-5906

9 Robert Courtney (CA SBN 248392) courtney@fr.com  
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
10 3200 RBC Plaza  
60 South Sixth Street  
11 Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Phone: (612) 335-5070 / Fax: (612) 288-9696  
12

13 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
FINJAN LLC

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
16 (SAN JOSE DIVISION)  
17

18 FINJAN LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability  
19 Company,  
20 Plaintiff,  
21 v.  
22 SONICWALL INC., a Delaware Corporation,  
23 Defendant.  
24

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

**FINJAN LLC'S OPPOSITION TO  
SONICWALL INC.'S MOTION TO  
STRIKE NEW THEORIES IN FINJAN  
LLC'S EXPERT REPORTS**

Date: March 11, 2021  
Time: 9:00 a.m.  
Judge: Hon. Beth Labson Freeman  
Dept: Courtroom 3, Fifth Floor

25  
26 **REDACTED VERSION**  
27  
28

**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. STATEMENT OF FACTS..... 1

II. LEGAL STANDARD..... 1

III. ARGUMENT..... 2

    A. Finjan’s Infringement Theories Were Disclosed In Its Contentions ..... 2

        1. The ’305 Patent ..... 2

        2. The ’408 Patent ..... 5

        3. The ’780 Patent ..... 6

        4. The ’154 Patent ..... 7

    B. Finjan’s Infringement Theories Are Consistent With This Court’s Orders .....10

IV. CONCLUSION.....10

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**Cases**

*Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*,  
5:12-CV-0630-LHK-PSG, 2014 WL 12917334 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 9, 2014) ..... 1, 3, 5, 7

*Digital Reg of Texas, LLC v. Adobe Sys. Inc.*,  
No. CV 12-01971-CW (KAW), 2014 WL 1653131 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 24, 2014)..... 1, 2, 4, 5, 6

**Other Authorities**

Patent Local Rule 3-1 ..... 1

Rewrite Engine, WIKIPEDIA, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rewrite\\_engine](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rewrite_engine)  
(last visited Nov. 22, 2020) ..... 10

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

1 Finjan provided ample notice of its theories in its initial and supplemental infringement  
2 contentions. Finjan’s expert reports marshal the evidence to provide a complete statement of their  
3 opinions, consistent with the contentions and the Court’s November 20, 2019 Order. Dkt. 210.  
4 SonicWall’s request would effectively require parties to identify infringement theories *and* all  
5 supporting evidence during fact discovery, eliminating the need for expert reports. That is not the  
6 law. Infringement contentions must identify infringement theories, not marshal all evidence  
7 collected during discovery. Finjan’s contentions disclose its theories—and more. Accordingly,  
8 SonicWall’s Motion to Strike Finjan’s Expert Reports (Dkt. 299-3) should be denied.

#### 9 I. STATEMENT OF FACTS

10 Finjan served its initial infringement contentions on April 10, 2018 pursuant to Patent  
11 Local Rule 3-1. *See, e.g.*, Declaration of Jason Wolff (“Wolff Decl.”) at ¶ 2. Finjan supplemented  
12 its Contentions three times, on November 9, 2018, May 31, 2019, and December 11, 2019. *See id.*  
13 at ¶¶ 5–12. Finjan updated certain infringement charts following the Court’s November 2019  
14 Order. *See, e.g.*, Dkts. 299-16, 299-17 (Appxs. H-2 and H-4, 7/2/2020). After Finjan’s service of  
15 infringement expert reports on September 3, 2020, SonicWall alleged Finjan’s reports contained  
16 new theories. Dkt. 299-8 (Sept. 21, 2020 Email fr. J. Gunther). The parties conferred and Finjan  
17 responded with a detailed explanation with pincites for each issue raised. *See* Dkt. 299-8 (Oct. 2,  
18 2020 Email fr. J. Wolff). Finjan maintains these theories were properly and timely disclosed.

#### 19 II. LEGAL STANDARD

20 Patent L.R. 3-1 “require[s] parties to crystallize their theories of the case early in the  
21 litigation.” *Digital Reg of Texas, LLC v. Adobe Sys. Inc.*, No. CV 12-01971-CW (KAW), 2014  
22 WL 1653131, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 24, 2014) (citation omitted). “The threshold question in  
23 deciding whether to strike an expert report is whether the expert has permissibly specified the  
24 application of a disclosed theory or impermissibly substituted a new theory altogether.” *Id.* The  
25 operative word “theories” does not mean marshalling all evidence or citing minutia. *Id.* (quoting  
26 *Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, 5:12-CV-0630-LHK-PSG, 2014 WL 12917334, at \*1 (N.D. Cal.  
27 Jan. 9, 2014) (“Contentions need not disclose specific evidence. . . .”).

1 **III. ARGUMENT**

2 **A. Finjan's Infringement Theories Were Disclosed In Its Contentions**

3 **1. The '305 Patent**

4 **a. Network Traffic Probe And Destination Computer Limitations**

5 Finjan's infringement contentions disclosed the "network traffic probe" theories described  
6 in ¶¶ 217-218 of Dr. Medvidovic's report. Finjan has always alleged that Capture ATP infringes  
7 the '305 claims by providing a network traffic probe that scans and diverts incoming content from  
8 its intended destination. *See* Exh. A (Appx. G-2, to Finjan's 4/10/18 Infr. Contentions) at 10-11.  
9 SonicWall does not dispute that Finjan accused Capture ATP of infringement and described how a  
10 functionality satisfies the network traffic probe limitation. Instead, SonicWall argues that Finjan  
11 "failed to identify a specific component that constitutes the claimed network traffic probe, and it  
12 identified only the [REDACTED] as the  
13 destination computer." Mot. at 2. SonicWall's dispute is not whether Finjan's *theory* was  
14 disclosed, but instead whether Finjan's contentions should have presented more evidence in  
15 support. It is proper for expert reports to present evidence and analysis to support theories  
16 disclosed in contentions. *See Digital Reg of Texas*, 2014 WL 1653131, at \*5 ("[E]xpert reports are  
17 expected to provide more information than is contained in infringement contentions.").

18 First, SonicWall cannot dispute that Finjan's contentions described how CaptureATP  
19 satisfies the network traffic probe limitation and Finjan's expert reports do not deviate from those  
20 contentions. Finjan's contentions stated, [REDACTED]  
21 [REDACTED] Exh. B (Appx. G-2, 12/11/19) at 16.  
22 Finjan's expert report consistently states that the network [REDACTED]  
23 [REDACTED]  
24 [REDACTED] Exh. C  
25 (Medvidovic Rep.) at ¶ 217. Finjan's contentions further identified the Capture ATP source code  
26 demonstrating that the network traffic probe performs the infringing functionality. Exh. B at 17  
27 [REDACTED]

# 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.