

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. 8,458,341

Issued: June 4, 2013

Filed: December 23, 2011

Inventors: Victor Larson, *et al.*

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD EMPLOYING AN AGILE NETWORK
PROTOCOL FOR SECURE COMMUNICATIONS USING SECURE DOMAIN
NAMES

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2015-00867

**Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of
U.S. Patent No. 8,458,341**

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
A.	Certification the '341 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
1.	Other Proceedings (§ 42.8(b)(2)).....	2
2.	Lead and Backup Lead Counsel (§ 42.8(b)(3))	2
3.	Service Information (§ 42.8(b)(4))	2
4.	Proof of Service (§§ 42.6(e) and 42.105(a)).....	2
II.	Identification of Claims Being Challenged (§ 42.104(b)).....	2
III.	Relevant Information Concerning the Contested Patent	3
A.	Overview of the '341 Patent	3
1.	The '341 Patent Specification.....	3
2.	Representative Claims	5
3.	Relevant Prosecution History	6
B.	Patent Owner's Contentions About Related Patents.....	6
C.	Effective Filing Date.....	7
D.	The Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	8
E.	Claim Construction	9
1.	“interception of the request”	9
2.	“provisioning information”	11
3.	“secure communications service”	12
4.	“indication”	13
5.	“virtual private network communication link”	14
6.	“domain name”	15
7.	“modulation”	16

IV.	Analysis of the Patentability of the '341 Patent.....	17
A.	Summary of Prior Art to the '341 Patent	17
1.	Overview of Aventail (Ex. 1009), Aventail User's Guide (Ex. 1010) and Aventail Extranet Guide (Ex. 1011)	17
a)	Nature of the Aventail Documents	17
b)	Components of the Aventail scheme	19
c)	Incorporation of Aventail Into A Client Computer	20
d)	Handling Requests	20
e)	Establishing a Secure Connection	23
f)	Using Multiple Proxies	24
g)	Secure Extranet Explorer	25
2.	Overview of RFC 2401 (Ex. 1008).....	26
3.	Overview of RFC 2543 (Ex. 1013).....	28
B.	Aventail (Ex. 1009) in View of RFC 2401 (Ex. 1008) Would Have Rendered Claims 1, 6-14, 19-20 and 22-25 Obvious	29
1.	Aventail Describes or, with RFC 2401, Suggests Every Element of Independent Claims 1 and 15	31
a)	<u>Claim 1 Preamble</u> : "a network device"	31
b)	"storage device storing an application program ..." and "processor configured to execute the application program ..."	32
c)	<u>Claim 15 Preamble</u> : a "method executed by a first device for communicating with a second network device"	33
d)	"send[ing] . . . a request to look up an internet protocol (IP) address . . . based on a domain name"	33
e)	The "receiving" step	34
f)	"connect[ing] . . . [over the virtual private network communication link], using the received IP address . . . and the provisioning information . . ."	44
g)	"communicat[e/ing]. . . using the secure communications service via the virtual private network communication link"	45

2.	The Distinctions Between the Claimed Methods and Systems Would Have Been Obvious Based on Aventail in View of RFC 2401	46
3.	Claims 4 and 18 Would Have Been Obvious	51
4.	Claims 5 and 19 Would Have Been Obvious	52
5.	Claims 9 and 23 Would Have Been Obvious	53
6.	Claims 10 and 24 Would Have Been Obvious	54
7.	Claims 11 and 25 Would Have Been Obvious	54
8.	Claims 14 and 28 Would Have Been Obvious	55
C.	Aventail in view of RFC 2401 in Further View of RFC 2543 Would Have Rendered Claims 2-5 and 15-18 Obvious	56
1.	Claims 2, 3, 6, 16, 17 and 20 Would Have Been Obvious	56
2.	Claims 7, 8, 21 and 22 Would Have Been Obvious	58
D.	No Secondary Considerations Exist	59
V.	Conclusion	60

I. Introduction

A. Certification the '341 Patent May Be Contested by Petitioner

Petitioner certifies that U.S. Patent No. 8,458,341 (Ex. 1001) (the '341 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 '341 patent. Neither Petitioner, nor any party in privity with Petitioner, has filed a civil action challenging the validity of any claim of the '341 patent. The '341 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 '341 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.