

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

VirnetX Inc.

Plaintiff,

vs.

Cisco Systems, Inc., *et al.*,

Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Case No. 6:10-cv-417

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**DEFENDANT APPLE INC.’S ORIGINAL ANSWER, AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES, AND  
COUNTERCLAIMS TO PLAINTIFF’S THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Defendant Apple Inc. (“Apple”) files this Original Answer, Affirmative Defenses and Counterclaims to Plaintiff’s Third Amended Complaint for Patent Infringement (the “Complaint”) filed by VirnetX Inc. (“VirnetX”) and Science Applications International Corporation (“SAIC”).

**I. ANSWER**

**THE PARTIES**

1. - 3. Apple is without sufficient information or knowledge to either admit or deny the allegations in paragraphs 1 - 3 and therefore denies the same.

4. Apple admits that it is a California corporation organized and existing under the laws of California, with its principal place of business at One Infinite Loop, Cupertino, California 95014. Apple admits that it has conducted business in this district. Apple denies all other allegations contained in paragraph 4 of the Complaint.

5. - 6. Apple is without sufficient information or knowledge to either admit or deny the allegations in paragraphs 5 and 6 and therefore denies the same.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

7. Apple admits that VirnetX alleges a civil action for patent infringement under the laws of the United States, Title 35 United States Code §§ 101, *et seq.* Apple admits that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over VirnetX's claims for patent infringement. Apple denies all other allegations contained in paragraph 7 of the Complaint.

8. To the extent the allegations in paragraph 8 relate to Apple, Apple admits that venue is proper in this Court, but Apple denies that this judicial district is the most convenient forum for this case. Apple denies all other allegations in this paragraph to the extent such allegations relate to Apple. To the extent the allegations in paragraph 8 relate to the other Defendants in this case, Apple is without sufficient information or knowledge to either admit or deny the allegations and therefore denies the same.

9. To the extent the allegations in paragraph 9 relate to Apple, Apple admits that this Court has personal jurisdiction over Apple. Apple admits that it has conducted business in the State of Texas. Apple admits that it has and does sell products and provide services to persons within the State of Texas and this District, but it denies that it has committed any acts of infringement within this District or the State of Texas, and specifically denies any wrongdoing, infringement, inducement of infringement, or contribution to infringement. Apple denies all other allegations in this paragraph to the extent such allegations relate to Apple. To the extent the allegations in paragraph 9 relate to the other Defendants in this case, Apple is without sufficient information or knowledge to either admit or deny the allegations and therefore denies the same.

**ASSERTED PATENTS**

10. Apple admits that, according to the face of the patent, United States Patent No. 6,502,135 (“the ‘135 patent”) is entitled “Agile Network Protocol for Secure Communications with Assured System Availability” and reflects an issue date of December 31, 2002. Apple admits that Edmund Colby Munger, Douglas Charles Schmidt, Robert Dunham Short, III, Victor Larson, and Michael Williamson are listed as inventors on the face of the patent. Apple admits that what appears to be a copy of the ‘135 patent is attached as Exhibit A to the Complaint. Apple denies all other allegations contained in paragraph 10 of the Complaint.

11. Apple admits that, according to the face of the patent, United States Patent No. 6,839,759 (“the ‘759 patent”) is entitled “Method for Establishing Secure Communication Link Between Computers of Virtual Private Network Without User Entering Any Cryptographic Information” and reflects an issue date of January 4, 2005. Apple admits that Victor Larson, Robert Dunham Short, III, Edmund Colby Munger, and Michael Williamson are listed as inventors on the face of the patent. Apple admits that what appears to be a copy of the ‘759 patent is attached as Exhibit B to the Complaint. Apple denies all other allegations contained in paragraph 11 of the Complaint.

12. Apple admits that, according to the face of the patent, United States Patent No. 7,188,180 (“the ‘180 patent”) is entitled “Method for Establishing Secure Communication Link Between Computers of Virtual Private Network” and reflects an issue date of March 6, 2007. Apple admits that Victor Larson, Robert Dunham Short, III, Edmund Colby Munger, and Michael Williamson are listed as inventors on the face of the patent. Apple admits that what appears to be a copy of the ‘180 patent is attached as Exhibit C to the Complaint. Apple denies all other allegations contained in paragraph 12 of the Complaint.

13. Apple admits that, according to the face of the patent, United States Patent No. 7,418,504 (“the ‘504 patent”) is entitled “Agile Network Protocol for Secure Communications Using Secure Domain Names” and reflects an issue date of August 26, 2008. Apple admits that Victor Larson, Robert Dunham Short, III, Edmund Colby Munger, and Michael Williamson are listed as inventors on the face of the patent. Apple admits that what appears to be a copy of the ‘504 patent is attached as Exhibit D to the Complaint. Apple denies all other allegations contained in paragraph 13 of the Complaint.

14. Apple admits that, according to the face of the patent, United States Patent No. 7,490,151 (“the ‘151 patent”) is entitled “Establishment of a Secure Communication Link Based on a Domain Name Service (DNS) Request” and reflects an issue date of February 10, 2009. Apple admits that Edmund Colby Munger, Robert Dunham Short, III, Victor Larson, and Michael Williamson are listed as inventors on the face of the patent. Apple admits that what appears to be a copy of the ‘151 patent is attached as Exhibit E to the Complaint. Apple denies all other allegations contained in paragraph 14 of the Complaint.

15. Apple admits that, according to the face of the patent, United States Patent No. 7,921,211 (“the ‘211 patent”) is entitled “Agile Network Protocol for Secure Communications Using Secure Domain Names” and reflects an issue date of April 5, 2011. Apple admits that Edmund Colby Munger, Robert Dunham Short, III, Victor Larson, and Michael Williamson are listed as inventors on the face of the patent. Apple admits that what appears to be a copy of the ‘211 patent is attached as Exhibit F to the Complaint. Apple denies all other allegations contained in paragraph 15 of the Complaint.

**COUNT ONE**

**ALLEGED PATENT INFRINGEMENT BY AASTRA**

16. Apple incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-15 above as if fully set forth herein. Apple is without sufficient information or knowledge to either admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 16 regarding Aastra and the '135, '504, and '211 patents and therefore denies the same.

16. – 36. Apple is without sufficient information or knowledge to either admit or deny the allegations in paragraphs 16-36 and therefore denies the same.

## **COUNT TWO**

### **ALLEGED PATENT INFRINGEMENT BY APPLE**

37. Apple incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-36 above as if fully set forth herein. Apple denies that it has infringed or continues to infringe the '135, '151, '504, or '211 patents.

38. Denied.

39. Denied.

40. Apple admits that it provides or has provided the iPhone, iPhone 3G, iPhone 3GS, iPhone 4, iPod touch, iPad, and iPad 2 to others in the United States. Apple denies that these or any other Apple products infringe any asserted claims of the '135 patent. Apple further denies all other allegations contained in paragraph 40 of the Complaint.

41. Denied.

42. Denied.

43. Apple admits that it makes or has made, uses or used, sells or sold, offers for sale or offered for sale, imports or imported, exports or exported, supplies or supplied, and/or distributes or distributed within and from the United States the iPhone, iPhone 3G, iPhone 3GS, iPhone 4, iPod touch, iPad and iPad 2, but it denies that these or any other Apple products

# 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.