

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

RPX CORPORATION.  
Petitioner,

v.

VIRNETX, INC. AND SCIENCE APPLICATION INTERNATIONAL  
CORPORATION,  
Patent Owner

Patent No. 7,490,151

Issued: Feb. 10, 2009

Filed: Sep. 30, 2002

Inventors: Edmund C. Munger, *et al*

Title: Establishment of a Secure Communication Link Based Domain Name  
Service (DNS) Request

---

*Inter Partes* Review No. IPR2014-00173

---

**MOTION TO SEAL EXHIBITS UNDER 47 C.F.R. §§ 42.14 AND 42.55**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.14 and 42.55, Petitioner RPX hereby moves to seal Exhibits 1072 and 1073, which are, respectively, a generic RPX addendum agreement and a client's executed copy of the RPX addendum agreement that are related to its Research & Development program.

### **I. Reasons for Sealing Exhibit**

The standard governing the Board's determination of whether to grant a motion to seal is "good cause." *Garmin v. Cuozzo*, IPR2012-00001, Paper 36 April 5, 2013). In that regard, the Board must "strike a balance between the public's interest in maintaining a complete and understandable file history and the parties' interest in protecting truly sensitive information." *Id.*

Exhibits 1072 and 1073 constitute confidential business information relating to an RPX initiative. The terms and language of these agreements are RPX confidential business information and its client's confidential business information that Petitioner has not made publicly available. The unprotected disclosure of these agreements could be used by Petitioner's competitors for their own interests.

Petitioner believes these agreements have no bearing on the real party in interest in this proceeding. However, to avoid any potential dispute and in the interest of full disclosure, Petitioner provides these exhibits for the Board's review and to clarify that the decisions related to this proceeding and the control of this proceeding are solely at the discretion of Petitioner. Petitioner further notes that

because the details of these agreements are unimportant to the merits of this case, the public's interest in having access to Exhibits 1072 and 1073 is minimal. *See Garmin v. Cuozzo*, IPR2012-00001, Paper 36 at 8-9 (April 5, 2013). The Petitioner therefore respectfully requests that Exhibits 1072 and 1073 remain under seal.

Finally, Petitioner notes that because this motion is being filed pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.55, Petitioner has not conferred with the Patent Owner.

## **II. PROPOSED PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Pursuant § 42.55(a), Petitioner proposes that the default protective order found in appendix B of the Trial Practice Guide be entered. Petitioner understands that pursuant to that section, it needs not serve Exhibits 1072 and 1073 on the Patent Owner until the Patent Owner agrees to the terms of the default protective order or otherwise obtains relief from the Board.

Dated: November 20, 2013

Respectfully Submitted,

/Gregory M. Howison, Reg. #30646/  
Gregory M. Howison  
Registration No. 30646  
Howison & Arnott, L.L.P.  
Lincoln Centre II  
5420 LBJ Freeway, Suite 660  
Dallas, Texas 75240-2318

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this 20th day of November 2013, a copy of this **MOTION TO SEAL EXHIBITS UNDER 47 C.F.R. §§ 42.14 AND 42.55**, has been served in its entirety by Federal Express on the following counsel of record for patent owner:

Joseph E. Palys  
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP  
11955 Freedom Drive  
Reston, VA 20190-5675  
Phone: (571) 203-2700  
Fax: (202) 408-4400  
E-mail: joseph.palys@finnegan.com

Naveen Modi  
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP  
901 New York Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20001-4413  
Telephone: (202) 408-4065  
Facsimile: (202) 408-4400  
E-mail: naveen.modi@finnegan.com

Dated: November 20, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

/Gregory M. Howison Reg. #30646/  
Gregory M. Howison  
Reg. No. 30646  
Attorney for Petitioner