

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 IPR2015-00866
Patent 8,458,341

**Patent Owner's Preliminary Response
to Petition for *Inter Partes* Review
of U.S. Patent No. 8,458,341**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	The Petition Fails to Meet the Requirements for Instituting an <i>Inter Partes</i> Review	1
A.	The Petition Improperly Relies on Material That It Fails to Establish Is Statutory Prior Art	2
B.	The Petition’s Obviousness Ground Is Redundant and Should Be Denied	9
C.	The Petition Fails to Show a Reasonable Likelihood Petitioner Will Prevail With Respect to Obviousness	14
III.	The Petition’s Claim Constructions Are Flawed and Should Be Rejected	20
A.	Overview of the ’341 Patent.....	22
B.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	23
C.	“Interception of the Request” (Claims 1, 11, 15, and 25).....	24
D.	“Provisioning Information” (Claims 1 and 15).....	28
E.	“Secure Communications Service” (Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 11, 15, 16, 18, 20, and 25).....	30
F.	“Indication” (Claims 1 and 15)	32
G.	“Virtual Private Network Communication Link” (Claims 1, 3, 15, and 17).....	33
1.	A “VPN Communication Link” Does Not Exist Outside of a Virtual Private Network.....	34
2.	“Authentication” and “Address Hopping” Alone Do Not Result in a “Virtual Private Network Communication Link”	35
3.	A “Virtual Private Network Communication Link” Must Be Direct	38

- 4. A “Virtual Private Network Communication Link”
Requires a Network.....41
- 5. A “Virtual Private Network Communication Link”
Requires Encryption.....43
- H. “Domain Name” (Claims 1 and 15)44
- I. “Modulation” (Claims 7, 8, 21, and 22).....45
- IV. Conclusion46

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>A.R.M., Inc. v. Cottingham Agencies Ltd.,</i> IPR2014-00671, Paper No. 10 (Oct. 3, 2014)	3
<i>Actavis, Inc. v. Research Corp. Techs., Inc.,</i> IPR2014-01126, Paper No. 22 (Jan. 9, 2015).....	3
<i>Apple Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.,</i> IPR2015-00450, Paper No. 9 (June 29, 2015).....	5
<i>Apple Inc. v. VirnetX, Inc.,</i> IPR2014-00237, Paper No. 15 (May 14, 2014).....	25, 45
<i>Apple Inc. v. VirnetX, Inc.,</i> IPR2014-00481, Paper No. 1 (Mar. 7, 2014)	35, 44
<i>Apple Inc. v. VirnetX Inc.,</i> IPR2014-00483, Paper No. 11 (Sept. 15, 2014).....	12
<i>In re Chaganti,</i> 554 F. App'x 917, 922 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	14
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC,</i> IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (Aug. 29, 2014).....	5
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended</i> <i>Release Capsule Patent Litig.,</i> 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	14
<i>Elec. Frontier Found. v. Pers. Audio, LLC,</i> IPR2014-00070, Paper No. 21 (Apr. 18, 2014).....	8, 9
<i>EMC Corp. v. Personal Web Techs., LLC,</i> IPR2013-00087, Paper No. 25 (June 5, 2013).....	11, 13
<i>Eon-Net LP v. Flagstar Bancorp.,</i> 653 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	43

<i>In re Fulton</i> , 391 F.3d 1195 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	19
<i>Garmin Int'l inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Tech, LLC</i> , IPR2012-00001, Paper No. 15 (Jan. 9, 2013).....	21, 40
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	14
<i>In re Gurley</i> , 27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	19
<i>Idle Free Sys., Inc. v. Bergstrom, Inc.</i> , IPR2012-00027, Paper No. 26 (June 11, 2013).....	2
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	15
<i>In re Klopfenstein</i> , 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	2-3
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	14
<i>L-3 Comm. Holdings, Inc. v. Power Survey, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00832, Paper No. 9 (Nov. 14, 2014).....	3
<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012-00003, Paper No. 7 (Oct. 25, 2012).....	10, 11, 12
<i>Medichem, SA v. Rolabo, SL</i> , 437 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	19, 20
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , No. 2014-1542, 2015 U.S. App. LEXIS 10081 (Fed. Cir. Jun. 16, 2015)	21
<i>Motorola Solutions, Inc. v. Mobile Scanning Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2013-00093, Paper No. 28 (Apr. 29, 2013).....	21, 40
<i>Petroleum Geo-Services Inc., v. WesternGeco LLC</i> , IPR2014-01476, Paper No. 18 (Mar. 17, 2015)	14

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.