

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

THE MANGROVE PARTNERS MASTER FUND, LTD., and APPLE INC.,
Petitioner

v.

VIRNETX INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-01046¹
Patent No. 6,502,135

**Patent Owner's Request for Rehearing Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)(1) of
Institution Decision in IPR2016-00062**

¹ Apple Inc., who filed a petition in IPR2016-00062, has been joined as a Petitioner in the instant proceeding.

Table of Contents

- I. INTRODUCTION AND PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED1
- II. BACKGROUND2
- III. LEGAL STANDARD5
- IV. STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR RELIEF REQUESTED6
 - A. The Decision Incorrectly Applied § 315(b) in Failing to Conclude Apple Is Time-Barred6
 - B. The Decision Incorrectly Applied § 325(d) and Ignored Apple’s Numerous Serial and Concurrent Attacks to Validity10
- V. PATENT OWNER REQUESTS REHEARING BY AN EXPANDED PANEL THAT INCLUDES THE CHIEF JUDGE.....12
- VI. CONCLUSION.....14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Achates Reference Publishing, Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 803 F.3d 652 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	9
<i>Apple Inc. v. DSS Technology Management, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00369, Paper No. 14 (Aug. 12, 2015)	6
<i>Butamax Adv. Biofuels LLC v. Gevo, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00581, Paper No. 8 (Oct. 14, 2014)	7
<i>Chevron U.S.A. Inc. v. Natural Res. Def. Council Inc.</i> , 467 U.S. 837 (1984).....	8
<i>Conopco, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.</i> , IPR2014-00506, Paper No. 25 (Dec. 10, 2015).....	10
<i>Conopco, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.</i> , IPR2014-00628, Paper No. 21 (Oct. 20, 2014)	11
<i>Google Inc. v. SimpleAir, Inc.</i> , CBM2015-00019, Paper No. 15 (Aug. 19, 2015)	12
<i>Oshkosh Truck Corp. v. United States</i> , 123 F.3d 1477 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	9
<i>Prism Pharma, Co., Ltd. v. Choongwae Pharma Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00315, Paper No. 14 (July 8, 2014)	11
<i>Standard Innovation Corp. v. Lelo, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00907, Paper No. 10 (Dec. 1, 2014).....	10
<i>Target Corp. v. Destination Maternity Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00508, Paper No. 28 (Feb. 12, 2015)	8, 13
<i>Unified Patents, Inc. v. Personal Web Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00702, Paper No. 13 (July 24, 2014)	11
<i>VirnetX, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 767 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	5

Zhongshan Ocean Motor Co. v. Nidex Motor Corp.,
IPR2015-00762, Paper No. 16 (Oct. 5, 2015)8, 13

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 315(b)*passim*
35 U.S.C. § 315(c)6, 7, 8
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)*passim*

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c).....5
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)5
37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b)6, 8
157 Cong. Rec. S1041 (daily ed. Mar. 1, 2011)10, 14
Standard Operating Procedure 1, Rev. 14.....2, 12

I. INTRODUCTION AND PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED

Patent Owner VirnetX Inc. requests rehearing of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board's Institution Decision entered January 25, 2016 (Paper No. 28 in IPR2015-01046, "Decision"), granting Apple Inc.'s petition and instituting trial in IPR2016-00062 and joining that proceeding with IPR2015-01046.

The patent-at-issue has been subjected to eleven office challenges—*six* of the eleven challenges were either filed directly by Apple or, worse, filed on Apple's behalf by RPX Corporation in an attempt to evade the one-year statutory bar under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b). (Prelim. Resp. in IPR2016-00062 at 4-7.) The Decision discounted VirnetX's argument that Apple's Petition is barred under § 315(b) without any substantive analysis of VirnetX's statutory interpretation. (Decision at 4.) However, as discussed in the Preliminary Response and below, strong dissenting opinions by Members of the Board suggest that VirnetX's statutory interpretation is correct and that joining Apple to IPR2015-01046, despite the one-year bar, is not only improper but also an *ultra vires* action.

Setting aside § 315(b), if there was ever a case where the Board should deny institution under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d), it is this case. Despite the extreme facts, with Apple actively trying to evade the statutory one-year bar, the Decision completely omits any discussion of § 325(d). Previous decisions dictate the Board should have exercised its discretion to deny Apple's Petition. The Decision took the

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.