

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

KOSS CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2021-00255
Patent 10,298,451

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	2
III. THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION AND DENY INSTITUTION FOR ALL GROUNDS PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 314.....	4
A. Factor 1: The District Court Has Not Issued a Stay	5
B. Factor 2: Proximity of the Scheduled Trial Date to the Board’s Statutory Deadline for Written Decision	8
C. Factor 3: The Parties and Court Will Have Invested Substantial Resources in the Texas Litigation Prior to the Institution Decision ..	12
D. Factor 4: There is Potentially Significant Overlap Between Issues Raised in the Petition and the Texas Litigation	14
E. Factor 5: Petitioner is Defendant in the Texas Litigation.....	16
F. Factor 6: Other Considerations That Influence the Board’s Exercise of Discretion Weigh in Favor of Denying Institution	17
IV. THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS	18
A. The Legal Framework for Assessing Obviousness	19
B. The Petition Does Not Establish a Reasonable Likelihood That the Challenged Claims Would Have Been Obvious.....	21
1. The Petition Does Not Identify the Differences Between the Claimed Subject Matter and the Cited References.....	21

2.	The Petition Does Not Articulate an Explicit Rationale and Meaningful Explanation for Combining Brown and Scherzer	24
3.	The Examples Demonstrating Hypothetical Applications of the Proposed Combination are Hindsight Reconstructions Based on the Claimed Subject Matter	31
4.	The Petition’s Obviousness Analysis Places an Undue Burden on the Board.....	35
V.	CONCLUSION	36

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Activevideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	30
<i>Adaptics Ltd. v. Perfect Co.</i> , IPR 2018-01596	24, 35
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB March 20, 2020).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Ramot at Tel Aviv Univ. Ltd.</i> , IPR2020-00122, Paper 15 (PTAB May 15, 2020).....	17
<i>DynamicDrinkware, LLC v. Nat'l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	21
<i>Google Inc. v. Everymd.com LLC</i> , IPR2014-00347, Paper 9 (PTAB May 22, 2014).....	21, 35, 36
<i>Google LLC v. Personalized Media Commc'ns, LLC</i> , IPR2020-00724, Paper 19 (PTAB Aug. 31, 2020)	5
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	4, 21
<i>Intel Corp. v. VLSI Tech. LLC</i> , IPR2019-01192, Paper 15 (PTAB Jan. 9, 2020).....	4
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	35
<i>Johns Manville Corp. v. Knauf Insulation, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00827, Paper 9 (PTAB October 16, 2018)	26

<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	20
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Micron Tech., Inc. v. Godo Kaisha IP Bridge 1</i> , IPR2020-01008, Paper 10 (PTAB Dec. 7, 2020).....	9
<i>Mintz v. Dietz & Watson, Inc.</i> , 679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	20, 34
<i>Nautilus Hyosung Inc. v. Diebold, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00633, Paper 9 (PTAB Aug. 22, 2016)	34
<i>NHK Spring Co. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018)	1
<i>PersonalWeb Tech. LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	26
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Ancora Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2020-01184, Paper 11 (PTAB Jan. 5, 2021).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Sand Revolution v. Cont'l Intermodal Grp.-Trucking LLC</i> , IPR2019-01393, Paper 24 (PTAB June 16, 2020).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>In re Schweickert</i> , 676 F. App'x. 988 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	34
<i>Securus Techs., Inc. v. Global Tel*Link Corp.</i> , 701 F. App'x 971 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	25
<i>Sotera Wireless, Inc. v. Masimo Corp.</i> , IPR2020-01019, Paper 12 (PTAB Dec. 1, 2020) (Precedential)	15
<i>Verizon Bus. Network Servs. LLC v. Huawei Techs. Co.</i> , IPR2020-01292, Paper 13 (PTAB Jan. 25, 2021).....	13, 14, 17
<i>Western Digital Corp. v. Kuster</i> , IPR2020-01391, Paper 10 (PTAB Feb. 16, 2021)	10

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.