

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

In re patent of Munger et al.	§	Merged Control Nos.: 95/001,714
	§	95/001,697
U.S. Patent No. 7,490,151	§	Group Art Unit: 3992
Filed: September 30, 2002	§	Examiner: Michael J. Yigdall
Issued: February 10, 2009	§	Confirmation No.: 3428
Title: Establishment of a Secure	§	Real Party in Interest:
Communication Link Based On	§	Cisco Systems, Inc.
a Domain Name Service (DNS) Request	§	
	§	

**COMMENTS BY THIRD PARTY REQUESTER**

**PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §1.947**

Mail Stop *Inter Partes* Reexam  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	REPLY TO PATENT OWNER ARGUMENTS.....	1
A.	Response to Patent Owner’s Argument That Certain References Are Not Prior Art .....	1
B.	The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 Based on Kiuchi Were Proper.....	5
1.	Kiuchi.....	5
2.	Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 12-16 (ISSUE #7).....	5
3.	Claims 5 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based on Kiuchi in view of Martin (ISSUE #8).....	10
4.	Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based on Kiuchi in view of Edwards (ISSUE #14).....	10
5.	Claims 5 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based on Kiuchi in view of Edwards and Martin (ISSUE #15).....	13
C.	The Rejections Based on Wesinger Were Proper .....	14
1.	Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 12-16 based on 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) (ISSUE #9) .....	14
2.	Claims 5 and 11 based on 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Wesinger in view of Martin (ISSUE #10).....	24
3.	Claims 1-4, 6-10, and 12-16 based on 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Wesinger in view of Edwards (ISSUE #16).....	24
D.	The Rejections Based on Blum Were Proper (ISSUE #11).....	28
1.	Overview of Blum.....	28
2.	Independent Claim 1 .....	28
3.	Independent Claims 7 and 13.....	31
E.	Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based on Aziz in view of Edwards (ISSUE #12) .....	31
1.	Aziz.....	31
2.	Independent Claim 1 .....	31
3.	Independent Claims 7 and 13.....	36
4.	Dependent Claims 2, 8 and 14 .....	37

5.	Dependent Claims 3, 9 and 15 .....	37
6.	Dependent Claims 6 and 12 .....	37
7.	Dependent Claims 4, 10 and 16 .....	38
F.	Claims 5 and 11 based on 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Aziz in view of Edwards and Martin (ISSUE #13).....	38
G.	The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 Based on Aventail Were Proper (ISSUE #1).....	38
1.	Aventail.....	39
2.	Independent Claim 1 .....	39
3.	Independent Claims 7 and 13.....	43
4.	Dependent Claims 2, 8 and 14 .....	43
5.	Dependent Claims 3, 9 and 15 .....	44
6.	Dependent Claims 4, 10 and 16 .....	45
7.	Dependent Claims 5 and 11 .....	45
8.	Dependent Claims 6 and 12 .....	46
H.	The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 Based on AutoSOCKS Were Proper (ISSUE #2).....	47
I.	The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 Based on BinGO Were Proper (ISSUE #3).....	47
1.	The BinGO User’s Guide Incorporates the BinGO EFR.....	47
2.	The BinGO User’s Guide.....	48
3.	Response to Patent Owner’s Arguments Regarding “Two Alternative Embodiments”.....	48
4.	Independent Claim 1 .....	48
5.	Independent Claims 7 and 13.....	52
6.	Dependent Claims 2, 8 and 14 .....	52
7.	Dependent Claims 3, 9 and 15 .....	53
8.	Dependent Claims 4, 10 and 16 .....	54
9.	Dependent Claims 5 and 11 .....	54
10.	Dependent Claims 6 and 12 .....	55

J.	The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Based on Beser in View of Kent Were Proper (ISSUE #4) .....	55
1.	Beser in View of Kent.....	55
2.	Beser and Kent Were Properly Combined.....	55
3.	Independent Claim 1 .....	55
4.	Independent Claims 7 and 13.....	57
5.	Dependent Claims 2, 8 and 14 .....	58
6.	Dependent Claims 4, 10 and 16 .....	58
7.	Dependent Claims 5 and 11 .....	58
8.	Dependent Claims 6 and 12 .....	59
K.	Response to Patent Owner’s Argument That Secondary Considerations Demonstrate Non-Obviousness .....	59
II.	Non-Adopted Rejections (ISSUES #4, #5, #6).....	61
III.	Conclusion .....	61

## LIST OF EXHIBITS

The present comments by third party requester Cisco Systems are accompanied by the following reference materials that, pursuant to 37 CFR 1.943, are excluded from the page limit restrictions.

- Exhibit F<sup>1</sup>: Bradner, “The Internet Standards Process – Revision 3,” Request for Comments 2026, Internet Engineering Task Force (Oct. 1996).
- Exhibit G: Burnside & Keromytis, “Accelerating Application-Level Security Protocols,” The 11th IEEE International Conference on Networks, 2003, pp. 313-318.
- Exhibit H: Copy of catalog listing from Boston University Digital Common website, listing the Martin reference with an issue date of February 21, 1998.
- Exhibit I: Copy of Technical Reports Archive listing from Boston University Computer Science Department which includes a link to the Martin paper. The link to the Martin paper was archived at archive.org on January 22, 1998 and retrieved by the Wayback Machine.
- Exhibit J: Boston University Computer Science Department Technical Reports Instructions, available at: <http://www.cs.bu.edu/techreports/INSTRUCTIONS>.
- Exhibit K: U. Möller, “Implementation eines Anonymisierungsverfahrens für WWW-Zugriffe,” Diplomarbeit, Universität Hamburg (July 16, 1999), citing to Martin at page 77.
- Exhibit L: Joint Claim Construction Chart for US 7490151, *VirnetX v. Cisco*, No. 6:10-cv-00417, Docket No. 194 (Dec. 21, 2011) (selected pages).

---

<sup>1</sup> Exhibits A-E are part of the originally filed Request for Reexamination.

# 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.