

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT**

01 COMMUNIQUE LABORATORY, INC.,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

LOGMEIN, INC.,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia in
case no. 10-CV-1007, Senior Judge Claude M. Hilton.

BRIEF FOR DEFENDANT-APPELLEE

WAYNE L. STONER
VINITA FERRERA
ARTHUR W. COVIELLO
ALEXANDRA AMRHEIN
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
(617) 526-6000
Attorneys for LogMeIn, Inc.

October 7, 2011

CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST

Counsel for Defendant-Appellee LogMeIn, Inc. certifies the following:

1. The full name of every party or amicus represented by me is:

LogMeIn, Inc.

2. The name of the real party in interest (if the party named in the caption is not the real party in interest) represented by me is:

LogMeIn, Inc.

3. All parent corporations and any publicly held companies that own 10 percent or more of the stock of the party or amicus curiae represented by me are:

There is no such corporation.

4. The names of all law firms and the partners or associates that appeared for the party or amicus now represented by me in the trial court or agency or are expected to appear in this Court are:

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP: Wayne L. Stoner, Vinita Ferrera, Joel Cavanaugh, Philip Seybold, Arthur W. Coviello, Brian Larivee, Katherine Dirks, Alexandra Amrhein, Kellie McEvoy

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP: Charles Bennett Molster, III

Dated: October 7, 2011



ARTHUR W. COVIELLO
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
Tel: (617) 526-6000
Attorney for LogMeIn, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST	1
TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iv
STATEMENT OF RELATED CASES	1
STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	2
STATEMENT OF THE FACTS.....	5
A. The Parties	5
B. Background On Remote Access Technology.....	6
C. The '479 Patent.....	8
D. The Reexamination Of The '479 Patent.....	11
E. LogMeIn's Accused Products.....	16
F. The District Court Proceedings	21
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT.....	24
ARGUMENT	27
I. Standard of Review	27
II. "Location Facility" Must Be Construed Consistent With The Claim Language, Specification, And Prosecution History.....	28
III. The District Court Correctly Construed "Location Facility".....	29
A. The District Court's Construction Of "Location Facility" Is Supported By The Claim Language	30