## 

```
1
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
                     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 3
                    THE HONORABLE CATHY ANN BENCIVENGO
 4
 5
     FINJAN, INC.,
                       Plaintiff, )
                                        CASE NO. 17CV183-CAB-BGS
 6
 7
                                         SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA
              VS.
 8
     ESET, LLC and ESET SPOL. S.R.O.,) WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 2020
 9
                       Defendants. )
10
11
12
13
14
15
          Reporter's Transcript of Jury Trial, Volume 2, Day 2
16
                              Pages 220-387
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
     Proceedings reported by stenography, transcript produced by
     computer assisted software
24
                  Mauralee Ramirez, RPR, CSR No. 11674
25
                      Federal Official Court Reporter
                        ordertranscript@amail com
```



## Case 3:17-cv-00183-CAB-BGS Document 804 Filed 08/18/20 PageID.39061 Page 2220f 168

1	APPEARANCES:	
2	For The Plaintiff:	Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel, LLP Paul Andre
3		James Hannah Lisa Kobialka
4		Kristopher Kaskins 990 Marsh Road
5		Menlo Park, California 94025
6		Cristina Lynn Martinez 1177 Avenue of the Americas
7		New York, New York 10036
8		
9		Eversheds Sutherland (US) LLP Nicola A. Pisano
10	1	Scott A. Penner Regis Worley
11		12255 El Camino Real, Suite 100 San Diego, California 92130
12		
13		
14		
15		
16 17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		



### 

```
1
       San Diego, California; Wednesday, March 11, 2020; 8:15 a.m.
 2
         (Case called)
 3
         (Appearances stated)
              THE COURT: All right. I got the dispute issue about
 4
 5
     the demonstratives for Dr. Cole's testimony as well as the
     exhibits, and fundamentally this comes down to the question
 6
 7
     that was raised in the motions in limine as to whether or not
 8
     there's foundation for tests that were done, and I think there
 9
     is no dispute that these products are post-expiration of the
10
     patent.
11
              MR. ANDRE: That's correct, Your Honor. But then
12
     technology was during the infringement period.
13
              THE COURT: And he has an opinion that they are the
     same as what was earlier?
14
15
              MR. ANDRE: That's correct, Your Honor.
16
              THE COURT: And was that in his report anywhere?
17
              MR. ANDRE: It was, Your Honor.
18
              MR. PENNER: If they can point to us where in the
19
     report he provides that because we don't believe it's in the
20
     report, and we also don't believe it's accurate.
              THE COURT: Well, accurate is a different question.
21
22
              MR. PENNER: I understand, Your Honor. But I don't
23
     believe that's in his report where he says after the expiration
     date are the same as those before.
24
```



25

MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, the testing is ThreatSense

### Case 3:17-cv-00183-CAB-BGS Document 804 Filed 08/18/20 PageID.39063 Page 2/20f 168

Engine that was put in sometime, I think, 2010.

MR. PENNER: The ThreatSense engine changes every day, Your Honor.

MR. ANDRE: No.

MR. PENNER: Multiple times a day.

THE COURT: Shh. He's talking.

MR. ANDRE: Thank you, Your Honor. And the cloud malware protection system was put in 2013. We can give you the cites in his report, but he's going to lay a foundation that he ensured by looking at the source code technical documents that functionality that he tested. And it's very superficial, to be candid with you. We're not getting into the weeds with his testing. But he did want to confirm through testing that what he found in the technical documents was still in the product and functioned the way he thought it was. And that's all it is.

existed over the course of time. I have many iPhones, but I don't think if you test the presence of something in an iPhone 10 you could necessarily conclude it was present in an iPhone 6, but they're all still iPhones. So if that's their argument, that he's going to need to show that he actually looked at the original products that were available for sale during the relevant time and can say with some certainty that these features were available in these products, I mean, that's the



2.1

problem.

2.1

MR. ANDRE: What he does is look at source code for the products and shows where the changes in the source code are and where they changed from what we're looking at, an infringing functionality. He looks at technical specifications. There's nothing to show that the infringing aspect has changed at all. Granted with the iPhone 11, you might get a better camera but they probably didn't change some of the other core components. What we're showing is those core components that were in the iPhone 5 generation are still there. These are core components. These are not user interface. Dr. Cole will discuss that, and he confirmed looking at technical documents that his testing just confirmed what was there previously is still there.

THE COURT: I'm going to allow the testimony subject to motion to strike. If he doesn't lay a proper foundation, then you can move to strike it.

MR. PENNER: So to be clear, just so I'm understanding, your Honor, and I think your iPhone analogy is probably a pretty good one here. Just because the functionality can still block software doesn't mean it's blocking it the same way underneath. I mean, the modules have changed, and there's going to be testimony that the modules change every four to six hours in some cases. And as you can see from our listing on our brief here, every one of the



# DOCKET

## 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.

