

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 IPR2015-00870
Patent 8,560,705

Patent Owner's Response

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Claim Construction.....	1
	A. “Interception of a Request . . . to Look up an Internet Protocol (IP) address” (Claims 1, 5, 9, 16, 19, and 23).....	4
	B. Secure Communication Link (Claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 10-12, 16, 20, 21, 24-27)	5
	1. “Authentication” and “Address Hopping” Alone Do Not Result in a “Secure Communication Link”.....	6
	2. A “Secure Communication Link” Must Be Direct	8
	3. A “Secure Communication Link” Requires Encryption.....	13
	C. Virtual Private Network Link” (Claims 6 and 21).....	15
	1. A “Virtual Private Network Link” Requires a Virtual Private Network	16
	2. “Authentication” and “Address Hopping” Alone Do Not Result in a “Virtual Private Network Link”	17
	3. A “Virtual Private Network Link” Must Be Direct	18
	4. A “Virtual Private Network Link” Requires a Network.....	19
	5. A “Virtual Private Network Link” Requires Encryption.....	21
	D. “Secure Domain Name” (Claims 7 and 22)	22
	E. Other Terms.....	25
III.	The Cited References Do Not Render Claims 1-30 Unpatentable.....	27
	A. <i>Beser</i> and RFC 2401 Do Not Render Claims 1-23 and 25-30 Unpatentable.....	27
	1. <i>Beser’s</i> Disclosure.....	27

2.	<i>Beser</i> and RFC 2401 Do Not Disclose “Interception of a Request, Generated By the Client Device, to Look Up an Internet Protocol (IP) Address of the Target Device Based on a Domain Name Associated With the Target Device”	30
a)	The Alleged Request in <i>Beser</i> Is Not a “Request . . . to Look Up an Internet Protocol (IP) Address”	31
b)	The Alleged Request in <i>Beser</i> Is Not “Intercept[ed]”	33
3.	<i>Beser</i> and RFC 2401 Would Not Have Been Combined as the Petition Suggests	36
4.	<i>Beser</i> and RFC 2401 Do Not Render Obvious Dependent Claims 6 and 21	42
5.	<i>Beser</i> and RFC 2401 Do Not Render Obvious Dependent Claims 7 and 22	43
6.	<i>Beser</i> and RFC 2401 Do Not Render Obvious Dependent Claims 13 and 28	44
7.	Dependent Claims 2-5, 8-12, 14, 15, 17-20, 23, 25-27, 29, and 30	47
B.	<i>Beser</i> , RFC 2401, and <i>Brand</i> Do Not Render Obvious Claim 24	47
IV.	Petitioner’s Expert Testimony Should be Accorded Little, If Any Weight	47
V.	Each of the Instituted Grounds Is Based on At Least One Reference That Does Not Qualify As Prior Art	51
A.	Petitioner Has Not Established that RFC 2401 Is a Prior Art Printed Publication	52
1.	The Evidence Presented with the Petition Cannot Establish by a Preponderance of the Evidence that RFC 2401 Was Publicly Accessible	52

- 2. The Board’s Findings Are Insufficient to Establish by a Preponderance of the Evidence that RFC 2401 Was Publicly Accessible54
- 3. The Supplemental Information Is Also Insufficient to Establish by a Preponderance of the Evidence that RFC 2401 Was Publicly Accessible.....57
- VI. Conclusion60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Alexsam, Inc. v. IDT Corp.</i> , 715 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	50
<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, 34
<i>Apple Inc. v. VirnetX Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00481, Paper No. 11 (September 3, 2014)	22
<i>Apple Inc. v. VirnetX Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00871, Paper No. 8 (Oct. 1, 2015)	10, 11
<i>Apple Inc. v. VirnetX Inc.</i> IPR2015-01009, Paper No. 1 (Apr. 28, 2015)	25
<i>Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Concepts In Optics, Inc.</i> , 111 F. App'x 582 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	48, 50
<i>Biogen Idec, Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline LLC</i> , 713 F.3d 1090 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	10, 15, 19, 24
<i>Brand v. Miller</i> , 487 F.3d 862 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	48
<i>Bruckelmyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc.</i> , 445 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	51
<i>Centricut, LLC v. Esab Group, Inc.</i> , 390 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	48
<i>In re Cuozzo</i> , 793 F.3d 1297 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	3
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , No. 15-446, 2016 WL 205946 (U.S. Jan. 15, 2016)	3

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.