

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., APPLE INC., AND  
BLACK SWAMP, LLC,  
Petitioner

v.

VIRNETX INC.,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2015-01047<sup>1</sup>  
Patent 7,490,151

---

**Patent Owner's Motion to Seal**

---

<sup>1</sup> Apple Inc. and Black Swamp, LLC, who filed petitions in IPR2016-00063 and IPR2016-00167, respectively, have been joined as Petitioners in the instant proceeding.

## **I. Introduction**

Patent Owner VirnetX Inc. (“Patent Owner”) hereby moves to seal Patent Owner’s Request for Rehearing, in accordance with the default protective order filed by Petitioner Mangrove Partners Master Fund, Ltd. (“Petitioner Mangrove”) on March 3, 2016 (Paper No. 43). *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.14, 42.54. Good cause exists for granting the instant motion to seal because Patent Owner’s Request for Rehearing contains information that has been designated as confidential during discovery by Petitioner Mangrove and that the Board has found to contain “confidential business information.” Paper No. 80 at 36.

Patent Owner intends to ask Petitioner Mangrove what material it believes should be redacted from a public version of the Patent Owner’s Request for Rehearing. Once so indicated, Patent Owner will promptly file such paper after such filing has been authorized by the Board.

## **II. Argument**

The standard governing the Board’s determination of whether to grant a motion to seal is “good cause.” *Garmin v. Cuozzo*, IPR2012-00001, Paper No. 36 (Apr. 5, 2013). In that regard, the Board must “strike a balance between the public’s interest in maintaining a complete and understandable file history and the parties’ interest in protecting truly sensitive information.” *Id.*

Patent Owner’s Request for Rehearing includes information that Petitioner

Mangrove has asserted as confidential during discovery and that the Board has found to contain “confidential business information.” Paper No. 80 at 36.

Because the relevant information has been designated as confidential by Petitioner Mangrove, Patent Owner intends to ask Petitioner Mangrove what material it believes should be redacted from a public version of the Patent Owner’s Request for Rehearing. Once so indicated, Patent Owner will promptly file such paper after such filing has been authorized by the Board.

### **III. Proposed Protective Order**

Petitioner Mangrove filed a Motion for Entry of the Default Protective Order on March 3, 2016. (Paper No. 43). Pursuant to Section 4(B) of the protective order, Patent Owner’s Request for Rehearing has been clearly marked as “PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL.”

### **IV. Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, Patent Owner respectfully requests that the Board seal Patent Owner’s Request for Rehearing.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 11, 2016

By: /Joseph E. Palys/

Joseph E. Palys  
Registration No. 46,508

Counsel for VirnetX Inc.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), I certify that I caused to be served on the counsel for Petitioners a true and correct copy of the foregoing Patent Owner's Motion to Seal by electronic means on the date below at the following address of record:

Abraham Kasdan (akasdan@wiggin.com)  
James T. Bailey (jtb@jtbaileylaw.com)  
IP@wiggin.com

Jeffrey P. Kushan  
Scott Border  
Thomas A. Broughan III  
iprnotices@sidley.com

Thomas H. Martin  
Wesley C. Meinerding  
tmartin@martinferraro.com  
docketing@martinferraro.com

Dated: October 11, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

/Joseph E. Palys/  
Joseph E. Palys  
Counsel for VirnetX Inc.