Paper No. 95

Filed: December 6, 2019

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD THE MANGROVE PARTNERS MASTER FUND, LTD. and APPLE INC., Petitioners, v. VIRNETX INC., Patent Owner. Case No. IPR2015-01046¹ U.S. Patent No. 6,502,135

PETITIONERS' REMAND BRIEF

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



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Intr	Introduction1				
II.	The Federal Circuit's Decision					
	A.	VirnetX's Patentability Arguments for the '135 Patent				
	B.	VirnetX's Procedural Arguments				
III.	Claim Construction6					
	A.	. "Client Computer"				
	B.	"Direct" Communication				
IV.	The Challenged Claims Are Anticipated under Both of the Petition's Kiuchi Mappings11					
	A.	The	First Mapping: User Agent to Origin Server	13		
		1.	Overview of the First Kiuchi Mapping	13		
		2.	Kiuchi's User Agent Communicates "Directly" with the C Server			
	B.	The Second Mapping: Client-Side Proxy to Server-Side Proxy24				
		1.	Overview of the Second Kiuchi Mapping	24		
		2.	Kiuchi's Client-Side Proxy Is a "Client Computer"	26		
V.	Petitioner Mangrove Was Not Time-Barred Under Section 315(b)30					
	A.	There Was No Conspiracy Between Mangrove and RPX or Apple31				
	B.	Man	grove's Purchases of RPX Stock Do Not Implicate § 315(B))33		
		1.	Mangrove's Stock Purchases Do Not Make RPX or Apple RPIs			
		2.	Mangrove's Stock Purchases Do Not Make RPX or Apple Privies			
VI.	Con	clusio	n	37		
Exhi	ibit Li	st		39		
Cert	ificate	e of Co	ompliance	43		
Cert	ificate	e of Se	rvice	44		



1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
Applications in Internet Time, LLC v. RPX Corp., 897 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	34
Dr. Reddy's Labs. v. Indivior UK Ltd., IPR2019-00329, Paper 21 (PTAB June 3, 2019)	34, 35
Gillig v. Nike, Inc., 602 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	37
<i>In re Gleave</i> , 560 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	27
National Ass'n of Home Builders v. Defenders of Wildlife, 551 U.S. 644 (2007)	5
Power Integrations, Inc. v. Semiconductor Components Indus., LLC, 926 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	30
RPX Corp. v. Publishing Techs., LLC, IPR2018-01131, Paper 10 (PTAB Dec. 3, 2018)	37
Taylor v. Sturgell, 553 U.S. 880 (2008)	36
TRW Automotive US LLC v. Magna Elecs. Inc., Case IPR2014-01499, Paper 7 (PTAB Mar. 19, 2015)	36
Unified Patents, Inc. v. Carucel, L.P., IPR2019-01079, Paper 9 (PTAB Nov. 12, 2019)	34
Unified Patents, Inc. v. Realtime Adaptive Streaming, LLC, IPR2018-00883, Paper 36 (PTAB Oct. 11, 2018)	35
Ventex Co. v. Columbia Sportswear N. Am., Inc., IPR2017-00651, Paper 148 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2019)	34, 35
VirnetX Inc. v. Mangrove Partners Master Fund, Ltd., 778 F. App'x 897 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	1



VirnetX, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.,	
767 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	28
WesternGeco LLC v. ION Geophysical Corp.,	
889 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	36
Wi-Fi One, LLC v. Broadcom Corp.,	20
878 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (en banc)	30
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 315(b)	passim



I. Introduction

In its Final Written Decision (Paper 71, "Final Decision"), the Board correctly concluded that claims 1, 3-4, 7-8, 10, and 12 of the '135 patent ("challenged claims") are unpatentable. Patent Owner VirnetX Inc. ("VirnetX") appealed, and on July 8, 2019, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit vacated the Final Decision and remanded for further consideration of certain issues. *VirnetX Inc. v. Mangrove Partners Master Fund, Ltd.*, 778 F. App'x 897 (Fed. Cir. 2019) ("CAFC Dec."). None of those remanded issues warrants the Board reaching a different determination.

First, Kiuchi anticipates the challenged claims because the communications between Kiuchi's user agent (a "client computer") and origin server (a "target computer") are "direct." Most notably, requests in Kiuchi's system directly address the desired server and resource, and thus satisfy even VirnetX's opaque definition of "direct" communications. And while VirnetX has criticized the Kiuchi system for using proxies that supposedly "break" these "direct" communications between Kiuchi's user agent and origin server, those criticisms ring hollow—VirnetX's expert admitted that examples in the '135 patent itself using operations indistinguishable from those in Kiuchi's system do not "break" direct communications. VirnetX does not dispute that Kiuchi's user agent is a "client computer" even under its narrow construction, so the only finding the Board need



DOCKET

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.

