

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent No. 7,490,151)
)
Filed: September 30, 2002) Group Art Unit: Central
) Reexamination Unit
Issued: February 10, 2009)
) Examiner:
Inventors: Munger et al.)
) Confirmation No.:
For: ESTABLISHMENT OF A SECURE)
COMMUNICATION LINK BASED)
ON A DOMAIN NAME SERVICE)
(DNS) REQUEST)

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. 7,490,151 (the '151 patent), entitled "Establishment of a Secure Communication Link Based on a Domain Name Service (DNS) Request." The inventors of the '151 patent are Edmund Colby Munger, Robert Dunham Short, Victor Larson and Michael Williamson. The present assignee of the '151 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 2007-Part 1
Apple v. Virnetx

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR A REQUEST FOR *INTER PARTES* REEXAMINATION..... 7

A. THE '151 PATENT IS ELIGIBLE TO BE THE SUBJECT OF AN INTER PARTES REEXAMINATION 7

B. CLAIMS OF THE '151 PATENT FOR WHICH REEXAMINATION IS REQUESTED..... 7

C. FEE FOR REEXAMINATION 7

D. CITATION AND COPIES OF PATENTS AND PRINTED PUBLICATIONS THAT ESTABLISH A SUBSTANTIAL NEW QUESTION OF PATENTABILITY 7

E. COPY OF THE PATENT FOR WHICH REEXAMINATION IS REQUESTED 7

F. CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY REQUESTER ON THE PATENT OWNER..... 7

G. REAL PARTY OF INTEREST OF THE REQUESTER..... 8

H. CERTIFICATION THAT REQUESTER IS NOT ESTOPPED FROM REQUESTING REEXAMINATION..... 8

II. STATEMENT IDENTIFYING EACH SUBSTANTIAL NEW QUESTION OF PATENTABILITY RAISED BY THE CITED PATENTS AND PRINTED PUBLICATIONS 9

A. EFFECTIVE FILING DATE OF CLAIMS 1-16 OF THE '151 PATENT 9

B. PRIOR ART STATUS OF CITED PATENTS AND PUBLICATIONS UPON WHICH REEXAMINATION IS REQUESTED . 9

1. Exhibit X1 – Aventail Connect v3.1/2.6 Administrator’s Guide (“Aventail Connect v3.1”) 10

2. Exhibit X2 – Aventail Connect v3.01/2.51 Administrator’s Guide (“Aventail Connect v3.01”) 10

3. Exhibit X3 – Aventail AutoSOCKS v2.1 Administration User’s Guide (“Aventail AutoSOCKS”)..... 11

4. Exhibit X4 - Wang, Broadband Forum TR-025: Core Network Architecture Recommendations For Access to Legacy Data Networks over ADSL, Issue 1.0 (September 1999) (“Wang”) 11

5. Exhibit X5 – U.S. Patent No. 6,496,867 to Beser et al. (“Beser”) 11

6. Exhibit X6 - Kent, “Security Architecture for IP,” RFC 2401 (November 1998) (“Kent”) 11

7. Exhibit X7 - BinGO! User’s Guide incorporating by reference BinGO! Extended Feature Reference (collectively, “BinGO”) 12

C. OTHER PRIOR ART PATENTS AND PRINTED PUBLICATIONS CITED TO DEMONSTRATE KNOWLEDGE IN THE FIELD OF THE INVENTION..... 13

1. Exhibit Y1 – Aventail Extranet Server v3.0 Administrator’s Guide (“Aventail Extranet Server v3.0”) 13

2. Exhibit Y2 – Mockapetris, P., RFC 1034, “Domain Names – Concepts and Facilities,” November 1987 (“RFC1034”)..... 13

3. Exhibit Y3 - Mockapetris, P., RFC 1035, “Domain Names - Implementation And Specification,” November 1987 (“RFC1035”)..... 13

4. Exhibit Y4 – Fielding, R., et al, RFC 2068, “Hypertext Transfer Protocol -- HTTP/1.1,” January 1997 (“RFC2068”)..... 13

5. Exhibit Y5 – Leech, M., et al., RFC 1928, “Socks Protocol Version 5,” March 1996 (“RFC1928”).... 14

6. Exhibit Y6 - Pall, G.S., RFC2118, “Microsoft Point-To-Point Encryption (MPPE) Protocol,” March 1997 (“RFC2118”) 14

7. Exhibit Y7 – Srisuresh, P., RFC2663, “IP Network Address Translator (NAT) Terminology and Considerations,” August 1999 (“RFC2663”)..... 14

8. Exhibit Y8 - Woodburn, R.A., et al., RFC1241, “A Scheme for an Internet Encapsulation Protocol: Version 1,” July 1991 (“RFC1241”) 14

9. Exhibit Y9 – Simpson, W., RFC1853, “IP in IP Tunneling,” October 1995 (“RFC1853”)..... 14

10. Exhibit Y10 – Hanks, S., et al., RFC1701, “Generic Routing Encapsulation (GRE),” October 1994 (“RFC1701”)..... 14

11. Exhibit Y11 – Simpson, W., RFC1994 “PPP Challenge Handshake Authentication Protocol (CHAP),” August 1996 (“RFC1994”) 14

Request for Reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 7,490,151

12. Exhibit Y12 – Perkins, D., RFC1171, “The Point-to-Point Protocol for the Transmission of Multi-Protocol Datagrams Over Point-to-Point Links,” July 1990 (“RFC1171”)	15
D. SUBSTANTIAL NEW QUESTIONS OF PATENTABILITY	16
1. Claims 1-16 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by <u>Aventail Connect v3.01</u>	16
2. Claims 1-16 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by <u>Aventail AutoSOCKS</u>	16
3. Claims 1-16 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) by <u>BinGO</u>	17
4. Claims 1-16 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by <u>Beser</u> taken in view of <u>Kent</u>	17
5. Claims 1-5, 7-11, and 13-16 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) by <u>Wang</u>	18
6. Claims 6 and 12 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on <u>Wang</u> in view of <u>Beser</u>	18
III. PREVIOUS FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS CONCERNING TERMS IN CLAIMS 1-16 OF THE '151 PATENT	20
IV. DETAILED EXPLANATION OF MANNER OF APPLYING AVENTAIL CONNECT V3.01 AND AVENTAIL AUTOSOCKS TO CLAIMS 1-16 AND PROPOSED REJECTIONS BASED ON SNQ NOS. 1-2.	21
A. <u>SNQ NO. 1: CLAIMS 1-16 ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 USC § 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY AVENTAIL CONNECT V3.01</u>	21
1. Claim 1	22
2. Claim 2	27
3. Claim 3	28
4. Claim 4	29
5. Claim 5	30
6. Claim 6	31
7. Claim 7	32
8. Claim 8	37
9. Claim 9	38
10. Claim 10	40
11. Claim 11	40
12. Claim 12	41
13. Claim 13	42
14. Claim 14	47
15. Claim 15	48
16. Claim 16	49
B. <u>SNQ NO. 2: CLAIMS 1-16 ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY AVENTAIL AUTOSOCKS</u>	51
1. Claim 1	52
2. Claim 2	57
3. Claim 3	58
4. Claim 4	60
5. Claim 5	60
6. Claim 6	61
7. Claim 7	62
8. Claim 8	67
9. Claim 9	68
10. Claim 10	71
11. Claim 11	71
12. Claim 12	72
13. Claim 13	72
14. Claim 14	77
15. Claim 15	78
16. Claim 16	81

V. DETAILED EXPLANATION OF MANNER OF APPLYING BINGO TO CLAIMS 1-16 AND PROPOSED REJECTIONS BASED ON SNQ NO. 3 82

A. SNQ NO. 3: CLAIMS 1-16 ARE ANTICIPATED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(A) BY BINGO 82

1. Claim 1 90

2. Claim 2 95

3. Claim 3 96

4. Claim 4 97

5. Claim 5 97

6. Claim 6 98

7. Claim 7 99

8. Claim 8 105

9. Claim 9 106

10. Claim 10 107

11. Claim 11 107

12. Claim 12 108

13. Claim 13 109

14. Claim 14 115

15. Claim 15 116

16. Claim 16 116

VI. DETAILED EXPLANATION OF MANNER OF APPLYING BESER AND KENT TO CLAIMS 1-16 AND PROPOSED REJECTIONS BASED ON SNQ NO. 4 118

A. RELEVANT TEACHINGS OF THE PRIMARY REFERENCE (BESER) 118

B. RELEVANT TEACHINGS OF THE SECONDARY REFERENCE (KENT – RFC 2401) 122

C. SNQ NO. 4: CLAIMS 1-16 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 BASED ON BESER IN VIEW OF KENT 127

1. Claim 1 127

2. Claim 2 131

3. Claim 3 134

4. Claim 4 134

5. Claim 5 135

6. Claim 6 135

7. Claim 7 135

8. Claim 8 139

9. Claim 9 142

10. Claim 10 142

11. Claim 11 142

12. Claim 12 143

13. Claim 13 143

14. Claim 14 147

15. Claim 15 150

16. Claim 16 150

VII. DETAILED EXPLANATION OF MANNER OF APPLYING WANG TO CLAIMS 1-16 AND PROPOSED REJECTIONS BASED ON SNQ NOS. 5-6 151

A. SNQ NO. 5: CLAIMS 1-5, 7-11, 13-16 ARE ANTICIPATED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(A) BY WANG 151

1. Claim 1 152

2. Claim 2 157

3. Claim 3 159

Request for Reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 7,490,151

4. Claim 4.....	161
5. Claim 5.....	161
6. Claim 7.....	162
7. Claim 8.....	168
8. Claim 9.....	170
9. Claim 10.....	172
10. Claim 11.....	172
11. Claim 13.....	173
12. Claim 14.....	179
13. Claim 15.....	181
14. Claim 16.....	183
B. <u>SNQ NO. 6</u> : CLAIMS 6 AND 12 WOULD HAVE BEEN RENDERED OBVIOUS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 BASED ON <u>WANG</u> IN VIEW OF <u>BESER</u>	183
1. Relevant Teachings of the Primary and Secondary References.....	183
2. <u>SNQ No. 14</u> : Claims 6 and 12 would have been rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on <u>Wang</u> in view of <u>Beser</u>	183
VIII. CONCLUSIONS	184

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.