

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 Opposition 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. Introduction.....1
- II. The Federal Circuit’s Decision.....1
- III. Claim Construction.....2
 - A. The *Phillips* Claim Construction Standard Applies on Remand2
 - B. “Client Computer”.....3
 - C. “Virtual Private Network (VPN)”12
- IV. Kiuchi Does Not Anticipate Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, and 12.....13
 - A. Kiuchi Discloses Relay-Based Communications.....14
 - B. Petitioners’ “User Agent to Origin Server” Mapping Is Deficient15
 - C. Petitioners’ “Client-Side Proxy to Server-Side Proxy” Mapping Is Deficient21
 - 1. Petitioners’ “Client-Side Proxy to Server-Side Proxy” Mapping Fails Under VirnetX’s Construction for “Client Computer”22
 - 2. Petitioners’ “Client-Side Proxy to Server-Side Proxy” Mapping Fails Under Petitioners’ Construction for “Client Computer”25
- V. The Board Should Not Rely on Dr. Guerin’s Testimony.....28
- VI. The Board Should Draw an Adverse Inference Regarding the RPI or Privity Relationship Between Mangrove and RPX, and Terminate the Proceeding29
- VII. A New Panel Should Consider this Remand Proceeding To Avoid Constitutional Concerns31
- VIII. The Proceedings Should Be Terminated in View of 35 U.S.C. § 315(b).....32

IX. Conclusion33

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Alexander v. FBI,
186 F.R.D. 113 (D.D.C. 1998)29

Applications in Internet Time, LLC v. RPX Corp.,
897 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2018)31

Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.,
941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019)31, 32

In re CSB-Sys. Int’l, Inc.,
832 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2016)3

Google Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC,
IPR2014-00787, Paper 68 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 18, 2018).....3

Nat. Alternatives Int’l, Inc. v. Iancu,
904 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2018)2

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)3, 4

Sipnet EU S.R.O. v. Straight Path IP Grp., Inc.,
IPR2013-00246, Paper 73 (P.T.A.B. May 23, 2016)3

U.S. v. \$671,160.00 in U.S. Currency,
730 F.3d 1051 (9th Cir. 2013)30

VirnetX Inc. v. Cisco Systems Inc.,
767 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2014)*passim*

VirnetX Inc. v. Mangrove Partners Master Fund, Ltd.,
778 F. App’x 897 (Fed. Cir. 2019)*passim*

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 315(b)2, 31, 32

35 U.S.C. § 315(c)2

I. Introduction

Patent Owner VirnetX Inc. (“VirnetX”) respectfully submits that Petitioners have failed to meet their burden to show that the challenged claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,502,135 (“the ’135 patent”) are unpatentable. Petitioners’ arguments are foreclosed by the Federal Circuit’s decision in *VirnetX Inc. v. Mangrove Partners Master Fund, Ltd.*, 778 F. App’x 897 (Fed. Cir. 2019), and the record evidence in this proceeding. In fact, the Federal Circuit rejected identical arguments—addressing the same patent and prior art—in *VirnetX Inc. v. Cisco Systems Inc.*, 767 F.3d 1308, 1323-24 (Fed. Cir. 2014).

II. The Federal Circuit’s Decision

The Federal Circuit vacated the Board’s claim constructions, imposed its own construction of the term “VPN,” and directed the Board to construe the term “client computer.” *VirnetX*, 778 F. App’x at 991. Invoking VirnetX’s disclaimer, it held that the phrase “‘VPN between the client computer and the target computer’ requires *direct communication* between the client and target computers.” *Id.* at 909-10 (emphasis added). The Federal Circuit also “agree[d] with VirnetX that the Board . . . fail[ed] to resolve the claim construction dispute as to the meaning of ‘client [computer].’” The Board had “latch[ed] onto . . . out-of-context language” in finding that Kiuchi’s client-side proxy could be the claimed “client computer,” just because it was “associated with a user, however indirectly.” *Id.* at 908, 909.

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.