

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC.,  
Petitioner

v.

VIRNETX INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2015-00811  
Patent 8,868,705

---

Before KARL D. EASTHOM, JENNIFER S. BISK, and  
GREGG I. ANDERSON, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

---

**PETITIONER'S REPLY**

## Table of Contents

<b>I.</b>	<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>Claim Construction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>A.</b>	<b>The Reexamination Prosecution Histories and Specification Do Not Contain the Alleged Disclaimers of Claim Scope.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>B.</b>	<b>The Board Should Maintain Its Claim Constructions.....</b>	<b>2</b>
	1. “Secure Domain Name”.....	2
	2. “Encrypted Communications Channel”.....	3
	3. “Provisioning Information” .....	4
	4. “Intercepting”.....	4
<b>III.</b>	<b>Obviousness Over Aventail in view of RFC 2401.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>A.</b>	<b>Aventail and RFC 2401 Teach Claim 1 and 21’s “Determining Whether the Request to Look Up the IP Address [Intercepted] in Step (1) . . . Corresponds to a Device that Accepts an Encrypted Channel Connection” Step .....</b>	<b>4</b>
	1. Patent Owner’s Analysis of the “Determining” Step Addresses the Wrong “Intercept[ions]”.....	5
	2. Patent Owner Ignores the Plain Language of the Claims, the Evidence, and the Combination with RFC 2401.....	8
	3. Patent Owner’s Analysis Ignores the Aventail Configuration Described in the Petition .....	9
<b>B.</b>	<b>Aventail and RFC 2401 Teach Claim 1 and 21’s “Encrypted Communications Channel Between the Client Device and the Target Device” .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>C.</b>	<b>Aventail and RFC 2401 Teach Claim 1 and 21’s “In Response to Determining . . . Providing Provisioning Information”.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>D.</b>	<b>Aventail and RFC 2401 Renders Claims 2, 16, and 33 Obvious... </b>	<b>14</b>

**E. Aventail and RFC 2401 Renders Claims 3 and 25 Obvious.....15**

**F. Aventail in view of RFC 2401 Renders Claims 17 and 34 Obvious.  
.....16**

**G. Not-Separately Argued Claims and Grounds .....17**

**IV. Dr. Tamassia’s Testimony Is Probative.....18**

**V. Aventail and the RFC References Are Conclusively Prior Art .....20**

**VI. Conclusion .....25**

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Arthrocare Corp. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 406 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	10, 12
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	19, 20
<i>Brand v. Miller</i> , 487 F.3d 862 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	1, 17, 19
<i>Deere &amp; Co. v. Bush Hog, LLC</i> , 703 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	17
<i>Interactive Gift Express, Inc. v. Compuserve Inc.</i> , 256 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	16
<i>Kyocera Wireless Corp. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 545 F.3d 1340 (2008).....	21
<i>Ohio Willow Wood Co. v. Alps S., LLC</i> , 735 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	21
<i>Poole ex rel. Elliott v. Textron, Inc.</i> , 192 F.R.D. 494 (D. Md. 2000) .....	25
<i>Schumer v. Lab. Computer Sys., Inc.</i> , 308 F.3d 134 (Fed. Cir 2002) .....	18
<i>Sundance, Inc. v. Demonte Fabricating Ltd</i> , 550 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	18
<i>Tempo Lighting Inc. v. Tivoli, LLC</i> , 742 F.3d 973 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	1, 2
<i>Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner</i> , 778 F.2d 775 (Fed. Cir. 1985) .....	20
<i>U.S. v. Taylor</i> , 166 F.R.D. 356 (M.D.N.C.) <i>aff'd</i> , 166 F.R.D. 367 (M.D.N.C. 1996) .....	25

*Ultratec, Inc. v. Sorenson Commc'ns, Inc.*,  
 No. 13-CV-346, 2014 WL 4829173 (W.D. Wis. Sept. 29, 2014).....25

*Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. & Eng’g, Inc.*,  
 200 F.3d 795 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....3, 4

*Guangdong Xinbao Elec. Appliances Holdings v. Adrian Rivera*,  
 IPR2014-00042, Paper 50 at 22-23 (Feb. 6, 2015) .....24

*LG Display Co., Ltd, v. Innovative Display Techs. LLC*, IPR2014-  
 01362, Paper 32 at 15-16 (Feb. 8, 2016) .....25

**STATUTES**

35 U.S.C. § 6.....20

35 U.S.C. § 102(a) .....20

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).....20

Fed. R. Evid. 702 .....18

# 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.