

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

BLACK SWAMP IP, LLC
Petitioner

v.

VIRNETX INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-00957
Patent 7,921,211

Patent Owner's Response

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Introduction.....1
- II. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art1
- III. Overview of the '211 Patent.....3
- IV. The Petition Lacks Required Expert Testimony6
- V. Claim Construction.....9
 - A. “Domain Name Service System” (Claims 1, 5, 15, 16, 23, 27, 36, 51 and 60).....10
 - B. “Secure Communication Link” (Claims 1, 16, 27, 36, 40, 51, and 60).....11
 - 1. “Authentication” and “Address Hopping” Alone Do Not Result in a “Secure Communication Link”.....12
 - 2. A “Secure Communication Link” Must Be Direct.....14
 - 3. A “Secure Communication Link” Requires Encryption.....18
 - C. “Indicate”/“Indicating” (Claims 1, 36, and 60).....21
 - D. “Transparently” (Claims 27 and 51)24
- VI. *Kiuchi* Does Not Anticipate Any of the Challenged Claims.....25
 - A. Overview of *Kiuchi*26
 - B. Independent Claim 129
 - 1. *Kiuchi* Does Not Disclose the Recited “Indication”.....29
 - 2. *Kiuchi* Does Not Disclose the Recited “Plurality of Domain Names and Corresponding Network Addresses”.....31
 - 3. *Kiuchi* Does Not Disclose a System for Establishing the Recited “Secure Communication Link”33
 - C. Independent Claims 36 and 6036

D. Dependent Claims 15 and 3937

E. Dependent Claims 16 and 4039

F. Dependent Claims 27 and 5140

G. Dependent Claims 2, 5, 6, 23, 37, and 4743

VII. Conclusion43

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Alexsam, Inc. v. IDT Corp.</i> , 715 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	8
<i>Apple Inc. v. VirnetX Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00403, Paper No. 42 (P.T.A.B. July 29, 2015)	2, 8
<i>Apple Inc. v. VirnetX Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00404, Paper No. 42 (P.T.A.B. July 29, 2015)	38
<i>Apple Inc. v. VirnetX Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00871, Paper No. 8 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 1, 2015)	17
<i>Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Concepts In Optics, Inc.</i> , 111 F. App'x 582 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	8
<i>Biogen Idec, Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline LLC</i> , 713 F.3d 1090 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	15, 16, 20
<i>Brand v. Miller</i> , 487 F.3d 862 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	7, 31
<i>Centricut, LLC v. Esab Grp., Inc.</i> , 390 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	7
<i>Cf. Encino Motorcars, LLC v. Navarro</i> , 136 S.Ct. 2117 (2016).....	17
<i>Cyber Corp. v. FAS Techs., Inc.</i> , 138 F.3d 1448 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	15
<i>Eon-Net LP v. Flagstar Bancorp.</i> , 653 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	19
<i>Garmin Int'l, Inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2012-00001, Paper No. 15 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 9, 2013)	16
<i>K/S HIMPP v. Hear-Wear Techs., LLC</i> , 751 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	7, 31

<i>In re Man Machine Interface Technologies LLC</i> , 822 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	9
<i>Meitzner v. Mindick</i> , 549 F.2d 775 (C.C.P.A. 1977)	7
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	16, 18, 20
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. VirnetX Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00615, Paper No. 9 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 15, 2014)	24
<i>Motorola Solutions, Inc. v. Mobile Scanning Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2013-00093, Paper No. 28 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 29, 2013)	16
<i>PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Commc'ns RF, LLC</i> , 815 F.3d 747 (Fed.Cir.2016)	10
<i>Proveris Scientific Corp. v. Innovasystems, Inc.</i> , 536 F.3d 1256 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	7
<i>Sharp Corp. v. Surpass Tech Innovation LLC</i> , IPR2015-00022, Paper No. 9 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 10, 2015)	7
<i>Straight Path IP Grp., Inc. v. Sipnet EU S.R.O.</i> , 806 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	16, 17, 20
<i>Tempo Lighting, Inc. v. Tivoli, LLC</i> , 742 F.3d 973 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	17, 18
<i>VirnetX, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 767 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	16, 20, 35
<i>Xilinx, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC</i> , IPR2013-00112, Paper No. 14 (P.T.A.B. June 27, 2013)	17
<i>ZTE Corp. & ZTE (USA) Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00134, Paper No. 12 (P.T.A.B. June 19, 2013)	17
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3)	6
35 U.S.C. § 316(e)	1, 6, 42

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.