

Paper No. ____

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BOSE CORPORATION
Petitioner,

v.

KOSS CORPORATION
Patent Owner.

Case No. TBD
Patent No. 10,368,155

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.1 *et seq.***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	MANDATORY NOTICES	xvi
A.	Real Party-In-Interest – § 42.8(b)(1).....	xvi
B.	Related Matters – § 42.8(b)(2)	xvi
1.	United States Patent & Trademark Office	xvi
2.	United States District Court for the Western District of Texas	xvii
C.	Counsel and Service Information – § 42.8(b)(3) and (b)(4)	xvii
II.	INTRODUCTION	1
III.	CERTIFICATION OF STANDING	4
IV.	UNPATENTABILITY GROUNDS.....	4
V.	OVERVIEW OF THE '155 PATENT	4
A.	Summary of the Challenged Claims	7
B.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	8
C.	Prosecution History	8
1.	The '155 Patent	8
2.	Earlier History.....	9
a.	Before the '155 Patent, Koss Exclusively Claimed the Ability to “Transition Automatically” from an Ad Hoc Network to an Infrastructure Network When Out of Range of the Ad Hoc Network	9
b.	The EPO Found, and Koss Conceded, that Rezvani Discloses the “Transition Automatically” Limitation ...	10
VI.	CLAIM INTERPRETATION	11

VII.	UNPATENTABILITY GROUNDS.....	11
A.	Ground 1: Pelland Renders All Challenged Claims Unpatentable	11
1.	Legal Standards.....	11
2.	Absent Priority, Pelland Is Prior Art.....	12
3.	Priority Is Lacking Since the Priority Applications Fail to Support the “Transition Automatically” Limitation.....	12
a.	The Priority Applications Only Disclose Transition Due to Lost Connection	13
b.	The Priority Applications Only Disclose Transition Between Ad Hoc and Infrastructure Networks	15
c.	All Challenged Claims Lack Priority	16
4.	Pelland Anticipates All Challenged Claims.....	17
B.	Grounds 2A-2E: All Challenged Claims Would Have Been Obvious Over Rezvani in View of Other References	24
1.	Ground 2A: Claims 1-4, 6-8 and 14 Would Have Been Obvious Over Rezvani in View of Skulley	25
a.	Rezvani	25
b.	Skulley	27
c.	The Rezvani-Skulley Combination	28
d.	Claim 1.....	29
(1)	[1.a] A wireless headphone assembly comprising:.....	29
(2)	[1.b] first and second earphones, wherein each of the first and second earphones comprises an acoustic transducer;	30
(3)	[1.c] an antenna for receiving wireless signals; ..	31

(4)	[1.d] a wireless communication circuit connected to the antenna, wherein the wireless communication circuit is for receiving and transmitting wireless signals to and from the wireless headphone assembly;.....	32
(5)	[1.e] a processor in communication with the wireless communication circuit; and.....	33
(6)	[1.f] a rechargeable battery for powering the wireless headphone assembly,.....	34
(7)	[1.g] wherein the headphone assembly is configured, with the processor, to transition automatically from playing digital audio content received wirelessly by the headphone assembly via a first wireless network to playing digital audio content received wirelessly by the headphone assembly via a second wireless network.....	35
e.	Claim 2.....	37
f.	Claim 3.....	38
g.	Headphone Design Claims	40
(1)	Claim 4	41
(2)	Claims 6-8	41
h.	Claim 14.....	42
2.	Ground 2B: Claims 11-12 Would Have Been Obvious Over Rezvani, Skulley and Feder.....	43
a.	Feder	43
b.	The Rezvani-Skulley-Feder Combination.....	44
c.	Claims 11-12.....	45

3.	Ground 2C: Claim 13 Would Have Been Obvious Over Rezvani, Skulley and Hind.....	45
a.	Hind	46
b.	The Rezvani-Skulley-Hind Combination.....	46
c.	Claim 13.....	48
4.	Ground 2D: Claims 5 and 9 Would Have Been Obvious Over Rezvani, Skulley and Rosener.....	48
a.	Rosener	49
b.	The Rezvani-Skulley-Rosener Combination.....	51
c.	Claim 5.....	52
d.	Claim 9.....	52
5.	Ground 2E: Claim 10 Would Have Been Obvious Over Rezvani, Skulley and Wilson	54
a.	Wilson.....	54
b.	The Rezvani-Skulley-Wilson Combination	55
c.	Claim 10.....	56
C.	Grounds 3A-3D: Challenged Claims 1-10 and 13-14 Would Have Been Obvious Over Nakagawa in View of Other References.....	56
1.	Ground 3A: Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10 and 14 Would Have Been Obvious Over Nakagawa in View of Wilson.....	57
a.	Nakagawa	57
b.	Wilson.....	60
c.	The Nakagawa-Wilson Combination	60

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.