

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent No. 6,502,135 )  
)  
Filed: February 15, 2000 ) Group Art Unit: Central  
) Reexamination Unit  
Issued: December 31, 2002 )  
) Examiner:  
Inventors: Munger et al. )  
) Confirmation No.:  
For: AGILE NETWORK PROTOCOL FOR )  
SECURE COMMUNICATIONS )  
WITH ASSURED SYSTEM )  
AVAILABILITY )

**REQUEST FOR INTER PARTES REEXAMINATION  
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 311**

**ATTN: Mail Stop Inter Partes Reexam**  
Central Reexamination Unit (CRU)  
Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent & Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir,

Presented herewith is a request for *inter partes* reexamination of United States Patent No. 6,502,135 (the '135 patent), entitled "Agile Network Protocol for Secure Communications with Assured System Availability." The inventors of the '135 patent are Edmund Colby Munger, Douglas Charles Schmidt, Robert Dunham Short, Victor Larson and Michael Williamson. The present assignee of the '135 patent is VirnetX Corporation, as recorded at Reel 018757, Frame 0326. A list of all exhibits submitted with this reexamination request is provided in the accompanying transmittal letter for this request for inter partes reexamination.

**VIRNETX EXHIBIT 2010**  
**Apple v. Virnetx**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR A REQUEST FOR *INTER PARTES* REEXAMINATION .....8**

A. THE '135 PATENT IS ELIGIBLE TO BE THE SUBJECT OF AN INTER PARTES REEXAMINATION.....8

B. CLAIMS OF THE '135 PATENT FOR WHICH REEXAMINATION IS REQUESTED .....8

C. FEE FOR REEXAMINATION .....8

D. CITATION AND COPIES OF PATENTS AND PRINTED PUBLICATIONS THAT ESTABLISH A SUBSTANTIAL NEW QUESTION OF PATENTABILITY .....8

E. COPY OF THE PATENT FOR WHICH REEXAMINATION IS REQUESTED .....8

F. CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY REQUESTER ON THE PATENT OWNER.....8

G. REAL PARTY OF INTEREST OF THE REQUESTER.....9

H. CERTIFICATION THAT REQUESTER IS NOT ESTOPPED FROM REQUESTING REEXAMINATION .....9

**II. STATEMENT IDENTIFYING EACH SUBSTANTIAL NEW QUESTION OF PATENTABILITY RAISED BY THE CITED PATENTS AND PRINTED PUBLICATIONS .....10**

A. EFFECTIVE FILING DATE OF CLAIMS 1-18 OF THE '135 PATENT .....10

B. PRIOR ART STATUS OF CITED PATENTS AND PUBLICATIONS UPON WHICH REEXAMINATION IS REQUESTED 11

2. Exhibit X1 – Aventail Connect v3.1/2.6 Administrator’s Guide (“Aventail Connect v3.1”)..... 11

3. Exhibit X2 – Aventail Connect v3.01/2.51 Administrator’s Guide (“Aventail Connect v3.01”)..... 11

4. Exhibit X3 – Aventail AutoSOCKS v2.1 Administrator’s Guide (“Aventail AutoSOCKS”)..... 12

5. Exhibit X4 - Reed et al., “Proxies for Anonymous Routing,” 12<sup>th</sup> Annual Computer Security Applications Conference, San Diego, CA (December 9-13, 1996)(“Reed”)..... 12

6. Exhibit X5 - Wang, Broadband Forum TR-025: Core Network Architecture Recommendations For Access to Legacy Data Networks over ADSL, Issue 1.0 (September 1999) (“Wang”)..... 12

7. Exhibit X6 – U.S. Patent No. 6,496,867 to Beser et al. (“Beser”)..... 13

8. Exhibit X7 - Kent, “Security Architecture for IP,” RFC 2401 (November 1998) (“Kent”)..... 13

9. Exhibit X8 – U.S. Patent No. 6,182,141 to Blum et al., (“Blum”) ..... 13

10. Exhibit X9 - BinGO! User’s Guide incorporating by reference BinGO! Extended Feature Reference (collectively, “BinGO”)..... 13

11. Exhibit X10 – U.S. Patent No. 4,885,778 to Weiss (“Weiss”) ..... 14

12. Exhibit X11 – U.S. Patent No. 6,615,357 to Boden (“Boden”)..... 14

C. OTHER PRIOR ART PATENTS AND PRINTED PUBLICATIONS CITED TO DEMONSTRATE KNOWLEDGE IN THE FIELD OF THE INVENTION ..... 14

1. Exhibit Y1 – Aventail Extranet Server v3.0 Administrator’s Guide (“Aventail Extranet Server v3.0”)..... 14

2. Exhibit Y2 - Goldschlag et al., “Hiding Routing Information,” Workshop on Information Hiding, Cambridge, UK (May 1996)(“Goldschlag”)..... 15

3. Exhibit Y3 - U.S. Patent No. 5,950,519 to Stockwell et al. (“Stockwell”)..... 15

4. Exhibit Y4 – Ferguson, P. and Huston, G., “What Is a VPN”, The Internet Protocol Journal, Vol 1., No. 1 (June 1998) (“Ferguson”)..... 15

5. Exhibit Y5 – Mockapetris, P., RFC 1034, “Domain Names – Concepts and Facilities,” November 1987 (“RFC1034”)..... 15

6. Exhibit Y6 - Mockapetris, P., RFC 1035, “Domain Names - Implementation And Specification,” November 1987 (“RFC1035”) ..... 15

7. Exhibit Y7 – Braden, R., RFC 1123, “Requirements for Internet Hosts -- Application and Support,” October 1989 (“RFC1123”)..... 15

8. Exhibit Y8 – RFC 2068, Fielding, R., et al, RFC 2068, “Hypertext Transfer Protocol -- HTTP/1.1,” January 1997 (“RFC2068”)..... 16

9. Exhibit Y9 – Leech, M., et al., RFC 1928, “Socks Protocol Version 5,” March 1996 (“RFC1928”)..... 16

Request for Reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 6,502,135

10. <u>Exhibit Y10</u> – Socolofsky, T. et al., RFC 1180, “A TCP/IP Tutorial,” January 1991.....	16
11. <u>Exhibit Y11</u> - Simpson, W., editor, RFC 1661, “The Point-to-Point Protocol (PPP),” July 1994.....	16
12. <u>Exhibit Y12</u> - Meyer, G., RFC 1968, “The PPP Encryption Control Protocol (ECP),” June 1996.....	16
13. <u>Exhibit Y13</u> - Kummert, H., RFC 2420, “The PPP Triple-DES Encryption Protocol (3DESE),” September, 1998.....	16
14. <u>Exhibit Y14</u> - Townsley, W.M., et al., RFC 2661, “Layer Two Tunneling Protocol ‘L2TP’ ,” August 1999.....	16
15. <u>Exhibit Y15</u> - Pall, G.S.,RFC2118, “Microsoft Point-To-Point Encryption (MPPE) Protocol,” March 1997.....	16
16. <u>Exhibit Y16</u> - Gross, G., et al., RFC 2364, “PPP Over AAL5,” July 1998.....	17
17. <u>Exhibit Y17</u> – Srisuresh, P., RFC2663, “IP Network Address Translator (NAT) Terminology and Considerations,” August 1999.....	17
18. <u>Exhibit Y18</u> - Heinanen, J., RFC 1483, “Multiprotocol Encapsulation over ATM Adaptation Layer 5,” July 1993.....	17
D. SUBSTANTIAL NEW QUESTIONS OF PATENTABILITY.....	18
1. Claims 1-10, 12-14 and 18 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) by <u>Aventail Connect v3.1</u> .....	18
2. Claims 1-10, 12-14 and 18 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by <u>Aventail Connect v3.01</u> .....	19
3. Claims 1-10, 12-13 and 18 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by <u>Aventail AutoSOCKS</u> .....	19
2. Claim 11 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C §103 by <u>Aventail Connect v3.1</u> in view of <u>Reed</u> .....	20
3. Claim 11 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C §103 by <u>Aventail Connect v3.01</u> in view of <u>Reed</u> .....	20
4. Claims 11, 14 and 15 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C §103 by <u>Aventail AutoSOCKS</u> in view of <u>Reed</u> .....	21
5. Claim 16 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by <u>Aventail Connect v3.1</u> taken in view of <u>Boden</u> .....	21
6. Claim 16 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by <u>Aventail Connect v3.01</u> taken in view of <u>Boden</u> .....	22
7. Claim 16 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by <u>Aventail AutoSOCKS</u> taken in view <u>Reed</u> , and taken further in view of <u>Boden</u> .....	23
8. Claim 17 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by <u>Aventail Connect v3.1</u> taken in view of <u>Weiss</u> .....	23
9. Claim 17 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by <u>Aventail Connect v3.01</u> taken in view of <u>Weiss</u> .....	24
10. Claim 17 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by <u>Aventail AutoSOCKS</u> taken in view of <u>Weiss</u> .....	25
11. Claims 1-10, 12-13 and 18 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) by <u>Wang</u> .....	25
12. Claims 3 and 8 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on <u>Wang</u> in view of <u>Aventail Connect v3.01</u> .....	26
13. Claims 3 and 8 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on <u>Wang</u> in view of <u>Aventail AutoSOCKS</u> .....	27
14. Claims 11, 14 and 15 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on <u>Wang</u> in view of <u>Reed</u> .....	27
15. Claim 16 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in based on <u>Wang</u> in view of <u>Reed</u> , taken further in view of <u>Boden</u> .....	28
16. Claim 17 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on <u>Wang</u> in view of <u>Weiss</u> .....	29
17. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10, 12-13 and 18 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by <u>Beser</u> taken in view of <u>Kent</u> .....	29

18. Claims 3, 5, 8, 9 and 18 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by <u>Beser</u> in view of <u>Kent</u> , taken further in view of <u>Blum</u> .....	30
19. Claims 3, 5, 8, 9 and 18 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on <u>Beser</u> in view of <u>Kent</u> , taken further in view of <u>Aventail AutoSOCKS</u> .....	31
20. Claim 11 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by <u>Beser</u> taken in view of <u>Kent</u> , and taken further in view of <u>Reed</u> .....	32
21. Claims 1-10, 12-15 and 18 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) by <u>BinGO</u> .....	32
22. Claim 11 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by <u>BinGO</u> in view of <u>Reed</u> .....	33
23. Claim 16 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on <u>BinGO</u> in view of <u>Boden</u> .....	33
24. Claim 17 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on <u>BinGO</u> in view of <u>Weiss</u> .....	34

**III. PREVIOUS FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS CONCERNING TERMS IN CLAIMS 1-18 OF THE '135 PATENT**.....35

A. CLAIM TERMS SHOULD BE GIVEN THEIR BROADEST REASONABLE INTERPRETATION IN EVALUATING THIS REEXAMINATION REQUEST .....	35
B. “VIRTUAL PRIVATE NETWORK” .....	35
C. “TRANSPARENTLY CREATING A VIRTUAL PRIVATE NETWORK” .....	35
D. “DOMAIN NAME SERVICE” (DNS).....	36
E. “DNS PROXY SERVER” .....	36
F. “WEB SITE” AND “SECURE WEB SITE” .....	36

**IV. DETAILED EXPLANATION OF MANNER OF APPLYING AVENTAIL CONNECT V3.1, AVENTAIL CONNECT V3.01 AND AVENTAIL AUTOSOCKS TO CLAIMS 1-18 AND PROPOSED REJECTIONS BASED ON SNQ NOS. 1-12**.....38

A. <u>SNQ No. 1: CLAIMS 1-10 AND 12 ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 USC § 102(A) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY AVENTAIL CONNECT V3.1</u> .....	38
a. Claim 1 .....	39
b. Claim 2 .....	44
c. Claim 3 .....	45
d. Claim 4 .....	45
e. Claim 5 .....	48
f. Claim 6 .....	49
g. Claim 7 .....	50
h. Claim 8 .....	51
i. Claim 9 .....	52
j. Claim 10 .....	52
k. Claim 12 .....	55
l. Claim 13 .....	55
m. Claim 14 .....	56
n. Claim 15 .....	57
o. Claim 18 .....	57
B. <u>SNQ No. 2: CLAIMS 1-10 AND 12 ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 USC § 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY AVENTAIL CONNECT V3.01</u> .....	59
a. Claim 1 .....	59
b. Claim 2 .....	64
c. Claim 3 .....	66
d. Claim 4 .....	66
e. Claim 5 .....	68
f. Claim 6 .....	69
g. Claim 7 .....	70
h. Claim 8 .....	71

Request for Reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 6,502,135

i.	Claim 9 .....	73
j.	Claim 10 .....	73
k.	Claim 12 .....	75
l.	Claim 13 .....	76
m.	Claim 14 .....	77
n.	Claim 15 .....	78
o.	Claim 18 .....	78
C.	<u>SNQ No. 3: CLAIMS 1-10 AND 12 ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY AVENTAIL AUTOSOCKS</u> .....	79
a.	Claim 1 .....	80
b.	Claim 2 .....	85
c.	Claim 3 .....	86
d.	Claim 4 .....	86
e.	Claim 5 .....	89
f.	Claim 6 .....	89
g.	Claim 7 .....	90
h.	Claim 8 .....	91
i.	Claim 9 .....	92
j.	Claim 10 .....	93
k.	Claim 12 .....	95
l.	Claim 13 .....	96
m.	Claim 18 .....	97
D.	<u>SNQ NOS. 4-12: CLAIMS 11, 14-17 ARE OBVIOUS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 BASED ON AVENTAIL CONNECT V3.1, AVENTAIL CONNECT V3.01 OR AVENTAIL AUTOSOCKS CONSIDERED IN VIEW OF REED, WEISS AND BODEN</u> .....	98
1.	Relevant Teachings of the Primary References .....	98
a.	<u>Aventail Connect v3.1</u> .....	98
b.	<u>Aventail Connect v3.01</u> .....	99
c.	<u>Aventail AutoSOCKS</u> .....	101
2.	Relevant Teachings of the Secondary References .....	102
a.	Relevant Teachings of <u>Reed</u> .....	102
b.	Relevant Teachings of <u>Weiss</u> .....	105
c.	Relevant Teachings of <u>Boden</u> .....	106
3.	<u>SNQ No. 4: Claim 11 Would Have Been Obvious to a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Based on Aventail Connect v3.1 in View of Reed</u> .....	107
4.	<u>SNQ No. 5: Claim 11 Would Have Been Obvious to a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Based on Aventail Connect v3.01 in View of Reed</u> .....	109
5.	<u>SNQ No. 6: Claims 11, 14 and 15 Would Have Been Obvious to a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Based on Aventail AutoSOCKS in View of Reed</u> .....	111
a.	Claim 11 .....	112
b.	Claims 14 and 15 .....	113
6.	<u>SNQ No. 7: Claim 16 Would Have Been Obvious to a Person of Ordinary Skill Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Aventail Connect v3.1 in view of Boden</u> .....	113
7.	<u>SNQ No. 8: Claim 16 Would Have Been Obvious to a Person of Ordinary Skill Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Aventail Connect v3.01 in view of Boden</u> .....	114
8.	<u>SNQ No. 9: Claim 16 Would Have Been Obvious to a Person of Ordinary Skill Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Aventail AutoSOCKS in view of Reed, taken Further in View of Boden</u> .....	115
9.	<u>SNQ No. 10: Claim 17 Would Have Been Obvious to a Person of Ordinary Skill under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Aventail Connect v3.1 in view of Weiss</u> .....	116
10.	<u>SNQ No. 11: Claim 17 Would Have Been Obvious to a Person of Ordinary Skill under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Aventail Connect v3.01 in view of Weiss</u> .....	117
11.	<u>SNQ No. 12: Claim 17 Would Have Been Obvious to a Person of Ordinary Skill under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Aventail AutoSOCKS in view of Weiss</u> .....	118

# 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.