

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 317591) fryckman@fr.com  
 3 K. Nicole Williams (CA291900) nwilliams@fr.com  
 4 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
 12860 El Camino Real, Ste. 400  
 5 San Diego, CA 92130  
 Telephone: (858) 678-5070 / Fax: (858) 678-5099  
 6

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

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

13 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
 14 FINJAN LLC

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

18 FINJAN LLC., a Delaware Limited Liability  
 19 Company,

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 SONICWALL, INC., a Delaware Corporation,

23 Defendant.  
 24  
 25

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

**PLAINTIFF FINJAN LLC'S MOTION IN  
 LIMINE NO. 1 TO PRECLUDE  
 TESTIMONY ON WRITTEN  
 DESCRIPTION FROM SONICWALL'S  
 TECHNICAL EXPERTS**

Date: March 18, 2021  
 Time: 1:30 PM  
 Hon. Beth Labson Freeman  
 Ctrm: 3, 5th Floor

26  
 27 **UNREDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED**  
 28

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence 401, 402, 403, and 702, Finjan LLC (“Finjan”)  
3 respectfully requests that the Court exclude from presentation at trial any testimonial opinions that  
4 any asserted patent claim lacks sufficient written description, and/or is invalid for that reason.

5 **II. ARGUMENT**

6 SonicWall proposes to present the jury with technical opinions concerning the sufficiency  
7 of the written description supporting Finjan’s patent claims. SonicWall’s technical experts did not  
8 base these opinions on the Court’s claim constructions, but used improper alternative claim  
9 constructions the experts invented themselves. Such opinions are improper, and the Court should  
10 preclude SonicWall from presenting them to the jury.

11 **A. For Written Description, SonicWall’s Technical Experts Relied on Alternative**  
12 **Constructions Not Adopted by the Court**

13 Each of SonicWall’s technical experts, Aviel Rubin, Ph.D; Kevin Almeroth, Ph.D.; and  
14 Patrick McDaniel, Ph.D., applied the same methodology opining on written description:

- 15 1. Identifying a Finjan infringement contention against a SonicWall product;
- 16 2. Based on the contention, forming an alternative construction of a claim  
17 limitation(s);
- 18 3. Reasoning that Finjan would have adopted this alternative construction; then
- 19 4. Opining that the patent’s written description fails to teach or suggest an  
20 embodiment conforming to the alternative claim construction.

21 The written description opinions of all four experts use this approach. (See Exh. 1 at 212–  
22 40; Exh. 2 at 253–86; Exh. 3 at 128–41.) The Opening Rubin report is illustrative. It begins by  
23 analyzing Finjan’s infringement contentions. (Exh. 1 at 212 (“Finjan contends this claim language  
24 is met . . .”).) It then hypothesizes that Finjan’s basis for those contentions might have been an  
alternative interpretation of some claim term (here, the 2408 claim term “an incoming stream of

1 programming code”) such that the term would cover the limitation in question (here, “loading a  
2 file into memory before it is analyzed.” (*Id.* at 213.) The Report assigns this hypothetical  
3 construction to Finjan, though it cites neither any filing by Finjan adopting that construction, nor  
4 the Court’s claim construction order. (*Id.*) Finally, the Report compares its alternative  
5 construction to the specification of the ’408 patent to look for disclosure of the exact alleged  
6 functionality and, finding none, opines that a skilled artisan would not find support for the claim  
7 under this alternative, hypothetical construction never adopted by (or even submitted to) the Court.  
8 (*Id.* at 213–14.)

### 9 **B. Depositions Confirmed The Experts’ Reliance on Alternative Constructions**

10 When challenged at deposition, the SonicWall Technical Experts confirmed that their  
11 analysis of written description primarily relied on Finjan’s infringement contentions, and not on  
12 the Court’s Claim Construction Order or the terms’ ordinary meaning to one of skill in the art.

13 Dr. Rubin confirmed that under the proper construction of the claims, he was “not  
14 challenging” written description. (Exh. 4 50:11–18 (“Q: [Under] what you understand is the  
15 proper scope of the claims[, y]ou’re not challenging the limitations on a written description basis;  
16 is that right? A: In these sections [concerning written description] . . . I’m not challenging, under  
17 proper construction, the written description.” (objection omitted)).) He confirmed that his written  
18 description opinions were based entirely on constructions that the Court has not adopted, and  
19 would apply only if the Court “decides that, in fact, they [the alternative constructions] are  
20 right[.]” (*Id.* at 46:9–47:1.)

21 Dr. Almeroth described his written description argument as a “conditional” argument, and  
22 that he was not providing a written description opinion under “the proper” interpretation of the  
23 claims. (Exh. 5 62:22–63:2, 64:13–19.) His analysis was expressly “predicated based on a claims  
24 scope” that he purportedly discerned from Finjan’s “infringement allegations.” (*Id.* at 67:8–15.)

1 Dr. McDaniel confirmed that he—like all the SonicWall experts—was applying a different  
2 claim construction for written description than he applied to either infringement or other aspects of  
3 invalidity. (Exh. 6 54:12–21 (describing how his written description discussion “adopt[s] what  
4 Finjan appeared to be arguing as the scope of the claim”).) And, like the other experts, he offered  
5 no written description opinion under the claim construction actually entered by the Court. (*Id.* at  
6 55:16–20.)

7 **C. The Court Should Not Permit Presentation of Hypothetical, Alternative**  
8 **Constructions, or Opinions Based Thereon, to the Jury**

9 The SonicWall Technical Expert’s hypothetical-construction methodology is improper as a  
10 matter of law, per se unreliable, and inappropriate for the jury. Unless the Court precludes it, such  
11 testimony would confuse the jury as to the meaning of claim terms, which meanings should only  
12 every be set by the Court. The jury should only be presented with one set of claim constructions:  
13 those in the Court’s Claim Construction Order.

14 **1. Legal Standards**

15 The Supreme Court has long held that patent claim interpretation is an issue of law, to be  
16 resolved exclusively by the court. *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 517 U.S. 370, 372  
17 (1996). In jury trials, the court supplies its constructions to the jury via instructions. *E.g.*, *Every*  
18 *Penny Counts, Inc. v. American Express Co.*, 563 F.3d 1378, 1383 (Fed. Cir. 2009) (“[T]he court’s  
19 obligation is to ensure that questions of the scope of the patent claims are not left to the jury.”)  
20 Claim interpretation is not, in any sense, a jury issue. *Id.* Courts construing patent claims give  
21 terms the meaning they would have to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the  
22 invention in view of the specification and the prosecution history. *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415  
23 F.3d 1303, 1312–13 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc). As to written description, patents must contain a  
24 sufficient written description “as to enable any person skilled in the art . . . to make and use the

1 ordinary skill in the art to recognize that the inventor invented what is claimed.” *Ariad Pharms.,*  
2 *Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 598 F.3d 1336, 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc) (quote marks omitted).  
3 “[T]he test for sufficiency is whether the disclosure of the application relied upon reasonably  
4 conveys to those skilled in the art that the inventor had possession of the claimed subject matter as  
5 of the filing date.” *Id.* The sufficiency of written description is evaluated based on “the four  
6 corners of the specification.” *Id.* A patent satisfies the written description requirement where its  
7 specification is adequate “to support the full scope of the claims as construed [by the court].”  
8 *Energy Trans. Grp. v. William Demant Holding A/S*, 697 F.3d 1342, 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2012). Fact-  
9 finders evaluating the sufficiency of a patent’s written description apply a presumption that the  
10 description is sufficient. A patent may be invalidated on written description grounds only upon  
11 clear and convincing evidence that the full scope of the claims, using the construction assigned by  
12 the court, lacks support in the written description. *Ariad*, 598 F.3d at 1354.

## 13 2. Opinions Based on Alternative Claim Constructions Derived From 14 Infringement Allegations are Improper

15 The written description opinions offered by Drs. Rubin, Almeroth, and McDaniel should  
16 be precluded. For written description, claims must only interpreted according to their ordinary  
17 meaning at the time of the invention, in view of the specification and the prosecution history.  
18 *Koninklijke Philips Elecs. N.V. v. Cardiac Sci. Operating Co.*, 590 F.3d 1326, 1336 (Fed. Cir.  
19 2010) (“A district court must base its analysis of written description . . . on proper claim  
20 construction.”); *see also Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1312–13. This Court properly held claim  
21 construction proceedings, and issued an order. (See Claim Constr. Order (Mar. 26, 2019), D.I.  
22 132.) Eliciting testimony using constructions neither Finjan nor the Court have adopted flatly  
23 abridges that law.

24 Further, infringement contentions are not a recognized source for claim construction. Post-

patent documents—such as contentions—that do not help establish what claim terms meant at the

# 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.