

EXHIBIT 11

1 IRELL & MANELLA LLP
Jonathan S. Kagan (SBN 166039)
2 jkagan@irell.com
1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900
3 Los Angeles, California 90067-4276
4 Telephone: (310) 277-1010
Facsimile: (310) 203-7199

5
6 Rebecca Carson (SBN 254105)
rcarson@irell.com
7 Ingrid M. H. Petersen (SBN 313927)
ipetersen@irell.com
8 840 Newport Center Drive, Suite 400
Newport Beach, California 92660-6324
9 Telephone: (949) 760-0991
Facsimile: (949) 760-5200

10
11 *Attorneys for Defendant*
JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.

12 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
13 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
14 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

15 FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,) Case No. 3:17-cv-05659-WHA
16)
Plaintiff,) **JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.’S MOTION**
17) **FOR ATTORNEYS’ FEES PURSUANT**
vs.) **TO 35 U.S.C. § 285**
18)
JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC., a Delaware)
19 Corporation,) Hearing Date: January 7, 2021
Hearing Time: 8:00 a.m.
20 Defendant.) Judge: Hon. William Alsup
Courtroom: 12

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1	
2	
3 I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
4 II. FACTUAL & PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND	3
5 A. Round One Of The “Patent Showdown”.....	3
6 B. Finjan’s Damages Theory As To The ’494 Patent.....	4
7 C. December 2018 Trial On The ’494 Patent	4
8 D. Juniper’s Motion For Sanctions	5
9 E. The Second Round Of The “Patent Showdown”	5
10 F. Post-Showdown Proceedings	6
11 G. Federal Circuit Appeal Resulting In Summary Affirmance.....	7
12 III. LEGAL STANDARD.....	7
13 IV. ARGUMENT	7
14 A. Juniper Is The Prevailing Party	7
15 B. This Case Is Exceptional	8
16 1. Finjan’s Shifting Sands Approach To Damages And Its	
17 Pursuit Of A “Woefully Inadequate” Damages Case At Trial	
Was Exceptional.....	9
18 2. Finjan’s Self-Selected “Strongest” Claim Was Based On A	
19 “Smoke and Mirrors” Infringement Theory.....	12
20 3. Finjan’s Motion For Summary Judgment On Its “Second-	
21 Best” Claim Was So Baseless It Ended In A Dispositive	
Ruling For Juniper.....	14
22 4. Finjan Lacked A Good Faith Argument That It Complied	
23 With The Notice Requirements Of § 287 For The ’780	
Patent.....	17
24 5. Finjan Repeatedly Forced Juniper To Waste Time And	
25 Money On Claims Finjan Did Not Intend To Pursue.....	21
26 6. Finjan Further Prolonged This Case By Appealing Five	
27 Different Issues, And The Federal Circuit Summarily	
28 Rejected Finjan’s Arguments	22
C. Juniper Should Be Awarded \$8,656,971 In Reasonable Attorneys’	
Fees.....	23
V. CONCLUSION.....	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>3form, Inc. v. Lumicor, Inc.</i> , No. 2:12-cv-293, 2018 WL 4688348 (D. Utah Sep. 28, 2018).....	16
<i>Arctic Cat, Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prods. Inc.</i> , 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	21, 22, 23
<i>Auto. Techs. Int'l, Inc. v. Siemens VDO Auto. Corp.</i> , 744 F. Supp. 2d 646 (E.D. Mich. 2010).....	26
<i>Banas v. Volcano Corp.</i> , 47 F. Supp. 3d 957 (N.D. Cal. 2014)	28
<i>Big Baboon, Inc. v. SAP Am., Inc.</i> , No. 17-cv-02082-HSG, 2019 WL 5088784 (N.D. Cal. Sep. 9, 2019).....	29
<i>Elec. Commcn's Techs., LLC v. ShoppersChoice.com, LLC</i> , 963 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	11
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Sys., Inc.</i> , 879 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	14
<i>Funai Elec. Co. v. Daewoo Elecs. Corp.</i> , 616 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	23
<i>Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Merck & Co., Inc.</i> , No. 13-cv-04057-BLF, 2017 WL 3007071 (N.D. Cal. July 14, 2017).....	29
<i>In re High-Tech Emp. Antitrust Litig.</i> , No. 11-cv-02509-LHK, 2015 WL 5158730 (N.D. Cal. Sep. 2, 2015).....	29
<i>Inventor Holdings, LLC v. Bed Bath & Beyond, Inc.</i> , 876 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	27
<i>Ketab Corp. v. Mesriani & Assoc.</i> , P.C., 734 F. App'x 401 (9th Cir. 2018).....	18
<i>Kilopass Tech., Inc. v. Sidense Corp.</i> , 82 F. Supp. 3d 1154 (N.D. Cal. 2015)	28
<i>Lans v. Digital Equip. Corp.</i> , 252 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	21
<i>Linex Techs., Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , No. C 13-159 CW, 2014 WL 4616847 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 2014)	20

	<u>Page</u>
1 <i>Logic Devices, Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , No. C 13-02943 WHA, 2014 WL 6844821 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 4, 2014).....	25
2	
3 <i>Nilssen v. Osram Sylvania, Inc.</i> , 528 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	12
4 <i>Novo Nordisk A/S v. Becton Dickinson & Co.</i> , 96 F. Supp. 2d 309 (S.D.N.Y. 2000), <i>aff'd</i> , 304 F.3d 1216 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	24
5	
6 <i>Palo Alto Networks, Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.</i> , 752 F. App'x 1017 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	20
7	
8 <i>In re PersonalWeb Technologies, LLC, Patent Litig.</i> , No. 18-md-2834, 2020 WL 5910080 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 9, 2020)	<i>passim</i>
9 <i>Phigenix, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , No. 15-cv-1238, 2018 WL 3845998 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 13, 2018)	12, 15
10	
11 <i>Phonometrics, Inc. v. Westin Hotel Co.</i> , 350 F.3d 1242 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	20
12	
13 <i>Princeton Digital Image Corp. v. Office Depot Inc.</i> , No. C 13-239, 2016 WL 1533697 (D. Del. Mar. 31, 2016).....	22
14 <i>Raniere v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 887 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	12
15	
16 <i>Raniere v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , No. 3:15-cv-0540, 2016 WL 4626584 (N.D. Tex. Sep. 2, 2016).....	22
17	
18 <i>SRI Int'l, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , No. 13-1534, 2020 WL 1285915 (D. Del. Mar. 18, 2020)	28
19 <i>Straight Path IP Grp., Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 411 F. Supp. 3d 1026 (N.D. Cal. 2019)	15, 18, 25, 28
20	
21 <i>Straight Path IP Grp., Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , No. C 16-03463 WHA, 2020 WL 5522993 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 4, 2020).....	20, 27
22	
23 <i>Takeda Chem. Indus., Ltd. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.</i> , 549 F.3d 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	29
24 <i>Taurus IP, LLC v. DaimlerChrysler Corp.</i> , 726 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	16, 21
25	
26 <i>Technology for Energy Corp. v. Hardy</i> , No. 3:16-cv-91, 2018 WL 8460252 (E.D. Tenn. Feb. 15, 2018).....	26
27	
28 <i>Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.</i> , 745 F.3d 513 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	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.