

Paper No. _____
Filed: March 6, 2014

Filed on behalf of: VirnetX Inc.
By: Joseph E. Palys
Naveen Modi
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P.
11955 Freedom Drive
Reston, VA 20190-5675
Telephone: 571-203-2700
Facsimile: 202-408-4400
E-mail: joseph.palys@finnegan.com
naveen.modi@finnegan.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

RPX CORPORATION
Petitioner

v.

VIRNETX INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-00171
Patent 6,502,135

**Patent Owner's Preliminary Response
to Petition for *Inter Partes* Review
of U.S. Patent No. 6,502,135**

Table of Contents

I. Introduction.....1

II. The Petition Fails to Meet the Requirements for Instituting an *Inter Partes* Review.....2

A. The Petition Should Not Be Considered Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 312(a)(2) and 315(b)2

1. There Is a [REDACTED]3

a) [REDACTED]3

b) RPX and Apple Have Tried to Hide Apple’s Involvement.....5

2. The Petition Fails to Name a Real Party-in-Interest.....7

a) [REDACTED]9

b) [REDACTED]9

c) RPX and Apple Violated the Third *Guan* Factor10

d) RPX Is Like the Requester in *Guan*12

3. Trial May Not Be Instituted Under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b)13

a) Apple Is a Time-Barred Real Party-in-Interest13

b) Apple Is a Time-Barred Privy14

4. Policy Considerations Support Denying the Petition16

B. The Petition Fails to Comply with 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4)18

C. RPX’s Petition Should Be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....22

D. The Proposed Grounds Treat Aventail as a Single Document Instead of Two Separate Documents.....24

E. The Board Should Not Institute Based on the Petition’s Redundant Grounds.....26

III. The Petition’s Claim Constructions Are Flawed and Should Be Rejected32

A. Overview of the ’135 Patent.....32

B. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art33

C. “Virtual Private Network (VPN)” (Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, and 18).....34

D. “Virtual Private Link” (Claim 13).....39

E. “Domain Name” (Claims 1, 3, 10, and 18).....40

F. “Domain Name Service” (Construe as Part of “Domain Name Service (DNS) Request”)42

G. “Domain Name Service (DNS) Request” (Claims 1, 3-5, and 18).....43

H. “DNS Server” (Claims 2, 8, and 18).....44

I. “DNS Proxy Server” (Claims 8 and 10)44

J. “Secure [Target] Web Site” (Claims 1, 3, 8, 10, and 18).....45

K. “Web Site” (Construe as Part of “Secure [Target] Web Site”).....47

L. “Secure Web Computer” (Claim 10)48

M. “Target Computer” (Claims 1, 4-7, 9-11, and 18)50

N. “IP Address Hopping Scheme” (Claim 6)51

O. “Determining” (Claims 1, 3-5, and 18).....52

P. “Client Computer” (Claims 1-7, 9-13, 17, and 18).....52

Q. “Transparently [Creating a Virtual Private Network (VPN)]” (Claims 1, 10, and 18)56

R. “Automatically Initiating the VPN” (Claims 1, 4, 5, and 18).....57

S. “Passes Through the Request to a DNS Server” (Claim 8)58

T. “Gatekeeper Computer” (Claims 7 and 10-12).....59

U. “Allocates VPN Resources” (Claim 7), “Allocates Resources for the VPN” (Claim 10), and “Allocating Resources to Establish a Virtual Private Link” (Claim 13).....59

IV. If Trial Is Instituted, VirnetX Requests an 18-Month Schedule59

V. Conclusion60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	25
<i>Apple Inc. v. VirnetX Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00348 (June 12, 2013) Paper No. 1	3
<i>Apple Inc. v. VirnetX Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00349 (Sept. 17, 2013) Paper No. 10	19, 24, 31
<i>Asahi Glass Co. v. Toledo Eng’g Co.</i> , 505 F. Supp. 2d 423 (N.D. Ohio 2007)	15
<i>In re Bigio</i> , 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	38
<i>CallCopy, Inc. v. Verint Ams., Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00486 (Feb. 5, 2014) Paper No. 11	26
<i>Catalina Mktg. Int’l, Inc. v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.</i> , 289 F.3d 801 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	56
<i>Electro Sci. Indus., Inc. v. Dynamic Details, Inc.</i> 307 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	56
<i>EMC Corp. v. Personal Web Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2013-00087 (June 5, 2013) Paper No. 25	27
<i>Garmin Int’l, Inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2012-00001 (Jan. 9, 2013) Paper No. 15	38
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	26, 27
<i>Gustafson v. Alloyd Co., Inc.</i> , 513 U.S. 561 (1995)	11, 14
<i>Idle Free Sys., Inc. v. Bergstrom, Inc.</i> , IPR2012-00027 (June 11, 2013) Paper No. 26	27

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.