

EX 1006

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

GISH PLLC
Ryan Iwahashi (CA SBN 284766)
ryan@gishpllc.com
50 California Street, Suite 1500
San Francisco, CA 94111
Phone: (415) 630-2000

Alexander Rudis (NY Bar No. 4232591)
Admitted pro hac vice
alexanderrudis@quinnemanuel.com
295 5th Avenue, 9th Floor
New York, New York 10016
Tel: (212) 849-7000

Andrew D. Gish (NY SBN 4918454)
Admitted pro hac vice
andrew@gishpllc.com
Christopher Gerson (NY SBN 4595708)
Admitted pro hac vice
chris.gerson@gishpllc.com
Josef Schenker (NY SBN 4935185)
Admitted pro hac vice
josef.schenker@gishpllc.com
41 Madison Avenue, Floor 31
New York, NY 10010
Phone: (212) 518-7380

Jeff Gerchick (DC Bar No. 474529)
Admitted pro hac vice
jeffgerchick@quinnemanuel.com
1300 I Street NW Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 538-8000

Justin J. Sorensen (Bar No. 324817)
justinsorensen@quinnemanuel.com
2755 E Cottonwood Pkwy, Suite 430
Salt Lake City, Utah 84121
Tel: (801) 515-7300

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
David A. Nelson (IL Bar No. 6209623)
Admitted pro hac vice
davidnelson@quinnemanuel.com
Athena D. Dalton (IL Bar No. 6326790)
Admitted pro hac vice
athenadalton@quinnemanuel.com
Harrison Rose (IL Bar No. 6327523)
Admitted pro hac vice
harrisonrose@quinnemanuel.com
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Tel: (312) 705-7400

Andrew M. Holmes (Bar No. 260475)
drewholmes@quinnemanuel.com
Ognjen Zivojnovic (Bar No. 307801)
ogizivojnovic@quinnemanuel.com
50 California Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, California 94111
Tel: (415) 875-6600

Attorneys for Fortinet, Inc.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION**

NETSKOPE, INC.,
Plaintiff,

v.

FORTINET, INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. 4:25-cv-002360-HSG

**NOTICE OF SOTERA PLUS
STIPULATION OF DEFENDANT
FORTINET, INC.**

1 On October 7, 8, 10, and 13, 2025, Defendant Fortinet, Inc. ("Fortinet") filed petitions for
 2 *Inter Partes* Review ("IPR") of seven of the nine asserted patents in this lawsuit with the Patent Trial
 3 and Appeal Board of the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("PTAB").¹ Fortinet was
 4 named as the Petitioner and the real-party-in-interest in each IPR proceeding. The table below
 5 indicates the IPR number, challenged patent number, and challenged claims of the respective
 6 petitions before the PTAB:

7 IPR No.	Date Filed	Asserted U.S. Patent	Challenged Claims
8 IPR2026-00025	October 7, 2025	8,117,639	1-27
9 IPR2026-00026	October 7, 2025	8,327,426	1-13
10 IPR2026-00027	October 7, 2025	7,593,936	1-22
11 IPR2026-00031	October 8, 2025	8,635,697	1-25
12 IPR2026-00040	October 10, 2025	8,356,336	1-20
13 IPR2026-00041	October 10, 2025	8,397,282	1-35
14 IPR2026-00042	October 13, 2025	8,543,710	1-20

15 The claims challenged in these IPR petitions include all of the asserted claims of the above-
 16 listed patents asserted by Netskope, Inc. ("Netskope") against Fortinet in this litigation. Fortinet
 17 hereby notifies the Court and Netskope that Fortinet is submitting the following broadened "*Sotera*
 18 Plus Stipulations" for the IPR petitions discussed below. *See Sotera Wireless, Inc. v. Masimo Corp.*,
 19 IPR2020-01019, Paper 12 at 18-19 (PTAB Dec. 1, 2020) ("*Sotera*") (describing the standard,
 20 unbroadened *Sotera* stipulation).

21 Fortinet hereby stipulates, consistent with the stipulation made by the Petitioner in *Sotera*
 22 that, if the PTAB institutes an IPR and issues a final written decision in response to Fortinet's
 23 petition against Netskope's U.S. Patent No. 8,117,639 (IPR2026-00025), Fortinet will not pursue
 24 in this litigation (i) the specific grounds raised in IPR2026-00025, (ii) any other grounds that could
 25 have reasonably been raised before the PTAB in that instituted proceeding (i.e., any ground that
 26 could have reasonably been raised under §§ 102 or 103 on the basis of prior art patents or printed
 27 publications), or (iii) any ground based on a combination of system prior art and the references
 28 asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2026-00025.

¹ Netskope has since agreed to drop all claims from United States Patent No. 8,397,282. Dkt. No. 118.

1 Fortinet hereby stipulates, consistent with the stipulation made by the Petitioner in *Sotera*
2 that, if the PTAB institutes an IPR and issues a final written decision in response to Fortinet's
3 petition against Netskope's U.S. Patent No. 8,327,426 (IPR2026-00026), Fortinet will not pursue
4 in this litigation (i) the specific grounds raised in IPR2026-00026, (ii) any other grounds that could
5 have reasonably been raised before the PTAB in that instituted proceeding (i.e., any ground that
6 could have reasonably been raised under §§ 102 or 103 on the basis of prior art patents or printed
7 publications), or (iii) any ground based on a combination of system prior art and the references
8 asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2026-00026.

9 Fortinet hereby stipulates, consistent with the stipulation made by the Petitioner in *Sotera*
10 that, if the PTAB institutes an IPR and issues a final written decision in response to Fortinet's
11 petition against Netskope's U.S. Patent No. 7,593,936 (IPR2026-00027), Fortinet will not pursue
12 in this litigation (i) the specific grounds raised in IPR2026-00027, (ii) any other grounds that could
13 have reasonably been raised before the PTAB in that instituted proceeding (i.e., any ground that
14 could have reasonably been raised under §§ 102 or 103 on the basis of prior art patents or printed
15 publications), or (iii) any ground based on a combination of system prior art and the references
16 asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2026-00027.

17 Fortinet hereby stipulates, consistent with the stipulation made by the Petitioner in *Sotera*
18 that, if the PTAB institutes an IPR and issues a final written decision in response to Fortinet's
19 petition against Netskope's U.S. Patent No. 8,635,697 (IPR2026-00031), Fortinet will not pursue
20 in this litigation (i) the specific grounds raised in IPR2026-00031, (ii) any other grounds that could
21 have reasonably been raised before the PTAB in that instituted proceeding (i.e., any ground that
22 could have reasonably been raised under §§ 102 or 103 on the basis of prior art patents or printed
23 publications), or (iii) any ground based on a combination of system prior art and the references
24 asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2026-00031.

25 Fortinet hereby stipulates, consistent with the stipulation made by the Petitioner in *Sotera*
26 that, if the PTAB institutes an IPR and issues a final written decision in response to Fortinet's
27 petition against Netskope's U.S. Patent No. 8,356,336 (IPR2026-00040), Fortinet will not pursue
28 in this litigation (i) the specific grounds raised in IPR2026-00040, (ii) any other grounds that could

1 have reasonably been raised before the PTAB in that instituted proceeding (i.e., any ground that
2 could have reasonably been raised under §§ 102 or 103 on the basis of prior art patents or printed
3 publications), or (iii) any ground based on a combination of system prior art and the references
4 asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2026-00040.

5 Fortinet hereby stipulates, consistent with the stipulation made by the Petitioner in *Sotera*
6 that, if the PTAB institutes an IPR and issues a final written decision in response to Fortinet's
7 petition against Netskope's U.S. Patent No. 8,543,710 (IPR2026-00042), Fortinet will not pursue
8 in this litigation (i) the specific grounds raised in IPR2026-00042, (ii) any other grounds that could
9 have reasonably been raised before the PTAB in that instituted proceeding (i.e., any ground that
10 could have reasonably been raised under §§ 102 or 103 on the basis of prior art patents or printed
11 publications), or (iii) any ground based on a combination of system prior art and the references
12 asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2026-00042.

13 Fortinet's *Sotera Plus Stipulations* herein are not intended and should not be construed to
14 limit Fortinet's ability to assert invalidity of any claims in the patents-at-issue in this lawsuit based
15 on any other ground.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 DATED: January 9, 2026

By: /s/ Andrew D. Gish

2

GISH PLLC

3

Ryan Iwahashi (CA SBN 284766)
ryan@gishpllc.com
50 California Street, Suite 1500
San Francisco, CA 94111
Phone: (415) 630-2000

4

5

6

7

Andrew D. Gish (NY SBN 4918454)
Admitted pro hac vice
andrew@gishpllc.com
Christopher Gerson (NY SBN 4595708)
Admitted pro hac vice

8

9

10

chris.gerson@gishpllc.com
Josef Schenker (NY SBN 4935185)
Admitted pro hac vice

11

12

josef.schenker@gishpllc.com
41 Madison Avenue, Floor 31
New York, NY 10010
Phone: (212) 518-7380

13

14

**QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP**

15

16

David A. Nelson (IL Bar No. 6209623)
Admitted pro hac vice
davidnelson@quinnemanuel.com
Athena D. Dalton (IL Bar No. 6326790)
Admitted pro hac vice

17

18

19

athenadalton@quinnemanuel.com
Harrison Rose (IL Bar No. 6327523)
Admitted pro hac vice

20

21

harrisonrose@quinnemanuel.com
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Tel: (312) 705-7400

22

23

Alexander Rudis (NY Bar No. 4232591)
Admitted pro hac vice
alexanderrudis@quinnemanuel.com
295 5th Avenue, 9th Floor
New York, New York 10016
Tel: (212) 849-7000

24

25

26

27

Jeff Gerchick (DC Bar No. 474529)
Admitted pro hac vice

28

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

jeffgerchick@quinnemanuel.com
1300 I Street NW Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 538-8000

Justin J. Sorensen (Bar No. 324817)
justinsorensen@quinnemanuel.com
2755 E Cottonwood Pkwy, Suite 430
Salt Lake City, Utah 84121
Tel: (801) 515-7300

Andrew M. Holmes (Bar No. 260475)
drewholmes@quinnemanuel.com
Ognjen Zivojnovic (Bar No. 307801)
ogizivojnovic@quinnemanuel.com
50 California Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, California 94111
Tel: (415) 875-6600

Attorneys for Fortinet, Inc.

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

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 5-1, I hereby certify that, on January 9, 2026, all counsel of record who have appeared in this case are being served with a copy of the foregoing via the Court's CM/ECF system and email.

Dated: January 9, 2026

By: /s/ Andrew D. Gish
Andrew Gish