

Filed on behalf of: VirnetX Inc.

By:

Joseph E. Palys

Paul Hastings LLP

875 15th Street NW

Washington, DC 20005

Telephone: (202) 551-1996

Facsimile: (202) 551-0496

E-mail: josephpalys@paulhastings.com

Naveen Modi

Paul Hastings LLP

875 15th Street NW

Washington, DC 20005

Telephone: (202) 551-1990

Facsimile: (202) 551-0490

E-mail: naveenmodi@paulhastings.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION

Petitioner

v.

VIRNETX INC.

Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2014-00618

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 .....2
  - A. The Petition Fails to Comply with 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(2)(ii) .....2
  - B. Microsoft’s Petition Should Be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) .....3
  - C. The Board Should Not Institute Based on the Petition’s Redundant Grounds .....5
- III. The Petition’s Claim Constructions Are Flawed and Should Be Rejected .....8
  - A. Overview of the ’211 Patent.....9
  - B. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....12
  - C. “Domain Name” (Claims 1, 2, 15-17, 20, 21, 26, 35-37, 39, 40, 44, 45, 50, 59, and 60).....13
  - D. “Domain Name Service System” (Claims 1, 14-17, 19, 20, 23, 27, 33, 35, 36, 41, 51, 57, 59, and 60).....14
  - E. The “Indication” Phrases (Claims 1, 17, 36, 41, and 60).....15
  - F. “Secure Communication Link” (Claims 1, 16, 17, 22, 26-29, 33, 35, 36, 40, 41, 46, 50-53, 57, and 59-60).....17
  - G. “Transparently” (Claims 27 and 51) .....19
  - H. “Between [A] and [B]” (Claims 16, 27, 33, 40, 51, and 57).....20
- IV. If Trial Is Instituted, VirnetX Requests an 18-Month Schedule .....21
- V. Conclusion .....22

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**Federal Cases**

*Boku, Inc. v. Xilidev, Inc.*,  
 CBM2014-00140, Paper No. 4 (June 12, 2014).....2

*EMC Corp. v. Personal Web Techs., LLC*,  
 IPR2013-00087, Paper No. 25 (June 5, 2013).....6, 8

*Idle Free Sys., Inc. v. Bergstrom, Inc.*,  
 IPR2012-00027, Paper No. 26 (June 11, 2013).....6

*Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.*,  
 IPR2013-00324, Paper No. 19 (Nov. 21, 2013) .....4

*Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.*,  
 CBM2012-00003, Paper No. 7 (Oct. 25, 2012).....5, 6, 7

*Medtronic, Inc. v. Robert Bosch Healthcare Sys., Inc.*,  
 IPR2014-00436, Paper No. 17 (June 19, 2014).....4

*Prism Pharma Co., Ltd., v. Choongwae Pharma Corp.*,  
 IPR2014-00315, Paper No. 14 (July 8, 2014) .....3

*ScentAir Techs., Inc. v. Prolitec, Inc.*,  
 IPR2013-00180, Paper No. 18 (Aug. 26, 2013).....6, 8

**Federal Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 313..... 1

35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(1).....21

35 U.S.C. § 325(d) .....1, 3, 5

**Regulations**

37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(2)(ii).....1, 2

37 C.F.R. § 42.8 .....21

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(c).....21

37 C.F.R. § 42.107 .....1

**Other Authorities**

157 Cong. Rec. S1041-42 (daily ed. Mar. 1, 2011).....3

77 Fed. Reg. 48680 (Aug. 14, 2012).....3

77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012).....3

## I. Introduction

Patent Owner VirnetX Inc. 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 (the “Petition”) filed by Microsoft Corporation against U.S. Patent No. 7,921,211 (“the ’211 patent”). VirnetX requests that the Board not institute *inter partes* review for several reasons.

First, the Petition fails to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(2)(ii) because it uses a font that the Board has deemed noncompliant for being too narrow. The result is that Microsoft’s Petition contains additional arguments that it could not otherwise have made if written in a compliant font.

Second, this proceeding is duplicative of other actions before the Office and should be dismissed under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d). The Office currently has two *inter partes* reexamination proceedings against the ’211 patent. Another set of Office proceedings against the ’211 patent, as Microsoft requests here, is unnecessary and burdens both the Office and VirnetX. In addition, the primary prior art reference Microsoft relies on here is already being considered by the Office in a reexamination of the ’211 patent. Section 325(d) was designed to avoid the type of serial challenge Microsoft requests.

# 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.