

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. 8,560,705

Issued: October 15, 2013

Filed: January 3, 2012

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. IPR2015-00871

**Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of
U.S. Patent No. 8,560,705**

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
A.	Certification the '0705 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
2.	Other Proceedings (§ 42.8(b)(2)).....	2
3.	Lead and Backup Lead Counsel (§ 42.8(b)(3))	2
4.	Service Information (§ 42.8(b)(4))	2
5.	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 '0705 Patent	3
1.	The '0705 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 a request”	9
2.	“domain name”	10
3.	“secure communication link”	11
4.	“phone”	12
5.	“secure communications service”	13
6.	“virtual private network link”	14
7.	“secure domain name”	15
8.	“modulated transmission link” /	

	“unmodulated transmission link”	15
IV.	Analysis of the Patentability of the '0705 Patent	17
A.	Summary of Prior Art to the '0705 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	21
d)	Handling Requests	21
e)	Establishing a Secure Connection	23
f)	Using Multiple Proxies	25
g)	Secure Extranet Explorer	26
2.	Overview of RFC 2401 (Ex. 1008).....	27
3.	Overview of RFC 2543 (Ex. 1013).....	29
4.	Overview of U.S. Patent Number 5,237,566 (Brand) (Ex. 1012).....	30
B.	Aventail (Ex. 1009) in View of RFC 2401 (Ex. 1008) and RFC 2543 (Ex. 1013) Would Have Rendered Claims 1-23 and 25-30 Obvious	30
1.	Aventail Describes or, with RFC 2401 and RFC 2543, Suggests Every Element of Independent Claims 1 and 16	32
a)	<u>Claim 1 Preamble</u> : “a client device”	33
b)	<u>Claim 1</u> : “a memory configured and arranged to facilitate a connection of the client device with a target device ...”.....	33
c)	<u>Claim 16 Preamble</u> : a “method executed by a client device for communicating with a target device ... comprising ... facilitating a connection with the target device”	34
d)	“facilitat[e/ing] a connection with the target device over a secure communication link”	35
e)	“created based on (i) interception of a request ... to look up an internet protocol (IP) address . . . based on a domain name”	35

f)	“created based on ... (ii) a determination ... that... a secure communication link can be established”	38
g)	“allow[ing] participation in audio/video communications ... over the secure communication link”	41
h)	<u>Claim 1</u> : “a signal processing configuration arranged to execute the application program”	42
2.	The Distinctions Between the Claimed Methods and Systems Would Have Been Obvious Based on Aventail in View of RFC 2401 and RFC 2543	43
a)	End-To-End Encryption	43
b)	Participation in Audio and Video Communications.....	47
3.	Claims 2, 13, 14, 17, 28, and 29 Would Have Been Obvious ..	49
4.	Claims 3, 15, 18, and 30 Would Have Been Obvious	49
5.	Claims 4 and 20 Would Have Been Obvious	50
6.	Claims 5 and 19 Would Have Been Obvious	51
7.	Claims 6 and 21 Would Have Been Obvious	51
8.	Claims 7 and 22 Would Have Been Obvious	52
9.	Claim 8 Would Have Been Obvious.....	55
10.	Claims 9 and 23 Would Have Been Obvious	56
11.	Claims 10, 11, 25, and 26 Would Have Been Obvious	56
12.	Claims 12 and 27 Would Have Been Obvious	57
C.	Aventail in View of RFC 2401 and RFC 2543 in Further View of Brand (Ex. 1012) Would Have Rendered Claim 24 Obvious.....	58
D.	No Secondary Considerations Exist	59
V.	Conclusion	60

I. Introduction

A. Certification the '0705 Patent May Be Contested by Petitioner

Petitioner certifies that U.S. Patent No. 8,560,705 (Ex. 1050) (the '0705 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 '0705 patent. Neither Petitioner, nor any party in privity with Petitioner, has filed a civil action challenging the validity of any claim of the '0705 patent. The '0705 patent has not been the subject of a prior *inter partes* review by Petitioner or a privity 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 '0705 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.