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

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

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. OVERVIEW OF THE '581 PATENT AND THE STATE OF THE ART 4

A. Technical Background 4

B. The Mobility Problem Addressed by the '581 Patent 5

C. The '581 Patent's Solution to the Mobility Problem 7

III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 10

A. Claim Language 11

B. Specification 12

C. Prosecution History 14

D. Disclosure of Security Gateway in Documents from the Prosecution History or Relied Upon by Petitioner 15

1. Murakawa 17

2. Ahonen 18

3. Frankel 19

4. RFC 1122 22

5. RFC 2401 23

IV. GROUND 1: CLAIMS 1-2, 4, 6-7 AND 9 ARE PATENTABLE OVER THE COMBINATION OF ISHIYAMA AND MURAKAWA 24

A. Claim 1 is Patentable Over the Combination of Ishiyama and Murakawa 27

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

1. The Petition Fails to Establish that the Prior Art Teaches the "Security Gateway" in "At Least One Mobile Terminal and Another Terminal and a Security Gateway Therebetween" and Other Limitations 27

(a) Multiple Publications from the Relevant Timeframe Confirm that a Correspondent Host as in Ishiyama is Not a Security Gateway as Claimed 31

(b) Ishiyama's Correspondent Host is Demonstrably Not a Security Gateway Because it is the Final Destination for the Packets It Receives 34

(c) Ishiyama's Description of IPSec Processing Using the Security Databases Proves that the Correspondent Host is Not a Security Gateway 35

(d) Petitioner's Theory that the Correspondent Host Must be a Security Gateway Because IPSec Tunnel Mode is Used is Incorrect 37

1. The Use of Tunnel Mode Does Not Mean that a Security Gateway is Present 37

2. The Use of Tunnel Mode Does not "Suggest" that a Correspondent Host is Actually a Security Gateway 42

(e) Petitioner's Argument in this Proceeding that the Correspondent Host is a Security Gateway is Contradicted by the Position Taken in IPR2019-00821 44

2. The Petition Also Fails to Establish that the Prior Art Discloses the "Other Terminal" in "At Least One Mobile Terminal and Another Terminal and a Security Gateway Therebetween" and Other Limitations 45

3. The Petition Also Fails to Establish that the Prior Art Teaches "While at the Second Address, the Mobile

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Terminal Sending a Request Message to the Gateway 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" 54

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" 56

B. 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" 61

C. Claims 6-7 are Patentable Over the Combination of Ishiyama and Murakawa 63

D. Claim 9 is Patentable Over the Combination of Ishiyama and Murakawa 65

V. GROUND 2: CLAIMS 3 AND 5 ARE PATENTABLE OVER THE COMBINATION OF ISHIYAMA, MURAKAWA AND AHONEN 69

A. Overview of Ahonen 69

B. 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) 70

VI. GROUND 3: CLAIM 8 IS PATENTABLE OVER THE COMBINATION OF ISHIYAMA, MURAKAWA AND FORSLOW 73

VII. CONCLUSION 73

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

Continental Can Co. v. Monsanto Co.,
948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991) 39

David Netzer Consulting Eng'r LLC v. Shell Oil Co.,
824 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 10

Graham v. John Deere Co.,
383 U.S. 1 (1966)..... 25, 26

In re Robertson,
169 F.3d 743 (Fed.Cir.1999) 39, 45

InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGO Commc'ns, Inc.,
751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 55

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
127 S.Ct. 1727 (2007).....26

Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co.,
851 F.3d 1270 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 45, 48

Personal Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.,
848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 53, 54, 56

Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.,
480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007) 26

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) 10, 11

Regents of Univ. of California v. Broad Institute, Inc.,
903 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2018) 26

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.