

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 IPR2015-00871
Patent No. 8,560,705

**PATENT OWNER'S REPLY TO
PETITIONER'S OPPOSITION OF MOTION TO EXCLUDE**

Table of Contents

- I. Exhibits 1022, 1023, 1043, 1057-1060, and 1063-1065 Should Be Excluded1
 - A. Exhibits 1022, 1023, 1043, and 1057-1059 Should Be Excluded1
 - B. Exhibits 1060 and 1063-1065 Should Be Excluded3

- II. Exhibits 1001-1004, 1006, 1007, 1017, 1019, 1024-1041, 1044-1049, 1051-1054, 1067, 1069, and 1071 and Portions of Exhibit 1005 Should be Excluded5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Pozen Inc. v. Par Pharm., Inc.</i> , 696 F.3d 1511 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	1
<i>Conoco Inc. v. DOE</i> , 99 F.3d 387 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	2
<i>Doe v. United States</i> , 976 F.2d 1071 (7th Cir. 1992)	1
<i>Actifio, Inc., v. Delphix Corp.</i> , IPR2015-00108, Paper No. 56 (Apr. 29, 2016).....	5
<i>People v. Bowers</i> , 801 P.2d 511 (Colo.1990).....	4
Rules	
Federal Rule of Evidence 807	1, 2

On June 6, 2016, Petitioner Apple Inc. (“Apple”) filed an Opposition (Paper No. 33) to Patent Owner’s Motion to Exclude (Paper No. 30). Apple, however, provides insufficient reasons for admitting the exhibits at issue, i.e., Exhibits 1001-1004, 1006, 1007, 1017, 1019, 1022-1041, 1044-1049, 1051-1054, 1057-1060, 1063-1065, 1067, 1069, and 1071, and portions of Exhibit 1005. As such, Patent Owner’s Motion to Exclude should be granted.

I. Exhibits 1022, 1023, 1043, 1057-1060, and 1063-1065 Should Be Excluded

Apple argues that Exhibits 1022, 1023, 1043, 1057-1060, and 1063-1065 should be admitted under the residual exception of Fed. R. Evid 807. Paper No. 33 at 1. Apple states that courts have “wide discretion” in applying the residual exception to the hearsay rule. *See* Paper No. 33 at 1 (citing *Doe v. United States*, 976 F.2d 1071, 1076-77 (7th Cir. 1992)). But “Congress intended that the residual exceptions be *used sparingly* . . . [a judge’s discretion] . . . is ‘tempered by the requirement that the exception be *reserved for exceptional cases*.’” *Doe*, 976 F.2d at 1074 (emphasis added). Indeed, the Federal Circuit recently excluded a sworn declaration assumed to be trustworthy. *Pozen Inc. v. Par Pharm., Inc.*, 696 F.3d 1151, 1161 n.6 (Fed. Cir. 2012).

A. Exhibits 1022, 1023, 1043, and 1057-1059 Should Be Excluded

Ignoring the mandate that the residual hearsay exception is to be “used sparingly” for truly “exceptional cases,” Apple attempts to establish that these

exhibits meet the five requirements of Rule 807. For instance, Apple argues that the statements have circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness. This is incorrect.

For instance, Mr. Hopen baldly “estimate[s]” that “thousands of” copies of *Aventail* were distributed in the first six months of 1999. Ex. 1023 at ¶ 16. But the time lapse of over ten years between *Aventail*’s alleged distribution and Mr. Hopen’s statement cuts against the trustworthiness of his statements. *See, e.g., Conoco Inc. v. DOE*, 99 F.3d 387, 392-394 (Fed. Cir. 1996). Indeed, Mr. Hopen failed to provide a single piece of evidence (e.g., an e-mail showing the distribution of *Aventail* to a customer) supporting his assertion. Ex. 1057 at 189:1-191:6.

Apple’s contention that Mr. Hopen’s statements have “circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness” because they are corroborated (*see* Paper No. 33 at 2-6, citing Exs. 1022, 1023, 1043, and 1057-59) is incorrect. For instance, the documents attached to Mr. Hopen’s declaration (Exhibits A, B, D, H, and J) say nothing about the dissemination activities in the time frame before the Patent’s priority date and some of them do not even refer to the correct version of *Aventail* at issue, i.e., *Aventail* Connect v3.01 and AEC v3.0. Ex. 1023 at 10, 94, 293, 295, 424. Mr. Chester’s statements regarding events in July 1998 are irrelevant to Mr. Hopen’s statements regarding the alleged dissemination of *Aventail* in the first six months of 1999. Ex. 1022 at ¶ 19; Ex. 1023 at ¶ 16. Mr. Fratto’s statement that he

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.