

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FINJAN, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

ESET, LLC, a California Limited Liability
and ESET SPOL. S.R.O., a Slovak
Republic Corporation,

Defendants.

Case No.: 3:17-cv-0183-CAB-(BGS)

**ORDER ON ESET LLC’S MOTION
TO DISMISS
[Doc. No. 47]**

Before the Court is Defendant ESET LLC’s Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss Plaintiff Finjan, Inc.’s complaint for willful infringement of six patents. [Doc. No. 47.] This motion comes to the Court with an unusual procedural history.

I. Background

Finjan’s complaint was filed in the Northern District of California on July 1, 2016 (“N.D. Case”). Earlier that same day, ESET filed a complaint in the Southern District of California, 16-cv-1704, for declaratory judgment of non-infringement of one the patents at issue in the Finjan complaint (“S.D. Case”). On July 26, 2016, Finjan moved to dismiss the S.D. Case in light of the N.D. Case. On July 27, 2016, ESET moved to dismiss the N.D. Case in light of the S.D. Case. On September 1, 2016, District Judge James Donato

1 stayed the N.D. Case while this Court considered Finjan's motion to dismiss the S.D. Case.
2 On September 26, 2016, this Court granted Finjan's motion to dismiss the S.D. Case.

3 At a hearing on October 6, 2016, Judge Donato lifted the stay in the N.D. Case and
4 discussed with the parties setting a case management conference and issuing a scheduling
5 order. [Doc. No. 56-3, at 10-11.] Judge Donato instructed the parties to proceed with
6 initial disclosures in accordance with the local patent rules and submit a proposed
7 scheduling order. [*Id.*] The court also discussed the negotiation history between the parties
8 and mediation potential.

9 Although an answer had not yet been filed, there was no discussion regarding ESET
10 filing a responsive pleading to the complaint. Defense counsel stated ESET would file a
11 motion for change of venue, which was filed November 14, 2016 [Doc. No. 60], he never
12 apprised the court however that ESET would also file a motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule
13 12(b)(6) to challenge the adequacy of the pleadings under Rule 8. [Doc. No. 56-3 at 16.]
14 On October 20, 2016, the parties filed a Joint Case Management Statement [Doc. No. 49]
15 as directed by the court, and at the same time ESET filed this motion to dismiss for failure
16 to state a claim, that is now before this Court.

17 On November 14, 2016, despite the pending motion to dismiss the complaint, Judge
18 Donato entered a Scheduling Order [Doc. No. 61] that among other things required: (1) the
19 parties make initial disclosures by November 21, 2016; (2) Finjan provide infringement
20 contentions by December 9, 2016 and make a Preliminary Election of Asserted Claims by
21 January 11, 2017 [Doc. No. 72]; and (3) ESET provide invalidity contentions by January
22 20, 2017 and make a Preliminary Election of Prior Art by January 25, 2017 [Doc. No. 74].
23 On January 26, 2017, without ruling on the motion to dismiss, Judge Donato granted
24 ESET's motion for change of venue and ordered this case transferred to the Southern
25 District of California [Doc. No. 75] and it was ultimately assigned to the undersigned by
26 low number rule [Doc. No. 84] with the motion to dismiss still pending. On March 20,
27 2017, the Court heard argument on the motion.
28

1 **II. Discussion**

2 ESET challenges the sufficiency of the pleadings with regard to the allegations of
3 direct infringement, inducing infringement and willful infringement of the six patents at
4 issue. Although a motion to dismiss is based on the adequacy of the pleading itself, the
5 Court does not believe in the context of this particular case that it would be a proper
6 application of Rule 1, which directs the Court and the parties to construe and administer
7 the rules of civil procedure to secure the just, speedy and inexpensive determination of
8 every action and proceeding, for the Court to simply ignore all that has transpired since the
9 complaint was filed. The Court will therefore consider ESET’s motion to dismiss in light
10 of all the information that has been disclosed between the parties regarding the allegations
11 of patent infringement in this case pursuant to the Scheduling Order entered by Judge
12 Donato.

13 1. Dismissal of all Patents Based on Unsupported Allegations All Claims Infringed.

14 Defendant moved in part to dismiss the complaint as to all asserted patents because
15 the complaint alleges infringement of every claim of each asserted patent without providing
16 plausible allegations specific to each and every claim as to what accused product infringes
17 each element of each claim and how. Plaintiff has however at this point, pursuant to the
18 court’s scheduling order, narrowed the list to 25 total claims and provided claim charts for
19 each of those asserted claims directed to an accused product. The Court therefore deems
20 the matter of the sufficiency of the pleadings with regard to the now unasserted claims to
21 be moot.¹

22 Based on Finjan’s Preliminary Election of Asserted Claims and Preliminary
23 Infringement Contentions the following claims are presently at issue before the Court:

24 /////

25
26 _____

27 ¹ This determination does not preclude Finjan from seeking to renew allegations of infringement as to the
28 withdrawn claims of the patents at issue should Finjan contend it necessary to do so following claim
construction or with leave of court upon a showing of good cause.

| Patent | Claim | Type of Infringement Alleged |
|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 6,154,844 | Independent Claim 1 | Direct 271(a) and Inducing 271(b) |
| | Dependent Claim 7 | Direct 271(a) and Inducing 271(b) |
| | Dependent Claim 11 | Direct 271(a) and Inducing 271(b) |
| | Independent Claim 15 | Direct 271(a) |
| | Dependent Claim 16 | Direct 271(a) |
| | Dependent Claim 21 | Direct 271(a) |
| 6,804,780 | Independent Claim 9 | Direct 271(a) |
| | Dependent Claim 13 | Direct 271(a) |
| | Independent Claim 18 | Direct 271(a) |
| 7,975,305 | Independent Claim 1 | Direct 271(a) |
| | Dependent Claim 2 | Direct 271(a) |
| | Dependent Claim 7 | Direct 271(a) |
| | Dependent Claim 11 | Direct 271(a) |
| 8,079,086 | Independent Claim 1 | Direct 271(a) and Inducing 271(b) |
| | Dependent Claim 2 | Direct 271(a) and Inducing 271(b) |
| | Independent Claim 9 | Direct 271(a) |
| | Dependent Claim 10 | Direct 271(a) |
| | Independent Claim 24 | Direct 271(a) |
| 9,189,621 | Independent Claim 1 | Direct 271(a) and Inducing 271(b) |
| | Dependent Claim 5 | Direct 271(a) and Inducing 271(b) |
| | Independent Claim 10 | Direct 271(a) and Inducing 271(b) |
| | Dependent Claim 13 | Direct 271(a) and Inducing 271(b) |
| | Dependent Claim 15 | Direct 271(a) and Inducing 271(b) |
| 9,219,755 | Independent Claim 3 | Direct 271(a) and Inducing 271(b) |
| | Dependent Claim 6 | Direct 271(a) and Inducing 271(b) |

1 2. Dismissal of Direct Infringement Claims of ‘621, ‘755 and ‘305 Patents.

2 Defendant moved to dismiss the allegations of direct infringement of the ‘621 patent
3 and ‘755 patent because they cover systems that include computer hardware elements such
4 as a processor and memory, and the ‘305 patent because it covers a system that includes
5 the element of a network interface housed within a computer. The accused products are
6 security software products so Defendant asserts it does not make, use or sell a product that
7 Finjan can plausibly allege meets all the limitations of these system claims. Finjan’s
8 infringement contentions however include user guides for the accused software that
9 describe hardware system components required to operate the software. To ascertain the
10 required or recommended hardware components needed to utilize the software, it is
11 plausible that ESET uses a system within the scope of the claims. Unauthorized use of the
12 patented system, even for the purpose of developing, testing and improving the software
13 products ESET sells can constitute infringement.² Finjan’s infringement contentions
14 provide a sufficient basis for a plausible claim of direct infringement, and the Court finds
15 it unnecessary for Plaintiff to amend the complaint to incorporate the information set forth
16 in the contentions to meet Rule 8 requirements.³ The motion to dismiss the claims of direct
17 infringement of the ‘621, ‘755 and ‘305 patents is denied.

18 3. Dismissal of the Indirect Infringement Claims.

19 With regard to the allegations of inducing infringement which requires prior
20 knowledge of the patents by the Defendant, based on the Plaintiff’s narrowed infringement
21 contentions, there are presently four patents to which this allegation is asserted: Claims 1,
22
23

24 ² ESET denied such use at the hearing, but for purposes of the motion to dismiss such use is a plausible
25 allegation.

26 ³ This determination is limited to whether a sufficient pleading under Rule 8 was, or could be provided.
27 It is not a determination in any way on the merits of Plaintiff’s direct infringement allegations. Nor does
28 it preclude Finjan from establishing an alternative theory of direct infringement. In its opposition Finjan
contended that ESET directly infringes the claimed systems by putting the invention into service, i.e.,
controlling the system as a whole and obtaining benefit from it. *Centillion Data Sys., LLC v. Quest
Commc’ns Int’l, Inc.*, 631 F.3d 1279, 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2011).

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.