UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC., Petitioner,

v.

MPH TECHNOLOGIES OY, Patent Owner.

Case IPR2019-00820 Patent 7,937,581

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.120



TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Pag	ţе		
I.	INT	TRODUCTION	.1		
II.	OVERVIEW OF THE '581 PATENT AND THE STATE OF THE ART4				
	A.	Technical Background	.4		
	В.	The Mobility Problem Addressed by the '581 Patent	.5		
	C.	The '581 Patent's Solution to the Mobility Problem	.7		
III.	CL	AIM CONSTRUCTION1	0		
	A.	Claim Language1	.1		
	В.	Specification1	2		
	C.	Prosecution History1	4		
	D.	Disclosure of Security Gateway in Documents from the Prosecution History or Relied Upon by Petitioner1			
		1. Murakawa1	7		
		2. Ahonen1	8		
		3. Frankel1	9		
		4. RFC 11222	22		
		5. RFC 24012	23		
IV.		OUND 1: CLAIMS 1-2, 4, 6-7 AND 9 ARE PATENTABLE OVER E COMBINATION OF ISHIYAMA AND MURAKAWA2			
	A.	Claim 1 is Patentable Over the Combination of Ishiyama and Murakawa	27		



(a)	M14	tinle Dublications from the Delevent
(a)		tiple Publications from the Relevant eframe Confirm that a Correspondent Host as
		hiyama is Not a Security Gateway as Claimed.
(b)	•	yama's Correspondent Host is Demonstrably
		a Security Gateway Because it is the Final
	Dest	ination for the Packets It Receives
(c)	-	yama's Description of IPSec Processing Using
		Security Databases Proves that the
	Corr	respondent Host is Not a Security Gateway
(d)		cioner's Theory that the Correspondent Host
		t be a Security Gateway Because IPSec Tunnel
	Moa	le is Used is Incorrect
	1.	The Use of Tunnel Mode Does Not Mean
		that a Security Gateway is Present
	2.	The Use of Tunnel Mode Does not "Suggest"
		that a Correspondent Host is Actually a
		Security Gateway
(e)	Peti	tioner's Argument in this Proceeding that the
		respondent Host is a Security Gateway is
		ntradicted by the Position Taken in IPR2019- 21
The	Da4:4: -	on Algo Eoile to Establish that the Drive Aut
		on Also Fails to Establish that the Prior Art he "Other Terminal" in "At Least One Mobile
Disc		and Another Terminal and a Security Gateway
	loses t	he "Other Terminal" in "At Least One Mob



		Address of the Security Gateway to Request the Security Gateway to Change the Secure Connection to Be Defined Between the Second Address and the Gateway Address of the Security Gateway"		
		4. The Petition Also Fails to Establish that the Prior Art Teaches the "Mobile Terminal Sending a Secure Message From the Second Address of the Mobile Terminal to the Other Terminal via the Security Gateway"		
	В.	Claim 4 is Patentable Over the Combination of Ishiyama and Murakawa Because the Petition Fails to Establish that the Prior Art Teaches the "Request Message And/Or a Reply Message is Encrypted And/Or Authenticated"		
	C.	Claims 6-7 are Patentable Over the Combination of Ishiyama and Murakawa		
	D.	Claim 9 is Patentable Over the Combination of Ishiyama and Murakawa		
V.		OUND 2: CLAIMS 3 AND 5 ARE PATENTABLE OVER THE MBINATION OF ISHIYAMA, MURAKAWA AND AHONEN69		
	A.	Overview of Ahonen69		
	В.	The Combination of Ishiyama, Murakawa and Ahonen Fails to Teach Sending a "Reply Back to the Mobile Terminal From the Security Gateway" (Claim 3) or a "Reply Message to the Mobile Terminal at the Second Address to Confirm the Address Change" (Claim 5)		
VI.		OUND 3: CLAIM 8 IS PATENTABLE OVER THE OMBINATION OF ISHIYAMA, MURAKAWA AND FORSLOW.73		
VII.	CONCLUSION			



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s) CASES Continental Can Co. v. Monsanto Co., David Netzer Consulting Eng'r LLC v. Shell Oil Co., Graham v. John Deere Co., In re Robertson, InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGO Commc'ns, Inc., KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 127 S.Ct. 1727 (2007)......26 Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co., Personal Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc., Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc., 480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007)26 Phillips v. AWH Corp., Regents of Univ. of California v. Broad Institute, Inc.,



DOCKET

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.

