

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 B2

**PETITIONER'S OPPOSITION TO PATENT
OWNER'S MOTION FOR ADDITIONAL
DISCOVERY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Overview..... 1

II. Response to Alleged “Petitioner Acknowledgements”..... 2

III. The Garmin Factors Are Not Satisfied..... 4

A. Additional Discovery Will Not Uncover Useful Information..... 4

B. Petitioner’s Litigation Positions 7

C. Ability to Generate Equivalent Information by Other Means 8

D. The Patent Owner’s RFPs Require Clarification..... 9

E. The Patent Owner’s RFPs are Overreaching and Overly Burdensome to Answer 9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Garmin Int'l Inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC,
IPR2012-00001, Paper No. 26 at 6 (March 5, 2013) 4, 6

I. Overview

Desperate to avoid the merits of the invalidity of its patent, Patent Owner has now submitted its Motion for Additional Discovery (“Motion”) which is its fourth collateral attempt to attack these proceedings without addressing validity: 1) Patent Owner asserted the same or similar grounds in its Preliminary Patent Owner Statement (*see* Paper No. 9 at 3-11); 2) rehashed the same grounds in its request for reconsideration (*see* Paper No. 13 at 4-5); 3) raised entirely speculative grounds that RPX Corp. and/or Apple Corp. were controlling these proceedings in a November 10, 2015 conference call with the Board (Ex. 2037 at 12:4-13:21, 20:7-18); and 4) now brings the instant Motion. Patent Owner has also threatened to bring separate litigation in state or Federal court – regardless of any underlying merit to such claims -- to forestall a determination on the merits of the validity of its patents. *See, e.g.*, Paper No. 9 at 12-13, n.2.

All Patent Owner has presented in its Motion is that it would like broad RPI discovery and argued that such discovery likely exists. Patent Owner has not, however, demonstrated that any such discovery will be useful. Because Patent Owner’s Motion fails to meet the “necessary in the interests of justice” standard for any of the additional discovery sought, the Motion should be denied in its entirety.

II. Response to Alleged “Petitioner Acknowledgements”

The additional discovery Patent Owner seeks generally falls into two categories: 1) discovery regarding investors in the Petitioner and 2) discovery regarding other Mangrove entities, including Mangrove Partners, Mangrove Partners Fund Ltd., Mangrove Partners Fund LP, Mangrove Capital (collectively “Mangrove-Named Entities”) and Mr. Nathaniel August. Patent Owner’s attempts to lump the investors with these other Mangrove-Named Entities and Mr. August, is both disingenuous and obfuscates the real issues.

During multiple meet-and-confer telephone conferences leading up to this Motion, much of Patent Owner’s inquiries focused on the investors and in particular, Patent Owner’s speculative – bordering on paranoid – belief that time-barred entities, namely Apple Corp. or RPX Corp., were investors in the Petitioner and were controlling these proceedings on behalf of Petitioner. *Cf.* Ex. 2037 at 12:4-13:21, 20:7-18. In response, Petitioner informed Patent Owner that neither Apple Corp. nor RPX Corp. are or were investors and that to best of the Petitioner’s knowledge, no one affiliated with either entity is now or was ever an investor. Petitioner also informed Patent Owner that no investors were even aware of the present proceedings before they were filed and that the Petitioner’s costs were borne solely by the Petitioner. Petitioner even offered to put all of these facts in a

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.