

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

THE MANGROVE PARTNERS MASTER FUND, LTD., APPLE INC., and  
BLACK SWAMP IP, LLC,  
Petitioners,

v.

VIRNETX INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case Nos. IPR2015-01046,<sup>1</sup> -01047<sup>2</sup>  
U.S. Patent Nos. 6,502,135 & 7,490,151

---

**PETITIONER MANGROVE'S RESPONSES TO  
PATENT OWNER'S INTERROGATORIES**

---

<sup>1</sup> Apple Inc., who filed a petition in IPR2016-00062, has been joined as a Petitioner in IPR2015-01046.

<sup>2</sup> Apple Inc. and Black Swamp IP, LLC, which filed petitions in IPR2016-00063 and IPR2016-00167, respectively, have been joined as Petitioners in IPR2015-01047.

The Board granted in part Patent Owner VirnetX Inc.'s ("VirnetX") motion for additional discovery ("Mot.") of Petitioner The Mangrove Partners Master Fund, Ltd. ("Mangrove") in the form of up to "10 interrogatories, inclusive of any subparts, limited to a pre-institution time frame and on topics no broader than the requested deposition topics in Appendices C and D of the Motion." *E.g.*, IPR2015-01046, Paper 88 ("Order"), 28. VirnetX served the same 10 interrogatories on Petitioner Mangrove in each of IPR2015-01046 and IPR2015-01047.

Petitioner Mangrove's responses in this paper employ the definitions of terms as they were provided by VirnetX in its discovery requests. Also, by providing these responses, Petitioner Mangrove does not waive in any manner any applicable attorney-client privilege or attorney work product.

### **MANGROVE'S GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

Petitioner Mangrove generally objects to each of VirnetX's interrogatories to the extent they request information, knowledge, or evidence that first came into existence only after October 7, 2015, and its responses below therefore are "limited to a pre-institution time frame." *See* Order 28. Petitioner Mangrove further generally objects to each of VirnetX's interrogatories as overbroad and unduly burdensome for requesting "*all* facts and circumstances concerning" its subject matter, which may encompass needlessly duplicative information not relevant to show any relationship between Petitioner Mangrove and RPX or Apple. *See*

*Garmin Int'l, Inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC*, IPR2012-00001, Paper 26 at 6–7 (PTAB Mar. 5, 2013) (“*Garmin*”) (Factors 1 & 5). The extent to which Petitioner Mangrove has responded to each interrogatory is explained below.

### **VIRNETX’S INTERROGATORY NO. 1**

Describe all facts and circumstances concerning each communication between Mangrove Partners and RPX prior to October 7, 2015, concerning VirnetX.

### **MANGROVE’S RESPONSE TO VIRNETX’S INTERROGATORY NO. 1**

Subject to the foregoing general objection(s), Petitioner Mangrove has undertaken a reasonable inquiry and is aware of no communications between Mangrove Partners and RPX prior to October 7, 2015, concerning VirnetX. *See also* Ex. 1050, 1–2.

### **VIRNETX’S INTERROGATORY NO. 2**

Describe all facts and circumstances concerning each communication between Mangrove Partners and RPX prior to October 7, 2015, concerning proceedings before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

### **MANGROVE’S RESPONSE TO VIRNETX’S INTERROGATORY NO. 2**

Subject to the foregoing general objection(s), Petitioner Mangrove has undertaken a reasonable inquiry and is aware of no communications between

Mangrove Partners and RPX prior to October 7, 2015, concerning proceedings before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. *See also* Ex. 1050, 2–3.

### **VIRNETX’S INTERROGATORY NO. 3**

Describe all facts and circumstances concerning each communication between Mangrove Partners and any person not part of Mangrove Partners prior to October 7, 2015, concerning both RPX and VirnetX.

### **MANGROVE’S RESPONSE TO VIRNETX’S INTERROGATORY NO. 3**

Petitioner Mangrove objects to this interrogatory as overbroad and unduly burdensome for requesting information about “communication[s] between Mangrove Partners and *any person* not part of Mangrove Partners,” instead of only about communications between Mangrove Partners and either of RPX or Apple. *See Garmin*, Paper 26 at 6–7 (Factors 1 & 5). VirnetX represented that it would request “discovery narrowly focuse[d] on the relationship between Mangrove and RPX” (Mot. 6), and the Board agreed that “limiting [discovery] to communications between Mangrove and RPX ... appears reasonable under the interests of justice, because [VirnetX] seeks discovery about that relationship.” Order 21–22. Allowing discovery of communications other than those between Mangrove Partners and either RPX or Apple is not reasonable under the interests of justice. *See Garmin*, Paper 26 at 6–7 (Factors 1 & 5). Petitioner Mangrove also objects to the scope of

this interrogatory to the extent it seeks discovery of communications that concern either RPX or VirnetX, but not both entities.

Subject to the foregoing general and specific objection(s), Petitioner Mangrove has undertaken a reasonable inquiry and is aware of no communications between Mangrove Partners and any person not part of Mangrove Partners prior to October 7, 2015, concerning both RPX and VirnetX.

#### **VIRNETX'S INTERROGATORY NO. 4**

Describe all facts and circumstances concerning each communication between Mangrove Partners and any person not part of Mangrove Partners prior to October 7, 2015, concerning challenges to VirnetX's patents.

#### **MANGROVE'S RESPONSE TO VIRNETX'S INTERROGATORY NO. 4**

Petitioner Mangrove objects to this interrogatory as overbroad and unduly burdensome for requesting information about “communication[s] between Mangrove Partners and *any person* not part of Mangrove Partners,” instead of only about communications with RPX or Apple. *See Garmin*, Paper 26 at 6–7 (Factors 1 & 5). VirnetX represented that it would request “discovery narrowly focuse[d] on the relationship between Mangrove and RPX” (Mot. 6), and the Board agreed that “limiting [discovery] to communications between Mangrove and RPX ... appears reasonable under the interests of justice, because [VirnetX] seeks discovery about that relationship.” Order 21–22. Allowing discovery of communications other than

# 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.