

1 NICOLA A. PISANO, CA Bar No. 151282
NicolaPisano@eversheds-sutherland.com

2 JOSE L. PATIÑO, CA Bar No. 149568
JosePatino@eversheds-sutherland.com

3 JUSTIN E. GRAY, CA Bar No. 282452
JustinGray@eversheds-sutherland.com

4 SCOTT A. PENNER, CA Bar No. 253716
ScottPenner@eversheds-sutherland.com

5 **EVERSHEDS SUTHERLAND (US) LLP**

6 12255 EL CAMINO REAL, SUITE 100

7 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92130

8 TELEPHONE: 858.252.6502

9 FACSIMILE: 858.252.6503

10 Attorneys for Defendants and Counter-Plaintiffs
ESET, LLC and ESET, SPOL. S.R.O.

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
12 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

13 FINJAN, INC.,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 ESET, LLC, et al.,

17 Defendants.

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

**MOTION FOR ADDITIONAL
DISCOVERY AND ISSUANCE OF
LETTER OF REQUEST**

Judge: Hon. Bernard G. Skomal

18
19 AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 28(b)(2)(A), Defendants ESET, spol. s.r.o. and ESET,
2 LLC (collectively, “ESET”) make this application to the Court to permit a second
3 deposition of Shlomo Touboul on topics that were previously stayed, as well as for
4 issuance of a Letter of Request, in the form attached as Exhibit A. The Letter of Request
5 is to be issued pursuant to the Hague Convention on the Taking of Evidence Abroad in
6 Civil and Commercial Matters (the “Hague Convention”). The letter seeks the
7 assistance of the Israeli Center Authority for The Hague Evidence Convention to compel
8 the deposition of Mr. Touboul, who is living in Israel and is a named inventor on one or
9 more of the patents asserted in this action.¹ The deposition will take place at a mutually
10 agreeable location in Israel to provide testimony under oath concerning matters in this
11 case.²

12 I. BACKGROUND

13 On May 7, 2018, this Court stayed discovery as to U.S. Patent No. 7,975,305 (“the
14 ’305 patent”). On July 23, 2018, Mr. Touboul was deposed in this action. In view of the
15 stay, ESET did not question Mr. Touboul regarding the ’305 patent. Following ESET’s
16 examination, Finjan introduced the ’305 patent as an exhibit. ESET objected to the
17 exhibit – and each of the following questions regarding the ’305 patent – as being
18 outside the scope of the direct examination and in violation of the Court’s order for the
19 stay.³ ESET did not join Finjan in violating the Court’s order by questioning the witness
20 about the ’305 patent.

21 Also, in view of the stay, ESET had not yet served amended invalidity contentions
22 to address newly asserted claims of the ’305 patent, nor had ESET consulted its expert to
23 address potential issues to be explored during deposition of the inventors of the ’305
24 patent. ESET also did not invest additional time or effort in preparing to take Mr.

25 _____
26 ¹ Following a number of meet-and-confer sessions, the parties agreed to avoid Hague
27 service for Moshe Rubin, another witness living in Israel, and are working cooperatively
28 to schedule his deposition.

² To the extent the Israeli authorities permit, and the parties can agree on a time, date,
and method, ESET is also amenable to a remote deposition of Mr. Touboul.

1 Touboul's deposition relating to '305 patent. Now that the stay is lifted and discovery is
2 open as to the '305 patent, ESET seeks to depose Mr. Touboul on discrete topics
3 concerning the '305 patent.

4 This dispute arose on November 10, 2020, when Finjan's counsel refused service
5 for Mr. Touboul and stated they would oppose ESET's request to examine him on topics
6 that were previously stayed. Specifically, as part of the meet and confer process, counsel
7 for Finjan stated that while Finjan's counsel previously represented Mr. Touboul, they
8 refused to accept service stating that he was no longer represented by Finjan's counsel.
9 Thus, in order to serve Mr. Touboul, who lives in Israel, ESET must use the Hague
10 Convention. Also, despite no longer representing Mr. Touboul, counsel for Finjan stated
11 that Finjan would oppose this request because Mr. Touboul had already been deposed,
12 notwithstanding that he had not been questioned about the '305 patent nor was counsel
13 for ESET required to make such inquiries in light of the stay.

14 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

15 Leave of court or a stipulation of the parties is required if the deponent has already
16 been deposed once in the case. Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(a)(2)(A)(ii). "The Federal Rules of
17 Civil Procedure treat service under the Hague Convention as the primary means of
18 serving a defendant located in a country which ... is a signatory to the Hague
19 Convention." *Wright v. Old Gringo Inc.*, No. 17-cv-1996-BAS-NLS, 2018 U.S. Dist.
20 LEXIS 125491, at *3 (S.D. Cal. July 26, 2018) (citing *Volkswagenwerk*
21 *Aktiengesellschaft v. Schlunk*, 468 U.S. 694, 706 (1988)).

22 **III. ARGUMENT**

23 Leave to depose Mr. Touboul regarding discrete topics concerning the '305 patent
24 is especially appropriate where, as here, discovery regarding the '305 patent was stayed
25 at the time of Mr. Touboul's first deposition. Indeed, during the June 14, 2018 status
26 conference, this Court expressly acknowledged that ESET was not required to pursue
27 that discovery:

28

1 Okay. Basically the Court's position on this and the order is
2 that to the extent the parties wish to jointly pursue discovery on
3 the '305 for economic and efficiency reasons, particularly with
4 regard to international discovery, the stay is lifted for that
5 purpose. **It doesn't require that you do the discovery.** And
6 if there's an objection to discovery that is being sought in that
7 scope and you don't want to do it and the other side does, you
8 can come back to me on that as opposed to the magistrate judge
9 since it's my order, and I'll decide whether or not it's
10 appropriate.

11 June 14, 2018 Hearing Transcript at 9:20-10:4 (emphasis added); *see also* May 7, 2018
12 Order, D.I. 251 at 4 (“As to the '305 patent, any other pending and further proceeding
13 related to the '305 patent are STAYED until the issuance of the Board's decision.”).
14 Thus, regardless of whether Finjan chose to ignore the stay and question Mr. Touboul
15 following ESET's examination, the order staying discovery as to the '305 patent
16 remained in place and ESET was under no obligation to question the witness regarding
17 the stayed '305 patent. *See Coleman v. Newsom*, No. 2:90-cv-0520 KJM DB P, 2020
18 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 107238, at *14 (E.D. Cal. June 17, 2020) (recognizing the
19 “unremarkable proposition that any party bound by a court order may not act unilaterally
20 in violation of that order but, instead, must seek relief from the court that issued the
21 order.”). Indeed, “[d]isregard of [a court] order would undermine the court's ability to
22 control its docket ... and reward the indolent and the cavalier.” *Johnson v. Mammoth*
23 *Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 610 (9th Cir. 1992). Finjan now seeks to be rewarded
24 for its cavalier attitude toward the Court's stay order by seeking to preclude ESET from
25 now properly questioning Mr. Touboul about the '305 patent. Such attempts “would
26 undermine the court's ability to control its docket” and are improper. *Id.*

27 The purpose of the stay was to allow the parties to avoid incurring additional cost
28 associated with discovery concerning the '305 patent. Accordingly, when the stay

1 issued, counsel for ESET, ESET's experts, and ESET itself stopped such work. Left
2 uncompleted at that time was ESET's amended invalidity contentions, analysis of the
3 newly asserted claims (including analysis of priority dates, whether there was
4 specification support for the newly asserted claims, and whether any aspect of the newly
5 asserted claims were obvious in light of the prior art, all matters that would be relevant
6 to an inventor deposition), and any discussions with its expert regarding the scope of any
7 inventor deposition relating to the '305 patent. In light of the stay, when Mr. Touboul
8 was deposed in this action, ESET did not question him regarding the '305 patent.
9 Indeed, for ESET to have invested additional time or effort in preparing to take Mr.
10 Touboul's deposition relating to '305 patent would have defeated the purpose of the
11 stay. Instead, now that discovery is open as to the '305 patent, it is appropriate to depose
12 Mr. Touboul on issues limited to the '305 patent despite his prior deposition regarding
13 other topics. *Cypress Semiconductor Corp. v. GSI Tech., Inc.*, No. 13-cv-02013-JST,
14 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 142858, at *8 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 7, 2014) (noting that when a
15 partial stay is granted to a subset of patents in a multi-patent infringement action, "there
16 is a risk of duplicative discovery because all of the patents subject to a potential stay
17 overlap," and "[s]o long as the case proceeds in part and is stayed in part, the parties risk
18 duplication as a result of overlapping patents, witnesses, and issues"); *Doe v. Indyke*, No.
19 20cv00484 (JGK) (DF), 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 168258, at *18 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 14,
20 2020) ("a partial stay could lead to duplicative depositions, as, once the partial stay is
21 lifted, [defendant] would be *entitled* to question any witnesses (including Plaintiff) who
22 may have already been deposed during the pendency of the partial stay") (emphasis
23 added); *Peck Ormsby Constr. Co. v. City of Rigby*, No. CIV. 1:10-545 WBS, 2012 U.S.
24 Dist. LEXIS 36178, at *18-19 (D. Idaho Mar. 15, 2012) (recognizing that "[d]uplicative
25 discovery efforts are extremely likely" in the event of a partial stay); *Quad/Tech, Inc. v.*
26 *Q.I. Press Controls B.V.*, No. 09-2561, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 147548, at *2 n.1 (E.D.
27 Pa. June 9, 2010) ("The parties may very well have to re-depose certain witnesses after
28 the stay on Count I is lifted."); *Trs. of the Plumbers & Pipefitters Nat'l Pension Fund v.*

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.