1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

FINJAN, INC.,

12

13

v.

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

26

25

27

28

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Plaintiff.

ESET, LLC and ESET SPOL. S.R.O.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 17CV183 CAB (BGS)

## **BRIEFING ORDER**

[ECF 839]

On December 22, 2020, the parties jointly contacted Judge Skomal's Chambers to raise a discovery dispute concerning Finjan's objections to numerous Eset's RFPs. (ECF 839.) Although the objections concern ten RFPs, the parties indicated that there were overriding issues as to all: relevancy, attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the common interest doctrine, and the possibility that the RFPs may be seeking discovery beyond the '305 Patent. The only discovery the parties are currently permitted to pursue is discovery regarding the '305 Patent. The parties also indicated that Finjan has not yet provided a privilege log. The Court orders as follows.



Finjan shall provide a privilege log on or before **December 30, 2020**. Parties shall file a Joint Statement¹ not exceeding twenty pages, split evenly between the parties, by **January 6, 2021**. The parties may attach exhibits, however any exhibits must be quoted or summarized within the briefing. In addition to the issues identified above, the Joint Statement must address whether the discovery sought is beyond the scope of the '305 Patent and the proportionality of the discovery sought.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 23, 2020

Hon. Bernard G. Skomal United States Magistrate Judge

<sup>1</sup> As the Court has previously indicated, joint statement must provide each party's position as well as their response to the arguments of the opposing party. This requires the parties to exchange their briefing sufficiently in advance of the deadline to modify their own briefing to address the opposing party's argument. The intention is that the joint statement provide full briefing on the issues identified by the parties and the Court.

