

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

---

APPLE INC.  
Petitioner

v.

VIRNETX INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case No. IPR2015-00188  
U.S. Patent No. 7,418,504

---

**PATENT OWNER'S OPPOSITION TO  
APPLE'S MOTION FOR JOINDER**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- I. INTRODUCTION .....1
- II. PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED .....1
- III. STATEMENT OF FACTS .....2
- IV. ARGUMENT.....3
  - A. Granting Apple’s Motion for Joinder Is Statutorily Barred.....4
  - B. Apple’s Petition Raises Additional Issues Not Present in the  
’614 Proceeding.....7
  - C. Apple Will Not Be Prejudiced if the Board Denies Joinder .....8
- V. CONCLUSION.....8

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**FEDERAL CASES**

*Apple Inc. v. VirnetX Inc.*,  
IPR2013-00393, Paper No. 4 (July 1, 2013) .....3

*Apple Inc. v. VirnetX Inc.*,  
IPR2013-00393, Paper No. 17 (Dec. 18, 2013).....3

*Apple Inc. v. VirnetX Inc.*,  
IPR2013-00394, Paper No. 1 (July 1, 2013) .....3

*Apple Inc. v. VirnetX Inc.*,  
IPR2013-00394, Paper No. 15 (Dec. 18, 2013).....3, 4

*Dell Inc. v. Network-1 Security Solutions, Inc.*,  
IPR2013-00385, Paper No. 17 (July 29, 2013) .....6

*Microsoft Corp. v. Surfcast Inc.*,  
IPR2014-00271, Paper No. 20 (June 13, 2014).....4

*RPX Corp. v. VirnetX Inc.*,  
IPR2014-00176, Paper No. 57 (July 14, 2014) .....3

*Target Corp. v. Destination Maternity Corp.*,  
IPR2014-00508, Paper No. 18 (Sept. 25, 2014).....8

*VirnetX, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.*,  
767 F. 3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....2

**FEDERAL STATUTES**

35 U.S.C. § 311 .....6

35 U.S.C. § 315(b) .....*passim*

35 U.S.C. § 315(c) .....*passim*

## I. INTRODUCTION

For the third time, Apple has been responsible for filing a series of petitions for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 7,418,504 (“the ’504 patent”). Its first two petitions, in IPR2013-00393 and IPR2013-00394, were denied as untimely under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b). Apple had RPX Corporation file its next two petitions in IPR2014-0176 and IPR2014-00177, but those were also dismissed as untimely. Apple then filed two more petitions, those in this proceeding, IPR2015-00188 (“the ’188 proceeding”), and IPR2015-00189 (“the ’189 proceeding”). This time Apple accompanied its petitions with motions for joinder with consolidated IPR2014-00613 and IPR2014-00614 (collectively, “the ’614 proceeding”), filed by Microsoft. Apple’s repeated filings and its requests for joinder are an attempt to evade the time bar of § 315(b) and should be rejected. Not only does the plain language of § 315(b) require this result, § 315(c) and Congress’s express intent to avoid serial harassment of patent owners confirms it. In addition, Apple’s petition includes new grounds that were not presented nor considered in the ’614 proceeding. Thus, Patent Owner VirnetX respectfully requests that the Board deny Apple’s motion requesting joinder of the ’188 proceeding with the ’614 proceeding.

## II. PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED

VirnetX requests that the Board deny Apple’s motion for joinder (“Mot.”).

### III. STATEMENT OF FACTS

On February 4, 2011, VirnetX served Apple with a complaint alleging infringement of the '504 patent and other VirnetX patents. (Ex. 2001, VirnetX Inc.'s First Amended Complaint in *VirnetX Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc. et al.*, Case No. 6:10-cv-00417 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 4, 2011) (“the '417 litigation”).) In response, Apple alleged, among other things, noninfringement, invalidity, and unenforceability of the '504 patent. (Ex. 2002, Apple's Answer in the '417 Litigation at ¶¶ 37, 48-51, 122-123, counterclaim ¶¶ 6-10, 13, 15, 38-44 (E.D. Tex. April 16, 2012).) Prior to trial, Apple also requested *inter partes* reexamination of the '504 patent. The proceeding was assigned Control No. 95/001,788 (“the '1,788 reexamination”) and is ongoing.

Following a five day trial, the district court upheld the validity of the '504 patent. (Ex. 2003, Jury Verdict Form in the '417 litigation (E.D. Tex. Nov. 6, 2012); Ex. 2004, Final Judgment in the '417 litigation (E.D. Tex. Feb. 28, 2013).) Apple appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, which affirmed that “none of the asserted claims are invalid[.]” *VirnetX, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.*, 767 F. 3d 1308, 1313-14 (Fed. Cir. 2014).

After trial, in November 2012, VirnetX served Apple with a related complaint involving the '504 patent and three other VirnetX patents. (Ex. 2005, VirnetX Inc.'s Original Complaint in *VirnetX Inc. v. Apple Inc.*, Case No. 6:12-cv-

# 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.