

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

VirnetX Inc.,

Plaintiff,

v.

Apple Inc.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 6:11-cv-563

Jury Trial Demanded

VirnetX Inc. and Science Applications
International Corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Apple Inc.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 6:12-cv-855

Jury Trial Demanded

JOINT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND PREHEARING STATEMENT

Pursuant to Local Patent Rule 4-3, Plaintiffs, VirnetX Inc. and Leidos, Inc., formerly Science Applications International Corporation (collectively “VirnetX”) and Defendant, Apple Inc. (“Apple”) hereby file this Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement in accordance with the Court’s Docket Control Order entered June 25, 2013 [Dkt. 56].

a) Terms on Which the Parties Agree

After several meet and confer telephone conferences, the parties were able to narrow the list of disputed claim terms and phrases for their P.R. 4-1 lists and P.R. 4-2 exchange of preliminary claim construction and extrinsic evidence. The parties, however, were unable to reach an agreement on the meaning of the disputed claim terms or phrases set forth in **Exhibit B** hereto.

b) Proposed Constructions

The parties have set forth their proposed constructions in four exhibits:

Exhibit A sets forth the proposed constructions of each agreed upon claim term of the VirnetX patents in suit, U.S. Patent No. 6,502,135 (“the ‘135 patent”), U.S. Patent No. 7,418,504 (“the ‘504 patent”), U.S. Patent No. 7,490,151 (“the ‘151 patent”), U.S. Patent No. 7,921,211 (“the ‘211 patent”), U.S. Patent No. 8,051,181 (“the ‘181 patent”) and 8,504,697 (“the ‘697 patent”) (collectively, “the Patents-in-Suit”). For those terms in Exhibit A previously construed by this Court, the parties request that those terms be given the meanings as adopted in the Court’s memorandum opinions in *VirnetX Inc. v. Cisco Sys. Inc.*, No. 6:10-cv-417-LED, Dkt. No. 266 (Apr. 25, 2012) and *VirnetX Inc. v. Mitel Networks Corp.*, No. 6:11-cv-18-LED, Dkt. No. 307 (Aug. 1, 2012).

Exhibit B sets forth VirnetX’s and Apple’s proposed respective constructions of each disputed claim term of the Patents-in-Suit. VirnetX and Apple have agreed to rest on the prior claim construction briefing for many of the terms that have already been construed. *See* No. 6:10-CV-00417-LED, Dkt. Nos. 173, 182, 192, 209, 366, 424. Where a party proposes a construction that was previously adopted by the Court, that party requests that the term be given the meaning as adopted in the Court’s memorandum opinions in *VirnetX Inc. v. Cisco Sys. Inc.*, No. 6:10-cv-417-LED, Dkt. No. 266 (Apr. 25, 2012) and *VirnetX Inc. v. Mitel Networks Corp.*, No. 6:11-cv-18-LED, Dkt. No. 307 (Aug. 1, 2012). The terms that the parties will rest on the prior briefing have been highlighted in green. The un-highlighted terms will be the subject of new briefing in this matter.

Exhibit C sets forth all references from the specification and prosecution history that support VirnetX’s proposed constructions and an identification of the extrinsic evidence known to VirnetX on which VirnetX intends to rely either to support its proposed construction of the claim language or to oppose Apple’s proposed construction of the claim language. VirnetX relies on the intrinsic

evidence as a whole relating to the Patents-in-Suit, including the claim language, the specification and figures, the file history, and the references cited on the face of the patent. In addition to the intrinsic and extrinsic evidence identified by VirnetX, VirnetX reserves the right to rely on the record of *VirnetX Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*, No. 6:07-cv-80, *VirnetX Inc. v. Cisco Sys. Inc.*, No. 6:10-cv-417-LED, and *VirnetX Inc. v. Mitel Networks Corp.*, No. 6:11-cv-18-LED, and any intrinsic or extrinsic evidence identified by Apple in support of its proposed constructions. VirnetX may also rely upon intrinsic and extrinsic evidence, including the prosecution history and/or any re-examinations, to rebut the constructions proposed by Apple.

Exhibit D sets forth all references from the specification and prosecution history that support Apple's proposed constructions and an identification of the extrinsic evidence known to Apple on which Apple intends to rely either to support their proposed construction of the claim language or to oppose VirnetX's proposed construction of the claim language. Apple relies on the intrinsic evidence as a whole relating to the Patents-in-Suit, including the claim language, the specification and figures, the file history, and the references cited on the face of the patent. In addition to the intrinsic and extrinsic evidence identified by Apple, Apple reserves the right to rely on the record of *VirnetX Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*, No. 6:07-cv-80, *VirnetX Inc. v. Cisco Sys. Inc.*, No. 6:10-cv-417-LED, and *VirnetX Inc. v. Mitel Networks Corp.*, No. 6:11-cv-18-LED, and any intrinsic or extrinsic evidence identified by VirnetX in support of its proposed constructions. Apple may also rely upon intrinsic and extrinsic evidence, including the prosecution history and/or any re-examinations, to rebut the constructions proposed by VirnetX.

c) Claim Construction Hearing Length

VirnetX anticipates that the length of time necessary for the Claim Construction Hearing is 1 hour, with the time being split equally between VirnetX and Apple.

Apple anticipates that the length of time necessary for the Claim Construction Hearing is 2 hours, with the time being split equally between VirnetX and Apple.

d) Witnesses, Including Experts, for the Claim Construction Hearing

Based on their current understanding of the parties' respective claim construction positions, as derived from the meet-and-confer process, VirnetX and Apple do not believe expert testimony is necessary for the Claim Construction Hearing. If testimony becomes necessary, VirnetX reserves the right to call Dr. Mark Jones and Apple reserves the right to call Dr. John Kelly.

e) Other Issues for the Hearing

VirnetX respectfully requests that the Court allow VirnetX to argue its motion to compel the production of Apple's source code [Dkt. No. 95] which is currently before the Court.

DATED: February 14, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

CALDWELL CASSADY & CURRY

/s/ Jason D. Cassady

Bradley W. Caldwell
Texas State Bar No. 24040630
E-mail: bcaldwell@caldwellcc.com

Jason D. Cassady
Texas State Bar No. 24045625
E-mail: jcassady@caldwellcc.com

John Austin Curry
Texas State Bar No. 24059636
E-mail: acurry@caldwellcc.com

Daniel R. Pearson
Texas State Bar No. 24070398
E-mail: dpearson@caldwellcc.com

Hamad M. Hamad
Texas State Bar No. 24061268
Email: hhamad@caldwellcc.com

Justin T. Nemunaitis
Texas State Bar No. 24065815
Email: jnemunaitis@caldwellcc.com

Christopher S. Stewart
Texas State Bar No. 24079399
E-mail: cstewart@caldwellcc.com

John F. Summers
Texas State Bar No. 24079417
E-mail: jsummers@caldwellcc.com

Jason S. McManis
Texas State Bar No. 24088032
E-mail: jmcmanis@caldwellcc.com

CALDWELL CASSADY CURRY P.C.
2101 Cedar Springs Road, Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 888-4848
Facsimile: (214) 888-4849

Robert M. Parker
Texas State Bar No. 15498000
Email: rmparker@pbatyler.com
R. Christopher Bunt
Texas State Bar No. 00787165
Email: rcbunt@pbatyler.com
PARKER, BUNT & AINSWORTH, P.C.
100 East Ferguson, Suite 1114

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.