### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

### BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC., Petitioner

v.

MPH TECHNOLOGIES OY, Patent Owner

Case IPR2019-00825 U.S. Patent No. 9,762,397

# PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,762,397

### Mail Stop PATENT BOARD

Patent Trial and Appeal Board U.S. Patent & Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

DOCKET

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	Mandatory Notices (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1))2	
II.	Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a))	3
III.	Identification of Challenge (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b))	3
	A. Citation of Prior Art	3
	B. Statutory Grounds for the Challenge	б
IV.	The '397 Patent	б
	A. Overview of the '397 Patent	б
	1. Brief Overview of IPSec	7
	2. The '397 patent focused on employing standard IPSec protocols to establish a single secure connection	9
	3. The Examiner did not consider RFC3104 or Grabelsky12	2
	B. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	4
	C. Claim Construction	5
	1. "secure connection"1	5
	2. "unique identity"1	6
VII.	Grounds of Unpatentability	7
	A. Ground 1: Claims 1 and 2 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over RFC3104 and Grabelsky	7
	1. Overview of RFC31041	7
	2. Overview of the Combination of RFC3104 and Grabelsky2	1
	<ol> <li>The combination of RFC3104 and Grabelsky renders claim 1 obvious 26</li> </ol>	•
	<ol> <li>The combination of RFC3104 and Grabelsky renders claim 2 obvious 40</li> </ol>	•
VIII.	Conclusion4	2

DOCKET

## EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Description
1001	U.S. Patent No. 9,762,397 B2 to Vaarala <i>et al.</i> , issued Sept. 12, 2017
1002	Declaration of David Goldschlag, Ph.D. ("Goldschlag Decl.")
1003	Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 9,762,397 B2
1004	RFC3104 - RSIP Support for End-to-end IPsec (Oct. 2001)
1005	U.S. Patent No. 7,032,242 B1 to Grabelsky <i>et al.</i> , issued Apr. 18, 2006
1006	Intentionally Left Blank
1007	Declaration of Ms. Sandy Ginoza
1008	Curriculum Vitae of David Goldschlag, Ph.D.
1009-1010	Intentionally Left Blank
1011	S. Frankel, Demystifying the IPsec Puzzle, Artech House, Inc., 2001
1012	RSIP Support for End-to-end IPsec (RFC3104), IETF Data Tracker
1013	RFC2026 - The Internet Standards Process Revision 3 (Oct. 1996)
1014	Intentionally Left Blank
1015	RFC2401 - Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol (Nov. 1998)
1016	RFC2402 - IP Authentication Header (Nov. 1998)
1017	RFC2406 - IP Encapsulating Security Payload (ESP) (Nov. 1998)
1018	RFC2409 - The Internet Key Exchange (IKE) (Nov. 1998)
1019	RFC3102 - Realm Specific IP: Framework (Oct. 2001)

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

# Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Pat. No. 9,762,397

Exhibit No.	Description
1020	Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 8,346,949 B2

Apple Inc. petitions for *inter partes* review of claims 1 and 2 of United States Patent No. 9,762,397 to Vaarala *et al.* (Ex. 1001, "the '397 patent"), titled "Method and System for Sending a Message Through a Secure Connection." The Petition demonstrates that both claims of the '397 patent are unpatentable.

The '397 patent purported to solve issues with Internet Protocol Security (IPSec) operability for mobile hosts. It did not. Rather, the alleged issues with IPSec presented by the '397 patent were well-known and solved long before the earliest priority date of the '397 patent. Ex. 1002, Goldschlag Decl., ¶¶45-52. In particular, the '397 patent alleged that IPSec was designed for static connections, and therefore when a mobile host moved or changed its network address, IPSec provided no mechanism to alter parameters of the secure connection. *Id.* 

The '397 patent alleged to solve these problems by establishing an end-toend secure connection between two end hosts via an intermediate computer. But not only is this solution trivial, it was also explicitly disclosed by RFC3104 prior to the earliest priority date of the '397 patent. Additionally, Grabelsky explains other well-known and simple elements of the claims that would have been known to a POSITA, such as data packet formats and use of translation tables.

Accordingly, there is at least a reasonable likelihood that at least one claim of the '397 patent is unpatentable, as shown herein. Therefore, Petitioner

# 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.

