

**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. IPR2015-01046<sup>1</sup>  
U.S. Patent No. 6,502,135

---

**PETITIONERS' REPLY REMAND BRIEF**

---

<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

<b>I.</b>	<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>Claim Construction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
A.	“Client Computer”.....	1
1.	The Claim Language Supports Petitioners’ Construction.....	2
2.	The Specification Confirms a “Client Computer” Is Not Necessarily a User’s Computer.....	4
3.	The Extrinsic Evidence Supports Petitioners’ Construction .....	7
B.	“Virtual Private Network (VPN)” .....	9
<b>III.</b>	<b>The Claims Are Anticipated under Both of Petitioners’ Mappings.....</b>	<b>15</b>
A.	Petitioners’ “User Agent to Origin Server” Mapping .....	15
1.	Kiuchi Uses a Single HTTP Connection, Not Two Distinct Socket Connections Like Aventail .....	16
2.	Kiuchi’s User Agent Directly Addresses the Origin Server....	19
B.	Petitioners’ “Client-Side Proxy to Server-Side Proxy” Mapping.....	23
1.	Kiuchi’s Client-Side Proxy Meets Petitioners’ Construction of “Client Computer” .....	24
2.	Kiuchi’s Client-Side Proxy Meets Even VirnetX’s Construction of “Client Computer” .....	26
C.	Dr. Guerin’s Testimony is Probative and Entitled to Weight.....	28
<b>IV.</b>	<b>VirnetX’s Procedural Arguments Are Meritless .....</b>	<b>29</b>
A.	VirnetX Concedes the Evidence Shows No § 315(b) Violation .....	29
B.	VirnetX’s <i>Arthrex</i> Complaints Should Be Dismissed.....	33
C.	VirnetX Is Not Prejudiced by Apple’s Participation.....	34
<b>V.</b>	<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>35</b>
	<b>Exhibit List.....</b>	<b>36</b>
	<b>Certificate of Compliance .....</b>	<b>40</b>
	<b>Certificate of Service .....</b>	<b>41</b>

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Cordis Corp.</i> , 710 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	29
<i>Amazon.com, Inc. v. Barnesandnoble.com, Inc.</i> , 239 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	13, 25
<i>Anchor Wall Systems, Inc. v. Rockwood Retaining Walls, Inc.</i> , 340 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	7, 9
<i>Applications in Internet Time, LLC v. RPX Corp.</i> , 897 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	35
<i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. Polaris Indus., Inc.</i> , No. 19-1440, slip op. (Fed. Cir. Dec. 23, 2019).....	32
<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	36
<i>Becton, Dickinson &amp; Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Grp., LP</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	4
<i>CAE Screenplates, Inc. v. Heinrich Fiedler GmbH &amp; Co. KG</i> , 224 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	5
<i>Garmin Int’l, Inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2012-00001, Paper 26, 6 (June 11, 2013).....	32
<i>In re Gleave</i> , 560 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	26, 27
<i>Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	6
<i>Nidec Motor Corporation v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co. Ltd.</i> <i>Matal</i> , 868 F.3d 1013 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (Dyk, J., concurring).....	36, 37

<i>Novartis AG v. Noven Pharmaceuticals</i> , 853 F. 3d 1289 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	28
<i>In re NuVasive, Inc.</i> , 841 F.3d 966 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	31
<i>Omega Eng'g, Inc, v. Raytek Corp.</i> , 334 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	3
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc).....	2, 7
<i>Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Int'l, Inc.</i> , 843 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	21
<i>In re Rambus Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 42 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	3
<i>Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficoso N. Am. Corp.</i> , 299 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	6
<i>U.S. v. \$671,160.00 in U.S. Currency</i> , 730 F.3d 1051 (9th Cir. 2013).....	34
<i>Unwired Planet, LLC v. Google Inc.</i> , 841 F.3d 995 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	21
<i>VirnetX Inc. v. Mangrove Partners Master Fund, Ltd.</i> , 778 F. App'x 897 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	10, 28, 35, 37
<i>VirnetX, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 767 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<b>Statutes</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 315(b).....	31, 35, 36
35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(5).....	32
<b>Other Authorities</b>	
37 C.F.R. § 11.18(b)(2)(iii)-(iv).....	35
37 C.F.R. § 42.23.....	31

37 C.F.R. § 42.52..... 33  
37 C.F.R. § 42.62..... 35

# 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.