

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,
Petitioner

v.

VIRNETX INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-01047¹
Patent 7,490,151

Patent Owner's Opposition Brief

¹ Apple Inc. and Black Swamp IP, LLC, who filed petitions in IPR2016-00063 and IPR2016-00167, respectively, have 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. “Client”2

 B. “Between [A] and [B]”9

IV. Kiuchi Does Not Anticipate Claims 1, 2, 6-8, and 12-1410

 A. Kiuchi’s System11

 B. Petitioners’ Mapping Fails to Demonstrate Anticipation12

V. Kiuchi Combined with RFC 1034, With or Without Rescorla, Does Not Render Obvious Claims 1, 2, 6-8, and 12-1416

VI. The Board Should Not Rely on Dr. Guerin’s Testimony.....25

VII. The Board Should Draw an Adverse Inference Regarding the RPI or Privity Relationship Between Mangrove and RPX, and Terminate the Proceeding26

VIII. A New Panel Should Consider this Remand Proceeding To Avoid Constitutional Concerns29

IX. The Proceedings Should Be Terminated in View of 35 U.S.C. § 315(b).....29

X. Conclusion30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Alexander v. FBI,
186 F.R.D. 113 (D.D.C. 1998)27

Applications in Internet Time, LLC v. RPX Corp.,
897 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2018)28

Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.,
941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019)29

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)2

U.S. v. \$671,160.00 in U.S. Currency,
730 F.3d 1051 (9th Cir. 2013)28

VirnetX Inc. v. Cisco Systems Inc.,
767 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2014)1, 9, 12, 21

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, 28, 29, 30

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. 7,490,151 (“the ’151 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, and directed the Board to construe the term “client.” The Court “agree[d] with VirnetX that the Board erred in failing to resolve the claim construction dispute as to the meaning of ‘client.’” *VirnetX*, 778 F. App’x at 908. The Federal Circuit observed that “VirnetX’s proposed construction [of ‘client’] is a user’s computer, not any device that is associated with a user, however indirectly,” and instructed the Board to “analyz[e] the language of [VirnetX’s] proposed construction, which the patent owner response makes clear does not cover the client-side proxy.” *Id.*

Because those errors were dispositive of the Board’s anticipation and obviousness findings, the Federal Circuit vacated those findings and remanded to

the Board. *Id.* at 909, 911.

VirnetX also argued that Apple Inc.’s (“Apple’s”) joinder to these proceedings violates 35 U.S.C. § 315(b)-(c). The Federal Circuit declined to address that argument, finding VirnetX had not shown prejudice from Apple’s joinder, but “le[ft] open the question of whether prejudice could arise” on remand. *VirnetX*, 778 F. App’x at 901-02. The Federal Circuit also held that the Board erred in denying VirnetX leave to file a motion seeking additional discovery into the relationship between Mangrove Partners Master Fund, Ltd. (“Mangrove”) and RPX Corporation (“RPX”). *Id.* at 904.

III. Claim Construction

A. “Client”

The proper construction of “client” is a “user’s computer.” (PO Response at 8-10.) The claims recite initiating/creating the encrypted/secure channel between a client and a secure server. (*See, e.g.*, Ex. 1001 at claim 1.) One of ordinary skill in the art would read “client computer” in the claims in view of the specification—the “single best guide to the meaning of a disputed term,” *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc). (Ex. 2038 at ¶ 26.) The specification explains that the claimed inventions allow for secure communications between a user’s computer and a target computer. Thus, the “Background of the Invention” describes the importance of securing communications between an originating

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.