

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 IPR2015-00810

Patent 8,868,705

Declaration of Fabian Monroe, Ph.D.

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction.....4
- II. Resources Consulted.....5
- III. Background and Qualifications5
- IV. Level of Ordinary Skill.....10
- V. Claim Terms11
 - A. “Secure Domain Name” (Claims 3, 10, and 25)11
 - B. “Encrypted Communications Channel” Phrases (Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 11-13, 18, 21, 22, and 26-29)12
 - C. “Provisioning Information” (Claims 1, 2, 9, and 21).....14
 - D. Other Terms.....15
- VI. *Beser* and RFC 240117
 - A. *Beser*’s Disclosure17
 - B. Claims 1 and 2121
 - 1. “Intercepting From the Client Device a Request to Look Up an Internet Protocol (IP) Address Corresponding to a Domain Name Associated With the Target Device”21
 - a) The Alleged Request in *Beser* Is Not a “Request to Look Up an Internet Protocol (IP) Address”22
 - b) The Alleged Request in *Beser* Is Not “Intercept[ed]”24
 - 2. *Beser* and RFC 2401 Would Not Have Been Combined as the Petition Suggests.....27
 - C. Dependent Claims32
 - 1. Dependent Claims 3, 10, and 2532
 - 2. Dependent Claims 14 and 3132

3. Dependent Claims 18-20 and 22-2433

VII. Conclusion34

I, FABIAN MONROSE, declare as follows:

I. Introduction

1. I have been retained by VirnetX Inc. (“VirnetX”) for this *inter partes* review proceeding. I understand that this proceeding involves U.S. Patent No. 8,868,705 (“the ’705 patent”). I understand the ’705 patent is assigned to VirnetX and that it is part of a family of patents that stems from U.S. provisional application nos. 60/106,261 (“the ’261 application”), filed on October 30, 1998, and 60/137,704 (“the ’704 application”), filed on June 7, 1999. I understand that the ’705 patent is a continuation of U.S. application no. 13/049,552 filed March 16, 2011 (“the ’552 application”), which is a continuation of U.S. application no. 11/840,560 filed August 17, 2007 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,921,211, “the ’211 patent”), which is a continuation of U.S. application no. 10/714,849 filed November 18, 2003 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,418,504 (“the ’504 patent), which is a continuation of U.S. application no. 09/558,210 filed April 26, 2000 (“the ’210 application,” abandoned). And I understand the ’210 application is a continuation-in-part of U.S. application no. 09/504,783 filed February 15, 2000 (now U.S. Patent 6,502,135, “the ’135 patent”), and that the ’135 patent is a continuation-in-part of U.S. application no. 09/429,643 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,010,604) filed October 29, 1999, which claims priority to the ’261 and ’704 applications.

II. Resources Consulted

2. I have reviewed the '705 patent, including claims 1-34. I have also reviewed the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (Paper No. 1) filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (“Office”) by Apple Inc. on March 2, 2015 (Paper No. 1, the “Petition”). I have also reviewed the Patent Trial and Appeal Board’s (“Board”) decision to institute *inter partes* review (Paper No. 8, the “Decision”) of September 11, 2015.

3. I understand that in this proceeding the Board instituted review of the '705 patent on two grounds: (1) obviousness of claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-26, and 28-34 over *Beser* and RFC 2401; and (2) obviousness of claims 5, 11, and 27 over *Beser*, RFC 2401, and *Brand*. I have reviewed the exhibits and other documentation supporting the Petition that are relevant to the Decision and the instituted grounds, and any other material that I reference in this declaration.

III. Background and Qualifications

4. I have a great deal of experience and familiarity with computer and network security, and have been working in this field since 1993 when I entered the Ph.D. program at New York University.

5. I am currently a Professor of Computer Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. I also hold an appointment as the Director of Computer and Information Security at the Renaissance Computing Institute

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.