UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BOSE CORPORATION, Petitioner,

v.

KOSS CORPORATION, Patent Owner.

CASE IPR2021-00297 U.S. PATENT NO. 10,368,155

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTE	RODUCTION1				
II.	BAC	KGROUND				
III.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 314					
	A.	Factor 1: The District Court Has Not Issued a Stay				
	B.	Factor 2: Proximity of the Scheduled Trial Date to the Board's Statutory Deadline for Written Decision				
	C.	Factor 3: The Parties and Court Will Have Invested Substantial Resources in the Corresponding Litigation Prior to Institution11				
	D.	Factor 4: The Issues Raised in the Petition Overlap Substantially with Issues Raised in the Texas Litigations				
	E.	Factor 5: Petitioner is a Defendant in the Texas Litigations				
	F.	Factor 6: Other Considerations That Influence the Board's Exercise of Discretion Weigh in Favor of Denying Institution				
IV.	THE PETITION FAILS TO SHOW THAT THERE IS REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT PETITIONER WILL PREVAIL ON A SINGLE CLAIM					
	A.	The Petition Fails to Show that the Challenged Claims are Anticipated by Pelland				
		1. The PCT and Provisional Applications Do Not Unambiguously Limit the Invention to Transitioning from an Ad Hoc Wireless Network to an Infrastructure Wireless Network When a Connection is Lost				
		2. The Inventors Possessed a Headphone Assembly Configured to Transition Automatically Between Wireless Networks				



		3.	Petitioner Fails to Show Lack of Written Description Support for the "Transition Automatically" Limitation	. 26		
	В.	GROUNDS 2A-2E OF THE PETITION FAIL TO ESTABLISH THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS				
		1.	Rezvani Does Not Disclose the "Transition Automatically" Limitation and Petitioner Mischaracterizes the Teachings of Rezvani	. 30		
		2.	Koss Did Not Admit that Rezvani Discloses the "Transition Automatically" Limitation in the European Patent Office	.33		
	C.	THA	UNDS 3A-3D OF THE PETITION FAIL TO ESTABLISH T THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS WOULD HAVE BEEN IOUS	.37		
		1.	The Petition Fails to Show that the Relied-Upon References for Grounds 3A-3D Satisfy the "Transition Automatically" Limitation of Claim 1	.38		
		2.	The Petition's Alleged Motivations to Combine Nakagawa with Wilson and Rosener are Deficient and Do Not Consider the References for All That They Teach	.41		
V	CON	CLUS	ION	44		



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s) Cases Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Eletromedizinishe Geraete GMBH, AIA Eng'g Ltd. v. Magotteaux Int'l S/A, 657 F.3d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 2011)......34 Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc., IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB March 20, 2020)......passim Apple Inc. v. Motorola, Inc., 757 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2014)......34 Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co, 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc)......24, 25 Biofrontera Inc. v. DUSA Pharms., Inc., Carnegie Mellon Univ. v. Hoffman-LaRoche, Inc., 541 F.3d 1115 (Fed. Cir. 2008)......23 Cordis Corp. v. Medtronic AVE, Inc., 339 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2003)......25 Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc. v. Alpine Electronics of America, Inc., 609 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2010)......28 Gillette Co. v. Energizer Holdings, Inc., Google LLC v. Personalized Media Commc's, LLC, Hakim v. Cannon Avent Group, PLC, 479 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2007)......27



Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	4
Intel Corp. v. VLSI Tech. LLC, IPR2019-01192, Paper 15 (PTAB Jan. 9, 2020)	5
Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd., 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	33
Johnson Worldwide Assocs., Inc. v Zebco Corp., 175 F.3d 985 (Fed. Cir. 1999)1	17, 25
Medichem, S.A. v. Rolabo, SL, 437 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	42
Mintz v. Dietz & Watson, Inc., 679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	43
NHK Spring Co. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc., IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018)	1
<i>Pfizer, Inc. v. Ranbaxy Labs. Ltd.</i> , 457 F.3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	34
In re Rasmussen, 650 F.2d 1212 (CCPA 1981)	25
Regents of Univ. of Minn. v. AGA Med. Corp., 717 F.3d 929 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	35
Retractable Techs., Inc. v. Becton, Dickenson & Co., 653 F.3d 1296 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	
Rivera v. Int'l Trade Comm'n 857 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	26
Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Ancora Techs., Inc., IPR2020-01184, Paper 11 (PTAB Jan. 5, 2021)	15, 16
Sand Revolution v. Cont'l Intermodal GrpTrucking LLC, IPR2019-01393, Paper 24 (PTAB June 16, 2020)	.8, 15



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.

