

Paper No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Filed: September 27, 2013

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

---

NEW BAY CAPITAL, LLC  
Petitioner

v.

VIRNETX INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2013-00378  
Patent 7,921,211

---

**Patent Owner's Preliminary Response  
to Petition for *Inter Partes* Review  
of U.S. Patent No. 7,921,211**

**Table of Contents**

- I. Introduction.....1
- II. The Petition Fails to Meet the Requirements for Instituting an *Inter Partes* Review .....3
- III. The Petition’s Claim Constructions Are Flawed and Should Be Rejected .....5
  - A. Overview of the ’211 Patent.....6
  - B. “Domain Name” (Claims 36 and 37) .....10
  - C. “Top-Level Domain Name” (Claim 37) .....12
  - D. “Domain Name Service System” (Claims 36 and 51) .....14
  - E. “Secure Communication Link” (Claims 36 and 51) .....17
  - F. “Code for . . . Indicating” (Claim 36) .....21
  - G. “Transparently” (Claim 51).....23
- IV. If Trial Is Instituted, VirnetX Requests an 18-Month Schedule .....24
- V. Conclusion .....25

**Table of Authorities**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Garmin Int’l, Inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2012-00001 (Jan. 9, 2013) Paper No. 15.....	5-6, 19
<i>In re Bigio</i> , 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	19
<i>In re Zletz</i> , 893 F.2d 319 (Fed. Cir. 1989) .....	5
<i>Motorola Solutions, Inc. v. Mobile Scanning Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2013-00093 (Apr. 29, 2013) Paper No. 28.....	6, 19
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc) .....	5
<i>Xilinx, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC</i> , IPR2013-00112 (June 27, 2013) Paper No. 14.....	19
<i>ZTE Corp. &amp; ZTE (USA) Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00134 (June 19, 2013) Paper No. 12.....	19
<b>FEDERAL STATUTES</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 313 .....	1
35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(1).....	25
<b>FEDERAL REGULATIONS</b>	
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....	5
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(c).....	25
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....	3, 5
37 C.F.R. § 42.107 .....	1

## **I. Introduction**

Patent Owner VirnetX Inc. (“VirnetX” or “Patent Owner”) respectfully submits this Preliminary Response in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 313 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.107, responding to the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (Paper No. 4, the “Petition”) filed by New Bay Capital, LLC (“New Bay”).

This Petition is one of eleven *inter partes* reviews requested recently by Apple Inc. (“Apple”) and New Bay against VirnetX’s patents. Three of the *inter partes* review petitions challenge VirnetX’s U.S. Patent No. 7,921,211 (“the ’211 patent”).

New Bay’s Petition marks the seventh challenge to the validity of the ’211 patent. Apple and Cisco Systems, Inc. (“Cisco”) raised the first and second challenges to the ’211 patent in district court. Neither succeeded. The cases were tried before separate juries, and both juries upheld the validity of the asserted ’211 patent claims. (Ex. 2001, Jury Verdict Form Against Apple in *VirnetX Inc. v. Apple Inc.*, Case No. 6:10-CV-417 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 6, 2012) (“the ’417 Litigation”); Ex. 2002, Jury Verdict Form as to Cisco in the ’417 Litigation (E.D. Tex. Mar. 14, 2012). The court later entered judgments upholding the validity of the ’211 patent. (Ex. 2003, Final Judgment Against Apple in the ’417 Litigation (E.D. Tex. Feb. 28, 2013); Ex. 2004, Final Judgment as to Cisco in the ’417 Litigation (E.D. Tex. Mar. 19, 2013).)

In the third and fourth challenges, Apple and Cisco each requested *inter partes* reexamination of the '211 patent (Control Nos. 95/001,856 and 95/001,789). Those reexaminations are ongoing.

New Bay's Petition represents the fifth challenge to the '211 patent. Apple recently sought the sixth and seventh challenges to the '211 patent by filing two *inter partes* review petitions.<sup>1</sup> (See Case Nos. IPR2013-00397, "the '397 petition," and IPR2013-00398, "the '398 petition"). Apple's petitions are pending but not instituted. Accordingly, New Bay's Petition is now one of the five pending post-grant challenges before the Office concerning the '211 patent (two reexaminations and three *inter partes* review petitions).

These proceedings are largely duplicative of one another, and instituting New Bay's *inter partes* review will only serve to duplicate efforts already undertaken in litigation and in pending reexamination of the '211 patent. Indeed, each of New Bay's proposed rejections is based solely on *Kiuchi*. *Kiuchi* is also asserted in the Cisco reexamination (Control No. 95/001,856). Further, in the '417 Litigation, Apple's primary invalidity theory—and the only theory it elected to

---

<sup>1</sup> New Bay's Petition should also not be joined with Apple's petitions for the '211 patent, if instituted, for the reasons discussed in VirnetX's Opposition to Apple's Motion for Joinder, filed August 28, 2013, in matters IPR2013-00397 and -00398.

# 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.