

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.
Petitioner

v.

VIRNETX INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-01046
Patent 6,502,135

**Patent Owner's Preliminary Response
to Petition for *Inter Partes* Review
of U.S. Patent No. 6,502,135**

Table of Contents

I. Introduction.....1

II. The Petition Fails to Meet the Requirements for Instituting an *Inter Partes* Review2

 A. The Petition Fails to Name All of the Real Parties-in-Interest2

 1. The Mangrove Partners Hedge Fund and Nathaniel August3

 2. The US Feeder, the Cayman Feeder, and Mangrove Capital8

 3. The Unnamed Investors10

 4. The Petition Should Be Denied For Failing to Identify All RPIs.....11

 B. The Petition Was Filed for an Improper Purpose13

 C. The Petition Fails to Show a Reasonable Likelihood That Petitioner Will Prevail With Respect to Any Claim15

 D. The Petition Should Be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d)17

 E. The Petition Improperly Relies on Material That It Fails to Establish Is Statutory Prior Art20

III. The Petition’s Claim Constructions Are Flawed and Should Be Rejected27

 A. Overview of the ’135 Patent.....28

 B. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art29

 C. “Virtual Private Network (VPN)” (Claims 1, 4, 10, and 12).....31

 D. “Domain Name” (Claim 10)38

 E. “Domain Name Service (DNS) Request” (Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, 12).....39

- F. “DNS Proxy Server” (Claims 8, 10)41
- G. “Client Computer” (Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 10, 12)41
- H. “Automatically Initiating the VPN” (Claims 1, 4, 5).....44
- IV. Conclusion47

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page(s) |
|--|----------------|
| Cases | |
| <i>A.R.M., Inc. v. Cottingham Agencies Ltd.</i> , IPR2014-00671, Paper No. 10 (Oct. 3, 2014) | 20 |
| <i>Actavis, Inc. v. Research Corp. Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01126, Paper No. 22 (Jan. 9, 2015)..... | 20 |
| <i>Apple Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00450, Paper No. 9 (June 29, 2015)..... | 22 |
| <i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper No. 12 (Aug. 29, 2014) | 23 |
| <i>Elec. Frontier Found. v. Pers. Audio, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00070, Paper No. 21 (Apr. 18, 2014)..... | 26 |
| <i>Galderma S.A. v. Allergan Industrie, SAS</i> , IPR2014-01422, Paper No. 14 (Mar. 5, 2015) | 4, 7 |
| <i>Garmin Int’l, Inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2012-00001, Paper No. 15 (Jan. 9, 2013)..... | 28, 37 |
| <i>GEA Process Eng., Inc. v. Steuben Foods, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00041, Paper No. 15 (Dec. 23, 2014)..... | 12 |
| <i>Heckler v. Chaney</i> , 470 U.S. 821, 831 (1985)..... | 14 |
| <i>In re Klopfenstein</i> , 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004) | 20 |
| <i>In re Zletz</i> , 893 F.2d 319 (Fed. Cir. 1989)..... | 27 |
| <i>Integrated Global Concepts, Inc. v. Advanced Messaging Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01028, Paper No. 13 (Dec. 22, 2014)..... | 19 |
| <i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , IPR2013-00324, Paper No. 19 (Nov. 21, 2013) | 19 |
| <i>L-3 Comm. Holdings, Inc. v. Power Survey, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00832, Paper No. 9 (Nov. 14, 2014) | 20 |

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| <i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxycorr, Inc.</i> , No. 2014-1542, -1543, 2015 U.S. App. LEXIS 10081 (Fed. Cir. Jun. 16, 2015)..... | 28, 37, 38 |
| <i>Motorola Solutions, Inc. v. Mobile Scanning Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2013-00093, Paper No. 28 (Apr. 29, 2013)..... | 28, 37 |
| <i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc) | 27 |
| <i>RPX Corp. v. VirnetX, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00171, Paper No. 52 (June 23, 2014)..... | 11 |
| <i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Rembrandt Wireless Techs., LP</i> , IPR2014-00514, Paper No. 18 (Sep. 9, 2014) | 25, 26 |
| <i>Square, Inc. v. Unwired Planet, LLC</i> , CBM2014-00156, Paper 22 (Feb. 26, 2015) | 21, 22 |
| <i>Taylor v. Sturgell</i> , 553 U.S. 880, 894 (2008)..... | 11 |
| <i>VirnetX, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 767 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2014) | 5, 15, 16, 17, 44 |
| <i>Zerto Inc. v. EMC Corp.</i> , IPR2014-01329, Paper No. 33 (Mar. 3, 2015) | 10 |
| <i>Zetec, Inc. v. Westinghouse Elec. Co.</i> , IPR2014-00384, Paper No. 10 (July 23, 2014) | 14 |
| <i>Zoll Lifecor Corp. v. Philips Elecs. N. Am. Corp.</i> , IPR2013-00606, Paper No. 13 (Mar. 20, 2015) | 13 |
| Federal Statutes | |
| 35 U.S.C. § 311(b) | 20, 24, 25 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2)..... | 1, 2, 11 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 313 | 1 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) | 14, 15 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 316..... | 14 |

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.