

DUANE MORRIS LLP
D. Stuart Bartow (CA SBN 233107)
dsbartow@duanemorris.com
Nicole E. Grigg (CA SBN 307733)
negrigg@duanemorris.com
2475 Hanover Street
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1194
Telephone: 650.847.4150
Facsimile: 650.847.4151

DUANE MORRIS LLP
Joseph A. Powers (PA SBN 84590)
Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
japowers@duanemorris.com
Jarrad M. Gunther (PA SBN 207038)
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 (GA SBN 287789)
Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
mcgaudet@duanemorris.com
Robin L. McGrath (GA SBN 493115)
Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
rlmcgrath@duanemorris.com
David C. Dotson (GA SBN 138040)
Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
dcdotson@duanemorris.com
Jennifer H. Forte (GA SBN 940650)
Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
jhforte@duanemorris.com
1075 Peachtree NE, Suite 2000
Atlanta, GA 30309
Telephone: 404.253.6900
Facsimile: 404.253.6901

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

FINJAN, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability
Company,

Plaintiff,

v.

SONICWALL INC., a Delaware Corporation,

Defendant.

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

**DEFENDANT SONICWALL INC.'S
MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE
TESTIMONY OF FINJAN'S EXPERTS
DR. MCDUFF, DR. STRIEGEL, DR.
COLE, DR. MITZENMACHER, AND DR.
MEDVIDOVIC**

Date: February 18, 2021
Time: 9:00 AM
Courtroom: 3, 5th Floor
Judge: Hon. Beth Labson Freeman

REDACTED

DEFENDANT SONICWALL INC.'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE TESTIMONY OF DRs. MCDUFF, STRIEGEL, COLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1		
2		
3	I. Legal Standard	1
4	II. The Opinions of Finjan’s Damages Expert, Dr. McDuff, Are Methodologically	
5	Flawed.....	1
6	A. Dr. McDuff’s Overarching Failure to Discount for the Time Value of Money	2
7	B. Each of Dr. McDuff’s Individual Methodologies Is Methodologically Flawed.....	4
8	1. Dr. McDuff’s Method No. 1 is Methodologically Flawed	4
9	2. Dr. McDuff’s Method No. 2 is Methodologically Flawed	7
10	3. Dr. McDuff’s Method No. 3 Is Methodologically Flawed	8
11	III. Dr. Striegel’s “Technical Apportionment” Opinions Are Flawed and Render Dr.	
12	McDuff’s Apportioned Royalty Bases Unreliable.....	11
13	A. Overview of Dr. Striegel’s Analysis.....	11
14	B. Legal Standard	13
15	C. Dr. Striegel Admits He Did Not Attempt To Identify the Incremental Value	
16	That the Patented Invention Adds to the Accused Products.....	14
17	D. Dr. Striegel’s Determination of When “Overlap” Exists is Completely	
18	Arbitrary and Fails to Undertake the Necessary Further Apportionment.....	17
19	1. Dr. Striegel’s Identification of “Top-Level Functions” Is Flawed	17
20	2. Dr. Striegel’s Identification of “Top-Level Functions” Ignores Non-	
21	Accused Functionality	19
22	3. Dr. Striegel Identified “Overlap” If the Patent Provided Merely More	
23	Than a “Miniscule” Benefit to a “Top-Level Function” And Failed To	
24	Undertake the Necessary Further Apportionment	20
25	IV. Drs. Cole, Mitzenmacher, Medvidovic, and Striegel’s “Opinions” Regarding the	
26	Historical Relationship Between Finjan and SonicWall.....	22
27	A. Factual Background	23
28	B. Expert Testimony on the Finjan-SonicWall Relations is Improper.....	23

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Federal Cases

Arista Networks, Inc. v. Cisco Systems, Inc., No. 16-cv-00923-BLF, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 228820 (N.D. Cal. June 15, 2018).....24

Aro Mfg. Co. v. Convertible Top Replacement Co., 365 U.S. 336 (1961)5

Commonwealth Sci. & Indus. Research Organisation v. Cisco Sys., Inc., 809 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....*Passim*

Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 509 U.S. 579 (1993).....1, 14, 17

Deepsouth Packing Co. v. Laitram Corp., 406 U.S. 518 (1972)5

Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Sys., Inc., 773 F.3d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....13

Exmark Mfg. Co. v. Briggs & Stratton Power Products Grp., Inc., 879 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....22

Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Sys., 879 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....*Passim*

Garretson v. Clark, 111 U.S. 120 (1884)14

General Elec. C. v. Joiner, 522 U.S. 136 (1997).....17

GPNE Corp. v. Apple, Inc., 2014 WL 1494247 (N.D. Cal. Ap. 16, 2014).....17

Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc., 580 F.3d 1301 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....3

Mag Aero. Indus. v. B/E Aero., Inc., 816 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....19

PharmaStem Therapeutics, Inc. v. ViaCell, Inc., 491 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....13

Prime Media Group, LLC v. Acer Am. Corp., No. 12-cv-05020-BLF, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7515 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 22, 2015).....24

Regents of the Univ. of Minn. v. AGA Med. Corp., 717 F.3d 929 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....19

VirnetX, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc., 767 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....14, 20

Federal Statutes

35 U.S.C. §271(a)5

Rules

FRE 7021

1	FRE 702(a).....	23
2	FRE 702(b).....	23
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		

NOTICE OF MOTION

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on February 18, 2021 at 9:00 a.m., or on another date determined by the Court, in Courtroom 3, 5th Floor, in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, San Jose Courthouse, located at 280 S. 1st St, San Jose, CA 95113, Defendant SonicWall Inc. (“SonicWall”) will and does move for an order granting this Motion to Exclude the Testimony of Plaintiff Finjan, LLC’s (“Finjan”) Experts Dr. McDuff, Dr. Striegel, Dr. Cole, Dr. Mitzenmacher, and Dr. Medvidovic.

For the reasons explained below, this Court should exclude the expert opinions and testimony of Dr. McDuff, Dr. Striegel, Dr. Cole, Dr. Mitzenmacher, and Dr. Medvidovic for failure to meet the admissibility requirements of *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharms., Inc.*, 509 U.S. 579 (1993) and Fed. R. Evid. 702.

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

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.