

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 IPR2015-00811
Patent 8,868,705

Patent Owner's Response

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Claim Construction.....	2
	A. “Secure Domain Name” (Claims 3, 10, and 25)	4
	B. “Encrypted Communications Channel” Phrases (Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 11-13, 18, 21, 22, and 26-29)	8
	C. “Provisioning Information” (Claims 1, 2, 9, and 21).....	10
	D. “Intercept[ing] . . . A Request to Look up an Internet Protocol (IP) address” (Claims 1 and 21)	13
III.	The Cited References Do Not Render Claims 1-34 Unpatentable.....	15
	A. <i>Aventail</i> In View of RFC 2401 Does Not Render Claims 1-3, 6, 14, 16-25, 28, 31, 33, and 34 Unpatentable	15
	1. <i>Aventail</i> ’s Disclosure	15
	2. The Cited Portions of <i>Aventail</i> Do Not Disclose the Claimed “Determining”	17
	3. The Cited Portions of <i>Aventail</i> Do Not Disclose the Claimed “Encrypted Communications Channel Between the Client Device and the Target Device”	23
	4. The Cited Portions of <i>Aventail</i> Do Not Disclose the Claimed “In Response to Determining . . . Providing Provisioning Information”	25
	a) HOSTENT	26
	b) TCP Sequence Numbers	30
	c) Selection of Encryption Method & Certificate Exchange.....	31
	d) SOCKS Exchanges	32

5. *Aventail* In View of RFC 2401 Does Not Disclose the Features of Claims 2, 16, and 3334

6. *Aventail* In View of RFC 2401 Does Not Disclose the Features of Claims 3 and 25.....36

7. *Aventail* In View of RFC 2401 Does Not Disclose the Features of Claims 17 and 34.....38

8. *Aventail* In View of RFC 2401 Does Not Disclose the Features of Claims 6, 16, 18-20, 22-24, 28, and 31.....40

B. *Aventail* In View of RFC 2401 and RFC 2543 Does Not Render Claims 8-10, 12, 15, 30, and 32 Unpatentable40

1. *Aventail* In View of RFC 2401 and RFC 2543 Does Not Disclose the Features of Claims 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 30, and 32.....40

C. *Aventail* In View of RFC 2401 and *Brand* Does Not Render Claims 4, 5, 7, 26, 27, and 29 Unpatentable41

D. *Aventail* In View of RFC 2401, RFC 2543, and *Brand* Does Not Render Claims 11 and 13 Unpatentable.....42

IV. Petitioner’s Expert Testimony Should be Accorded Little, If Any Weight.....42

V. Each of the Instituted Grounds Is Based on At Least One Reference That Does Not Qualify As Prior Art.....46

A. Petitioner Has Not Established that *Aventail* Qualifies As a Printed Publication47

B. Petitioner Has Not Established that RFCs 2401 and 2543 Qualify As Printed Publications52

1. The Evidence Presented with the Petition Cannot Establish by a Preponderance of the Evidence that RFCs 2401 and 2543 Were Publicly Accessible52

- 2. The Board’s Findings Are Insufficient to Esestablish by a Preponderance of the Evidence that RFCs 2401 and 2543 Were Publicly Accessible55
- 3. The Supplemental Information Is Also Insufficient to Establish by a Preponderance of the Evidence that RFCs 2401 and 2543 Were Publicly Accessible58
- VI. Conclusion60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Alexsam, Inc. v. IDT Corp.</i> , 715 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	45
<i>Apple Inc. v. DSS Technology Management, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00369, Paper No. 9 (June 25, 2015).....	53
<i>Apple Inc. v. VirnetX Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00237, Paper No. 15 (May 14, 2014).....	4, 14
<i>Apple Inc. v. VirnetX Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00237, Paper No. 41 (May 11, 2015).....	11
<i>Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Concepts In Optics, Inc.</i> , 111 F. App'x 582 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	43, 45
<i>Biogen Idec, Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline LLC</i> , 713 F.3d 1090 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	7
<i>Brand v. Miller</i> , 487 F.3d 862 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	43
<i>Bruckelmyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc.</i> , 445 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	47
<i>Centricut, LLC v. Esab Group, Inc.</i> , 390 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	43
<i>In re Cuozzo</i> , 793 F.3d 1297 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	3
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , No. 15-446, 2015 WL 5895939 (Oct. 6, 2015)	3
<i>Cyber Corp. v. FAS Techs., Inc.</i> , 138 F.3d 1448 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	6
<i>Dish Network L.L.C. v. Dragon Intellectual Property, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00499, Paper No. 7 (July 17, 2015)	54

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.