

EX 1015

1 Thomas N. Millikan, Bar No. 234430  
TMillikan@perkinscoie.com  
2 Joseph P. Reid, Bar No. 211082  
JReid@perkinscoie.com  
3 PERKINS COIE LLP  
11452 El Camino Real, Suite 300  
4 San Diego, CA 92130-2080  
Telephone: 858.720.5700  
5 Facsimile: 858.720.5799

6 Andrew N. Klein, Bar No. 300221  
AKlein@perkinscoie.com  
7 PERKINS COIE LLP  
3150 Porter Drive  
8 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1212  
Telephone: 650.838.4300  
9 Facsimile: 650.838.4350

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
Netskope, Inc.

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
12 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
13 **OAKLAND DIVISION**  
14

15 NETSKOPE, INC.,

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 FORTINET, INC.,

19 Defendant.  
20

Case No. 4:25-cv-02360-HSG

**NETSKOPE, INC.'S PATENT L.R. 4-2  
PRELIMINARY CLAIM  
CONSTRUCTIONS AND EXTRINSIC  
EVIDENCE**

1 Plaintiff Netskope, Inc. (“Netskope”) hereby provides its Preliminary Claim Constructions  
2 and Preliminary Identification of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evidence pursuant to Patent L.R. 4-2.

3 For purposes of complying with Patent L.R. 4-2, Netskope’s preliminary proposed  
4 construction for each term of U.S. Patent Nos. 8,356,336 (the “336 Patent”), 8,543,710 (the “710  
5 Patent”), 8,117,639 (the “639 Patent”), 8,224,983 (the “983 Patent”), 8,327,426 (the “426  
6 Patent”), 7,593,936 (the “936 Patent”), 8,397,282 (the “282 Patent”), 8,661,153 (the “153  
7 Patent”), and 8,635,697 (the “697 Patent”) (collectively “Netskope’s Patents”) identified for claim  
8 construction is provided in the charts attached hereto as Exhibits A-I. The terms identified for  
9 construction will have the same meaning wherever they appear in any claim or element, including  
10 all dependent claims or claims where multiple terms appear in combination. Netskope additionally  
11 reserves the right to assert that any term or phrase need not be construed.

12 Furthermore, pursuant to Patent L.R. 4-2, Netskope’s preliminary identification of intrinsic  
13 and extrinsic evidence that may be used in support of Netskope’s proposed claim constructions is  
14 also shown in Exhibits A-I. Netskope’s citations to intrinsic evidence are not meant to be  
15 exhaustive. Where Netskope identifies a particular figure in the specification or prosecution history  
16 of a patent, the identification should be understood to encompass the caption and description of the  
17 figure and any text relating to the figure in addition to the figure itself. Conversely, where an  
18 identified portion of text refers to a figure, the identification should be understood to include the  
19 figure as well. Netskope may also rely on any intrinsic and extrinsic evidence cited by Defendant  
20 and Counterclaim Plaintiff Fortinet, Inc. (“Fortinet”), but by relying on such evidence, Netskope  
21 does not waive any evidentiary objections to such evidence.

22 As indicated in Exhibits A-I, Netskope may rely upon the expert testimony of Aaron  
23 Striegel as extrinsic evidence in support of Netskope’s positions on claim construction. Dr. Striegel  
24 may testify as to the background of the technology and the meaning of certain claim terms to one  
25 of ordinary skill in the art in the field of the Patents-in-Suit in a manner consistent with each of the  
26 Netskope’s proposed claim constructions. Dr. Striegel may rely on extrinsic evidence such as:  
27 (i) his experience in the field; (ii) materials of record during prosecution or subsequent proceedings  
28 in the U.S. Patent Office, or proceedings in foreign counterparts of the U.S. Patent Office, or

1 otherwise disclosed by Netskope in connection with this litigation; or (iii) any other literature that  
2 Dr. Striegel may regard as pertinent to the field.

3 Netskope further notes that the inclusion of any term that appears in a claim's preamble is  
4 not an admission by Netskope that the preamble is a claim limitation.

5 Netskope reserves the right to supplement, revise, modify, or otherwise finalize the  
6 proposed claim constructions to facilitate preparation of a Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing  
7 Statement. Netskope reserves the right to rely on any books, dictionaries, citations, or other  
8 materials that Fortinet identifies in its disclosure. Netskope further reserves the right to supplement,  
9 revise, modify, or otherwise finalize its proposed claim constructions in response to the proposed  
10 claim constructions provided by Fortinet.

11 DATED: September 19, 2025

**PERKINS COIE LLP**

By: /s/ Thomas N. Millikan

Thomas N. Millikan, Bar No. 234430

TMillikan@perkinscoie.com

Joseph P. Reid, Bar No. 211082

JReid@perkinscoie.com

Andrew N. Klein, Bar No. 300221

AKlein@perkinscoie.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Netskope, Inc.

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I, Thomas N. Millikan, declare:

3 I am a citizen of the United States and employed in San Diego, California. I am over the  
4 age of eighteen years and not a party to the within-entitled action. My business address is 11452  
5 El Camino Real, Suite 300, San Diego, CA 92130-2080. On September 19, 2025, I served a copy  
6 of the within document(s):

7 **NETSKOPE, INC.'S PATENT L.R. 4-2 PRELIMINARY CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS**  
8 **AND EXTRINSIC EVIDENCE**

9  by transmitting via e-mail or electronic transmission the document(s)  
listed above to the person(s) at the e-mail address(es) set forth below.

10  
11 Ryan Kiyoto Iwahashi  
12 Gish PLLC  
13 50 California Street, Suite 1500  
14 San Francisco, CA 94111  
408-223-5383  
Email: ryan@gishpllc.com

15 Andrew Gish  
16 Gish PLLC  
17 41 Madison Avenue, Floor 31  
18 New York, NY 10010  
212-518-7380  
Email: andrew@gishpllc.com

19 *Attorneys for Fortinet, Inc.*

20 I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose  
21 direction the service was made.

22 Executed on September 19, 2025, at San Diego, California.

23 /s/ Thomas N. Millikan  
24 Thomas N. Millikan

Exhibit A  
U.S. Patent No. 8,356,336 B2  
Preliminary Claim Constructions Pursuant to PLR 4-2

Term	Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence
“redirecting the browser application running on the client device associated with the anonymous user back to the pre-authentication capture destination hosted on the first server computer in the shared network” (claims 6, 13)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ’336 Patent at Abstract, 2:20-59, 3:14-4:14, 4:50-5:23, FIGS. 1, 3 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“second request” (claims 5-6, 12-14, 19-20)	a request, distinct from the first request	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ’336 Patent at Abstract, 3:14-4:14, 4:50-5:39, FIG. 1 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“shared network” (claims 1-2, 4, 6-9, 11, 13-17, 20)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ’336 Patent at Abstract, 1:26-2:59, 3:14-4:14 4:18-6:25, FIGS. 1-3 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Fifth Edition (Microsoft Press 2002).</li> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“authentication token” (claims 5-7, 12-14, 19-20)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ’336 Patent at 1:8-30, 1:66-2:59, 3:14-4:14, 4:18-5:23, 5:24-6:16, FIG. 3 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Fifth Edition (Microsoft Press 2002).</li> </ul>

Term	Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>

Exhibit B  
U.S. Patent No. 8,543,710 B2  
Preliminary Claim Constructions Pursuant to PLR 4-2

Term	Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence
“network packet traversal” (claim 19)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ’710 Patent at 6:8-28, FIGS. 1-2 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“network segment” (claims 1, 6, 13, 15, 20)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ’710 Patent at 2:47-3:55, FIGS. 1-2 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“evaluating network traffic emanating from the client device after the client device has been scanned and abnormal behavior has been removed, mitigated or rendered inert” (claim 17)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ’710 Patent at 2:47-3:40, 5:54-6:48.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“one or more network destination addresses that are not in or subordinate to the first network segment,” and “one or more network segments that are not in or subordinate to the first network segment”	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ’710 Patent at 2:47-4:12, 4:22-10, 5:11-6:28, FIGS. 1-2 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims,</li> </ul>

Term	Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence
(claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 15, 20)			specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.
“a network access gateway device” (claim 15)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• '710 Patent at 1:58-2:19, 2:41-3:55, 4:3-6:7, FIG. 1 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>

Exhibit C  
U.S. Patent No. 8,117,639 B2  
Preliminary Claim Constructions Pursuant to PLR 4-2

Term	Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence
“global stage” (claims 3, 12, 19)	a global stage, distinct from the client discrimination stage and distinct from the user specific stage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ’639 Patent at 8:6-24, 10:19-28, 10:52-55.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“processing the packet according to a plurality of stages” (claims 1, 10, 17, 27)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ’639 Patent at 8:6-9:7, 10:19-11:30, 11:59-12:35, FIGS. 3, 5, 6 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>

Exhibit D  
U.S. Patent No. 8,224,983 B2  
Preliminary Claim Constructions Pursuant to PLR 4-2

<b>Term</b>	<b>Proposed Construction</b>	<b>Intrinsic Evidence</b>	<b>Extrinsic Evidence</b>
-------------	------------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------

Exhibit E  
U.S. Patent No. 8,327,426 B2  
Preliminary Claim Constructions Pursuant to PLR 4-2

Term	Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence
“target service” (claims 2, 5)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ’426 Patent at 2:40-47, 4:30-38, 5:26-6:44, 7:25-8:12, 8:48-67, FIGS. 1-4 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“second redirection” (claim 5)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ’426 Patent at Abstract, 4:49-5:25, 8:13-40, 10:7-11:10, FIGS. 1, 3-5 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“authentication response” (claims 1, 3, 4, 6)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ’426 Patent at Abstract, 1:59-2:3, 4:30-5:42, 6:45-7:12, 9:26-44, 10:50-61, FIGS. 1-3 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“principal believing interactions are with the external service” (claim 1)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ’426 Patent at Abstract, 3:35-5:25, 6:31-5:52, 7:59-8:67, 9:10-10:6, FIGS. 1-3 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims,</li> </ul>

Term	Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence
			specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.
“the identity service acts as a proxy for access sessions to the other services on behalf of the principal, the principal’s access sessions occur indirectly through the identity service and transparently to the principal” (claim 1)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>’426 Patent at Abstract, 1:59-3:7, 3:22-5:25, 5:43-6:57, 7:19-8:67, 9:1-10:11, FIGS. 1-5 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>

Exhibit F  
U.S. Patent No. 7,593,936 B2  
Preliminary Claim Constructions Pursuant to PLR 4-2

Term	Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence
“cluster layer” (claim 10)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• '936 Patent at 10:29-46, 11:47-12:28, FIG. 4 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“inserting rules into the rule set of the adaptive reference model to augment or override rules of the rule set automatically generated from the snapshots / insert rules into the rule set of the adaptive reference model to augment or override rules of the rule set automatically generated from the snapshots” (claims 8, 22)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• '936 Patent at 7:60-8:3, FIG. 2 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“generic response” (claims 3-4, 14-15)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• '936 Patent at 8:53-62, 9:16-42, 10:13-28.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“snapshots” (claims 1, 7-8, 12, 21-22)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• '936 Patent at Abstract, 3:42-61, 4:49-6:32, 7:14-59, 8:63-9:36, 11:1-12:28, 13:22-15:23, 16:44-18:2, 18:40-19:16, 18:50-20:13, 20:62-21:27, FIGS. 6-</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by</li> </ul>

Term	Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence
		10, 13 (and associated text).	Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.
“normal state” (claims 1, 12)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>’936 Patent at 2:57-3:38, 6:64-7:45, 8:30-39, 8:63-9:23, 12:7-13:21, 13:48-14:15, 15:24-16:5, 19:8-26, 19:50-62, 20:40-67, 22:10-19.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“abnormal system states” (claim 1)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>’936 Patent at 2:32-3:7, 6:16-7:59, 21:62-22:32.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“anomaly” (claims 1-2, 10, 12-13, 18)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>’936 Patent at 3:41-62, 8:4-9:36, 10:47-11:33, FIGS. 3, 6, 7, 9, 10 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“value layer” (claim 9)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>’936 Patent at 10:32-11:56, FIG. 4 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the</li> </ul>

Term	Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence
			<p>art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</p>
<p>“profile layer” (claim 11)</p>	<p>Plain and ordinary meaning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• '936 Patent at 10:29-35, 12:7-28, FIG. 4 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>

Exhibit G  
U.S. Patent No. 8,397,282 B2  
Preliminary Claim Constructions Pursuant to PLR 4-2

Term	Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence
“conditioning the packet” (claims 7, 8, 19, and 32)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ’282 Patent at 7:5-20, 7:53-61.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“A method for controlling data through a firewall performed on at least one data controlling computer having computer instructions stored on at least one non-transitory computer readable medium, comprising” (claim 1)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ’282 Patent at 2:42-3:17, 4:35-47, 12:1-57, FIG. 1 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“wherein the set of firewall rules is dynamically self-configurable during runtime” (claims 1, 12, and 24)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ’282 Patent at 5:5-35, 6:60-7:29, 7:30-9:2, 12:1-57, FIGS. 1, 2 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“chains of rules forming various paths through a hierarchical structure” (claims 1, 12, and 24)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ’282 Patent at 5:5-35, 6:43-47, 6:36-47, 6:48-56, 6:60-7:29, 7:30-9:2, FIGS. 1, 2 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims,</li> </ul>

Term	Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence
			specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.
<p>“wherein the hierarchical structure comprises defined places for dynamically updating the set of firewall rules during runtime” (claims 1, 12, and 24)</p>	<p>Plain and ordinary meaning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• '282 Patent at 5:5-35, 7:30-9:2, FIGS. 1, 2 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>

Exhibit H  
U.S. Patent No. 8,661,153 B2  
Preliminary Claim Constructions Pursuant to PLR 4-2

Term	Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence
“default value” (claims 3, 4, 12)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• '153 Patent at 5:13-43, FIG. 2 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“programmatically user” (claims 7, 14, 24)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• '153 Patent at 4:29-45, FIG. 1 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“arbitrary number of attributes” (claims 1, 10, 15)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• '153 Patent at 2:32-60, 5:24-63, 7:22-37, 7:56-8:10, 8:52-62.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>

Exhibit I  
U.S. Patent No. 8,635,697 B2  
Preliminary Claim Constructions Pursuant to PLR 4-2

Term	Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence
“wherein the alert is cleared when all computing devices associated with the access device and the computing device having the at least one of the first OS ID or second OS ID have accessed the remediation portal” (claim 6)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ’697 Patent at 5:25-62, 6:14-50, 9:21-52, FIGS. 1, 5-8 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“generating an alert identifying a network address associated with the access device, the malware ID and the OS ID associated with TCP session that generated the alert” (claims 1, 15, 24)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ’697 Patent at Abstract, 1:52-2:43, 3:48-4:9, 4:50-5:62, 7:38-9:43, FIGS. 1, 3, 5-8 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“service provider network” (claims 1, 15, 24)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ’697 Patent at Abstract, 1:52-2:43, 3:8-47, 9:53-26, FIGS. 1, 8 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>
“a more reliable OS ID” (claims 9, 21)	Plain and ordinary meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ’697 Patent at 8:50-9:20, FIG. 6 (and associated text).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netskope may rely on the testimony of Aaron Striegel on how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this term as proposed by Netskope in the context of the claims, specification, prosecution history, and any pertinent extrinsic evidence.</li> </ul>