

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 IPR2015-01046<sup>1</sup>  
Patent 6,502,135

---

**Patent Owner's Sur-Reply**

---

<sup>1</sup> 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. Petitioners’ Improper New Arguments Fail to Remedy the Petitioners’ Original Analysis .....2
  - A. Petitioners’ New Position 1 .....2
  - B. Petitioners’ New Positions 2–3 .....4
  - C. Petitioners’ New Position 4.....9
  - D. Petitioners’ New Position 5.....10
- III. Petitioner Apple Inc.’s Separate Reply Omits Telling Facts.....11
- IV. Conclusion .....12

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**Cases**

*Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.*,  
821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) ..... 1

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3)..... 1

**Other Authorities**

37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b) ..... 1

Office Patent Trial Practice Guide,  
77 Fed. Reg. 48,756 (Aug. 14, 2012) ..... 1

## I. Introduction

In an Order dated July 7, 2016, the Board authorized Patent Owner to file a sur-reply “limited to issues enumerated by Patent Owner in Patent Owner’s Identification of Improper Arguments in Petitioners’ Consolidated Reply Brief and Petitioner Apple Inc.’s Separate Reply Filing.” Paper No. 66 at 2. As discussed below, Petitioners’ new positions (*see* Paper No. 55 at 1–3) are flawed and fail to remedy the deficiencies of Petitioners’ original positions. As such, to the extent the Board considers the substance of Petitioners’ improper new arguments,<sup>2</sup> the Board should enter judgment against Petitioners, confirm the patentability of the claims, and terminate this proceeding.

---

<sup>2</sup> Patent Owner continues to maintain that Petitioners’ new arguments should not be considered at this late stage. *See Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.*, 821 F.3d 1359, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (“Unlike district court litigation—where parties have greater freedom to revise and develop their arguments over time and in response to newly discovered material—the expedited nature of IPRs bring with it an *obligation for petitioners to make their case in their petition to institute.*”) (emphasis added); *see also* 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3); 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b); Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,767 (Aug. 14, 2012).

## **II. Petitioners' Improper New Arguments Fail to Remedy the Petitioners' Original Analysis**

In its Patent Owner's Response (Paper No. 44, "Patent Owner Resp."), VirnetX set forth a multitude of reasons why Petitioners' asserted grounds of unpatentability must fail. In response, Petitioners' Consolidated Reply Brief (Paper No. 50, "Consol. Rep.") shifts Petitioners' positions in at least five ways. Paper No. 55 at 1–3 (identifying Petitioners' New Positions 1–5). But these new positions are unsupported attorney arguments and do not actually remedy the problems with Petitioners' anticipation and obviousness allegations. Each of Petitioners' new arguments should be rejected.

### **A. Petitioners' New Position 1**

Petitioners' Consolidated Reply Brief asserts that Kiuchi discloses the claimed "Domain Name Service (DNS) request," relying on three different alleged requests sent by Kiuchi's client-side proxy. Consol. Rep. at 10. In particular, Petitioners point to (a) "a 'C-HTTP name service request' sent to the name server," which as discussed in Patent Owner's Response (at 20–23) does not read on the claimed DNS request, along with two new requests: (b) "a request for connection to the server-side proxy" and (c) "C-HTTP requests' to the server-side proxy." Consol. Rep. at 10; *see also* Paper No. 55 at 1–2 (identifying Petitioners' new position). Like Petitioners' original mapping, these latter two new mappings fail to support Petitioners' anticipation positions.

# 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.