

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 IPR2014-00173
Patent 7,490,151

**Patent Owner's Preliminary Response
to Petition for *Inter Partes* Review
of U.S. Patent No. 7,490,151**

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction.....1
- II. The Petition Fails to Meet the Requirements for Instituting an *Inter Partes* Review2
 - A. The Petition Should Not Be Considered Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 312(a)(2) and 315(b)3
 - 1. There Is a Long-Standing Relationship Between RPX and Apple4
 - a) RPX and Apple Worked Jointly to Challenge VirnetX Patents.....4
 - b) RPX and Apple Have Tried to Hide Apple’s Involvement6
 - 2. The Petition Fails to Name a Real Party-in-Interest8
 - a) RPX and Apple Violated the First *Guan* Factor.....10
 - b) RPX and Apple Violated the Second *Guan* Factor10
 - c) RPX and Apple Violated the Third *Guan* Factor11
 - d) RPX Is Like the Requester in *Guan*13
 - 3. Trial May Not Be Instituted Under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b)14
 - a) Apple Is a Time-Barred Real Party-in-Interest14
 - b) Apple Is a Time-Barred Privy15
 - 4. Policy Considerations Support Denying the Petition17
 - B. The Petition Fails to Comply with 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4)19
 - C. RPX’s Petition Should Be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....23
 - D. The Proposed Grounds Treat *Aventail* as a Single Document Instead of Two Separate Documents.....26

- E. The Board Should Not Institute Based on the Petition’s Redundant Grounds.....28
- III. The Petition’s Claim Constructions Are Flawed and Should Be Rejected33
 - A. Overview of the ’151 Patent.....34
 - B. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art36
 - C. “DNS Request” (Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, and 16)37
 - D. “Domain Name” (Construe as Part of “Domain Name Server (DNS) Proxy Module” or “Domain Name Server (DNS) Module”)38
 - E. “Domain Name Server” (Construe as Part of “Domain Name Server (DNS) Proxy Module” or “Domain Name Server (DNS) Module”)40
 - F. “Domain Name Server (DNS) Proxy Module” (Claims 1 and 7).....42
 - G. “Domain Name Server (DNS) Module” (Claim 13).....43
 - H. “Secure Server” (Claims 1-3, 5-9, and 11-15)44
 - I. “IP Address Hopping Scheme” (Claims 5 and 11)45
 - J. “Automatically Initiating an Encrypted Channel” / “Automatically Creating a Secure Channel” (Claims 1, 5-7, and 11-13)47
 - K. “Client” (Claims 1-16)48
 - L. “Determining” (Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13, and 14)51
 - M. “Forwarding the DNS Request” (Claims 1, 7, and 13).....52
 - N. “Intercepts DNS Requests / Intercepting a DNS Request / Intercepted DNS Request” (Claims 1, 7, and 13)52
- IV. If Trial Is Instituted, VirnetX Requests an 18-Month Schedule52
- V. Conclusion53

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	26
<i>Apple Inc. v. VirnetX Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00348 (June 12, 2013) Paper No. 1	4
<i>Apple Inc. v. VirnetX Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00349 (Sept. 17, 2013) Paper No. 10	26
<i>Apple Inc. v. VirnetX Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00354 (Sept. 19, 2013) Paper No. 15	20, 32
<i>Asahi Glass Co. v. Toledo Eng’g Co.</i> , 505 F. Supp. 2d 423 (N.D. Ohio 2007)	16
<i>CallCopy, Inc. v. Verint Ams., Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00486 (Feb. 5, 2014) Paper No. 11	27
<i>Chef Am., Inc. v. Lamb-Weston, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	51
<i>EMC Corp. v. Personal Web Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2013-00087 (June 5, 2013) Paper No. 25	29
<i>Garmin Int’l, Inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2012-00001 (Jan. 9, 2013) Paper No. 15	34
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	28
<i>Gustafson v. Alloyd Co., Inc.</i> , 513 U.S. 561 (1995)	15
<i>Idle Free Sys., Inc. v. Bergstrom, Inc.</i> , IPR2012-00027 (June 11, 2013) Paper No. 26	29

In re Guan et al. Inter Partes

Reexamination Proceeding, Control No. 95/001,045, Decision

Vacating Filing Date (Aug. 25, 2008)*passim**Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.,*

IPR2013-00324 (Nov. 21, 2013) Paper No. 1924

LaRose Indus., LLC v. Capriola Corp.,

IPR2013-00120 (July 22, 2013) Paper No. 2029, 33

Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.,

CBM2012-00003 (Oct. 25, 2012) Paper No. 7.....28, 29, 30, 33

Motorola Solutions, Inc. v. Mobile Scanning Techs., LLC,

IPR2013-00093 (Apr. 29, 2013) Paper No. 28.....34

Phelps v. Hamilton,

122 F.3d 1309 (10th Cir. 1997)16

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,

415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)34, 41

SAP Am., Inc. v. Versata Dev. Group, Inc.,

CBM2012-00001 (June 11, 2013) Paper 70.....39

SAP Am., Inc. v. Pi-Net Int'l, Inc.,

CBM2013-00013 (Sept. 19, 2013) Paper No. 1515

ScentAir Techs., Inc. v. Prolitec, Inc., Case

IPR2013-00180 (Aug. 26, 2013) Paper No. 1830

Tasco, Inc. v. Pagnani,

IPR2013-00103 (May 23, 2013) Paper No. 6.....19

Taylor v. Sturgell,

553 U.S. 880 (2008).....17

Wowza Media Sys., LLC et al. v. Adobe Sys., Inc.,

IPR2013-00054 (July 13, 2013) Paper No. 1619

In re Zletz,

893 F.2d 319 (Fed. Cir. 1989)33

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.