

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.
Petitioner,

v.

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

Patent No. 8,868,705

Issued: October 21, 2014

Filed: September 13, 2012

Inventors: Victor Larson, *et al.*

Title: AGILE NETWORK PROTOCOL FOR SECURE COMMUNICATIONS
USING SECURE DOMAIN NAMES

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2015-00810

**Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of
U.S. Patent No. 8,868,705**

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
A.	Certification the '705 Patent May Be Contested by Petitioner.....	1
B.	Fee for Inter Partes Review (§ 42.15(a))	1
C.	Mandatory Notices (37 CFR § 42.8(b))	1
1.	Real Party in Interest (§ 42.8(b)(1)).....	1
2.	Other Proceedings (§ 42.8(b)(2)).....	2
3.	Lead and Backup Lead Counsel (§ 42.8(b)(3))	2
4.	Service Information (§ 42.8(b)(4))	3
5.	Proof of Service (§§ 42.6(e) and 42.105(a)).....	3
II.	Identification of Claims Being Challenged (§ 42.104(b)).....	3
III.	Relevant Information Concerning the Contested Patent	4
A.	Overview of the '705 Patent	4
1.	The '705 Patent Specification.....	4
2.	Representative Claims	6
B.	Patent Owner's Contentions About Related Patents.....	6
C.	Effective Filing Date.....	7
D.	The Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	9
E.	Claim Construction	9
1.	“intercept[ing] . . . a request”	10
2.	“domain name”	11
3.	“secure domain name”	11
4.	“provisioning information”.....	12
5.	“modulated transmission link” / “unmodulated transmission link”.....	13
6.	“phone”	15
IV.	Analysis of the Patentability of the '705 Patent.....	15
A.	Overview of Beser (Ex. 1007)	15

a)	Request Containing a Unique Identifier	17
b)	Negotiation of Private IP Addresses.....	20
B.	Overview of RFC 2401 (Ex. 1008)	22
C.	Overview of Brand (Ex. 1012).....	24
D.	Beser (Ex. 1007) In View of RFC 2401 (Ex. 1008) Would Have Rendered Obvious Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-26 and 28-34.....	24
1.	A Person of Ordinary Skill Would Have Found It Obvious to Encrypt IP Traffic in the Beser Scheme Based on the Teachings in Beser and RFC 2401	26
2.	Independent Claims 1 and 21 Would Have Been Obvious	30
a)	Claim Preambles.....	30
b)	“intercept[ing] . . . a request to look up an [] IP address corresponding to a domain name associated with the target . . .”	32
c)	“determin[e/ing] whether the request . . . corresponds to a device that accepts an encrypted channel connection” ..	34
d)	In response to step (2) “provid[e/ing] provisioning information required to initiate . . . [an] encrypted communications channel”	37
e)	“the client device being a device at which a user accesses the encrypted communications channel”	40
3.	Claims 8, 15, 30 and 32 Would Have Been Obvious	41
4.	Claims 2 and 9 Would Have Been Obvious	42
5.	Claims 3, 10 and 25 Would Have Been Obvious	43
6.	Claims 4 and 26 Would Have Been Obvious	44
7.	Claims 6, 12 and 28 Would Have Been Obvious	45
8.	Claims 7, 13 and 29 Would Have Been Obvious	45
9.	Claims 14 and 31 Would Have Been Obvious	46
10.	Claims 16 and 33 Would Have Been Obvious	47
11.	Claims 17 and 34 Would Have Been Obvious	48
12.	Claims 18 and 22 Would Have Been Obvious	48
13.	Claims 19 and 23 Would Have Been Obvious	49

14. Claims 20 and 24 Would Have Been Obvious50

**E. Beser In View of RFC 2401 Further In View of Brand (Ex. 1012)
Would Have Rendered Obvious Claims 5, 11 and 2751**

F. No Secondary Considerations Exist52

V. Conclusion53

I. Introduction

A. Certification the '705 Patent May Be Contested by Petitioner

Petitioner certifies that U.S. Patent No. 8,868,705 (Ex. 1001) (the '705 patent) is available for *inter partes* review. Petitioner also certifies it is not barred or estopped from requesting *inter partes* review of the claims of the '705 patent. Neither Petitioner, nor any party in privity with Petitioner, has filed a civil action challenging the validity of any claim of the '705 patent. The '705 patent has not been the subject of a prior *inter partes* review by Petitioner or a privy of Petitioner.

Petitioner also certifies this petition for *inter partes* review is timely filed as it has never been asserted against Petitioner in litigation. Thus, because there is no patent owner's action, this petition complies with 35 U.S.C. § 315(b). Petitioner also notes that the timing provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 311(c) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.102(a) do not apply to the '705 patent, as it pre-dates the first-to-file system. *See* Pub. L. 112-274 § 1(n), 126 Stat. 2456 (Jan. 14, 2013).

B. Fee for Inter Partes Review (§ 42.15(a))

The Director is authorized to charge the fee specified by 37 CFR § 42.15(a) to Deposit Account No. 50-1597.

C. Mandatory Notices (37 CFR § 42.8(b))

1. Real Party in Interest (§ 42.8(b)(1))

The real party in interest of this petition pursuant to § 42.8(b)(1) is Apple Inc. ("Apple") located at One Infinite Loop, Cupertino, CA 95014.

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.