

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:
PH-VirnetX-IPR@paulhastings.com

Naveen Modi
Paul Hastings LLP
875 15th Street NW
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 551-1990
Facsimile: (202) 551-0490
E-mail:
PH-VirnetX-IPR@paulhastings.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.
Petitioner

v.

VIRNETX INC.
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2016-00062
U.S. Patent No. 6,502,135

**PATENT OWNER'S OPPOSITION TO
APPLE'S MOTION FOR JOINDER**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. INTRODUCTION1
- II. PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED1
- III. STATEMENT OF FACTS1
- IV. ARGUMENT.....3
 - A. Granting Apple’s Motion for Joinder Is Statutorily Barred.....3
 - B. Joining Apple Will Impact the ’046 Proceeding and Apple Will Not Be Prejudiced if the Board Denies Joinder8
 - C. If Apple’s Joinder Motion Is Granted, its Participation in the Mangrove Proceeding Should Be Limited.....9
- V. CONCLUSION.....11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>Achates Reference Publ'g, Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 803 F.3d 652 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	5
<i>Avaya Inc. v. Network-1 Security Solutions, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-0071, Paper No. 40 (July 29, 2013)	10
<i>Butamax Adv. Biofuels LLC v. Gevo, Inc.</i> , IPR2014- 00581, Paper No. 8 (Oct. 14, 2014)	5
<i>Dell Inc. v. Network-1 Security Solutions, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00385, Paper No. 17 (July 29, 2013)	8
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Surfcast Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00271, Paper No. 20 (June 13, 2014).....	4
<i>Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. v. E-Watch, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00611, Paper No. 9 (July 10, 2015)	10
<i>Target Corp. v. Destination Maternity Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00508, Paper No. 28, Dissent slip op. (Feb. 12, 2015)	5
<i>VirnetX, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 767 F. 3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	2
<i>Zhongshan Ocean Motor Co. v. Nidec Motor Corp.</i> , IPR2015-00762, Paper No. 16 (Oct. 5, 2015)	4
Federal Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 311	4, 7, 8
35 U.S.C. § 315(b)	<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 315(c)	<i>passim</i>

I. INTRODUCTION

For the fifth time, Apple has been responsible for filing a petition for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 6,502,135 (“the ’135 patent”). Its first two concurrently filed petitions, in IPR2013-00348 and IPR2013-00349, were denied as untimely under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b). Apple had RPX Corporation file its next two petitions in IPR2014-00171 and IPR2014-00172, but they were also dismissed as untimely. Now, Apple has filed yet another petition, IPR2016-00062 (“the ’062 proceeding”). This time, Apple accompanies its petition with a motion for joinder with IPR2015-01046 (“the ’046 proceeding”), filed by The Mangrove Partners Master Fund, Ltd. (“Mangrove”). Apple’s repeated filings and its request for joinder are an attempt to evade the time bar of § 315(b) and should be rejected. Not only does the plain language of § 315(b) require this result, § 315(c) and Congress’s express intent to avoid serial harassment of patent owners confirms it. Thus, Patent Owner VirnetX respectfully requests that the Board deny Apple’s motion requesting joinder of the ’062 proceeding with the ’046 proceeding.

II. PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED

VirnetX requests that the Board deny Apple’s motion for joinder (“Mot.”).

III. STATEMENT OF FACTS

On August 11, 2010, VirnetX served Apple with a complaint alleging infringement of the ’135 patent and other VirnetX patents. (Ex. 2002, VirnetX Inc.’s Original Complaint in *VirnetX Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc. et al.*, Case No. 6:10-

cv-00417 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 11, 2010) (“the ’417 litigation”).) In response, Apple alleged, among other things, noninfringement, invalidity, and unenforceability of the ’135 patent. (Ex. 2003, Apple’s Answer in the ’417 Litigation at ¶¶ 37, 40-42, 122-123, counterclaim ¶¶ 6-10, 11, 15-30, (E.D. Tex. April 16, 2012).) Prior to trial, Apple also requested *inter partes* reexamination of the ’135 patent. The proceeding was assigned Control No. 95/001,682 (“the ’1,682 reexamination”) and is ongoing.

Following a five day trial, the district court upheld the validity of the ’135 patent. (Ex. 2004, Jury Verdict Form in the ’417 litigation (E.D. Tex. Nov. 6, 2012); Ex. 2005, Final Judgment in the ’417 litigation (E.D. Tex. Feb. 28, 2013).) Apple appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, which affirmed that “none of the asserted claims are invalid[.]” *VirnetX, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.*, 767 F. 3d 1308, 1313-14 (Fed. Cir. 2014).

After trial, in November 2012, VirnetX served Apple with a related complaint involving the ’135 patent and three other VirnetX patents. (Ex. 2006, VirnetX Inc.’s Original Complaint in *VirnetX Inc. v. Apple Inc.*, Case No. 6:12-cv-00855 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 6, 2012) (“the ’855 litigation”).) In response, Apple again alleged, among other things, noninfringement and invalidity of the ’135 patent. (Ex. 2007, Apple’s Answer in the ’855 Litigation at ¶¶ 10, 13-15, 37-38, counterclaim ¶¶ 7, 9 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 23, 2013).)

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.