

Paper No. _____
Filed: March 21, 2016

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 6,502,135

Patent Owner's Response

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.....1

II. Claim Construction.....2

 A. “Virtual Private Network (VPN)” (Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, and 12).....4

 B. “Domain Name Service (DNS) Request” (Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, 12).....13

 C. “Client Computer” (Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 10, 12)15

 D. Other Terms.....17

III. Kiuchi Does Not Anticipate Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, and 12.....18

 A. Kiuchi’s Disclosure18

 B. Kiuchi Does Not Anticipate Independent Claim 120

 1. Kiuchi Does Not Disclose the Recited DNS Features.....20

 2. The Alleged Request in Kiuchi Does Not “Request an IP Address Corresponding to a Domain Name Associated with the Target Computer”22

 3. Kiuchi’s Client-Side Proxy and Server-Side Proxy Do Not Disclose the Claimed Client and Target Computers.....24

 4. Kiuchi Does Not Disclose the Claimed VPN29

 a) Network29

 b) Direct Communication31

 C. Kiuchi Does Not Anticipate Independent Claim 1032

 1. Kiuchi Does Not Disclose the Recited DNS Features.....32

 2. Kiuchi Does Not Disclose a DNS Proxy Server that Generates a Request to Create a VPN32

 3. Kiuchi Does Not Disclose a DNS Proxy Server that Returns an IP Address.....33

D. Kiuchi Does Not Anticipate Dependent Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, and 1234

1. Kiuchi Does Not Disclose the Features of Claim 435

2. Kiuchi Does Not Disclose the Features of Claim 736

IV. Kiuchi and RFC 1034 Do Not Render Obvious Claim 837

V. Dr. Guerin’s Testimony Should be Accorded Little, If Any, Weight38

A. Dr. Guerin Did Not Properly Analyze the Claims38

■ [REDACTED]39

VI. Petitioners Have Failed to Prove All References Are Prior Art41

A. Petitioners Do Not Establish by a Preponderance of the Evidence that RFC 1034 Was Publicly Accessible42

B. The Additional Evidence Presented by Petitioner Apple Is Insufficient to Establish by a Preponderance of the Evidence that RFC 1034 Was Publicly Accessible43

VII. Review is Barred by 35 U.S.C. §§ 312(a)(2) and 315(b)-(c)45

A. The Petition Filed by Mangrove Fails to Name All of the Real Parties-in-Interest46

1. The Complex Web of Mangrove Entities46

a) The Mangrove Entities47

b) The Unnamed Investors51

c) Recent Representations to the United States Securities and Exchange Commission51

2. RPX Corporation52

■ [REDACTED]54

4. Failure to Identify All RPIs Prohibits Review.....56

B. Review is Barred by 35 U.S.C. § 315(b)-(c).....57

VIII. Conclusion60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Aceto Agricultural Chems. Corp. v. Gowan Co.</i> , IPR2015-01016, Paper No. 15 (Oct. 2, 2015)	56, 57
<i>Apple Inc. v. DSS Technology Management, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00369, Paper No. 9 (June 25, 2015);.....	42
<i>Apple Inc. v. VirnetX Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00237, Paper No. 15 (May 14, 2014).....	5
<i>Apple Inc. v. VirnetX Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00404, Paper No. 42 (July 29, 2015)	22, 24
<i>Apple Inc. v. VirnetX Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00871, Paper No. 8 (Oct. 1, 2015)	10
<i>Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Concepts In Optics, Inc.</i> , 111 F. App'x 582 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	38, 39
<i>Atlanta Gas Light Co. v. Bennett Regulator Guards, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00453, Paper No. 88 (Jan. 6, 2015).....	56
<i>Becton, Dickenson & Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Group, LP</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	36
<i>In re Bigio</i> , 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	9
<i>Biogen Idec, Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline LLC</i> , 713 F.3d 1090 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	9
<i>Brand v. Miller</i> , 487 F.3d 862 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	38
<i>Bruckelmyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc.</i> , 445 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	41
<i>Centricut, LLC v. Esab Group, Inc.</i> , 390 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	38

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.