

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

KOSS CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

CASE: IPR2021-00592
U.S. PATENT NO. 10,469,934

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 4

 A. ’934 Patent..... 4

 B. Related Proceedings 5

III. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE OF CO-PENDING LITIGATION INVOLVING THE ’934 PATENT..... 6

 A. Factor 1: The District Court Has Not Issued a Stay..... 7

 B. Factor 2: Proximity of the Scheduled Trial Date to the Board’s Statutory Deadline for Written Decision..... 10

 C. Factor 3: The Parties and Court Will Have Invested Substantial Resources in the Texas Litigation Prior to the Institution Decision ... 13

 D. Factor 4: The Issues Raised in the Petition Overlap Substantially with Issues Raised in the Texas Litigation..... 16

 E. Factor 5: Petitioner is a Defendant in the Texas Litigation 20

 F. Factor 6: Other Considerations That Influence the Board’s Exercise of Discretion Weigh in Favor of Denying Institution..... 20

 G. Holistic Assessment of *Fintiv* Factors..... 22

IV. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE THE PETITION PRESENTS SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME ART PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED BY THE OFFICE AND HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED A MATERIAL ERROR BY THE OFFICE 24

 A. Contrary to Petitioner’s Assertion, the Petition Relies on the Same and Substantially the Same Art Considered by the Office 26

1.	<i>Becton, Dickinson</i> Factor (a): The Asserted Art and Prior Art Evaluated during Examination are Highly Similar and The Differences Show the Evaluated Prior Art is More Relevant...28
2.	<i>Becton, Dickinson</i> Factor (b): The Petition Relies on Teachings that are Cumulative to the Teachings Considered by the Office.....33
3.	<i>Becton, Dickinson</i> Factor (d): The Manner in Which Petitioner Relies on the Prior Art Overlaps with the Examiner’s Assessment of the Closest Prior Art34
4.	The Other Relied-Upon References Do Not Cure the Deficiencies of Haupt, Seshadri and Rao35
B.	Petitioner Fails to Make a Showing of Material Error by the Examiner36
1.	<i>Becton, Dickinson</i> Factor (c) – The Teachings of Haupt and Seshadri Were Evaluated During Examination37
2.	<i>Becton, Dickinson</i> Factor (e) – Petitioner Has Not Sufficiently Pointed Out How the Examiner Erred In His Evaluation of the Asserted Prior Art38
3.	<i>Becton, Dickinson</i> Factor (f) – Petitioner Does Not Present Additional Evidence or Facts to Warrant Reconsideration of Any Combination Involving Haupt38
V.	THE PETITION FAILS TO SHOW THAT THERE IS REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT PETITIONER WILL PREVAIL ON A SINGLE CLAIM.....39
A.	The Petition Fails to Show that the Haupt-Seshadri-Rao Combination Satisfies “the processor is configured to, upon activation of a user-control of the headphone assembly, initiate transmission of a request to a remote, network-connected server that is in wireless communication with the mobile, digital audio player”41

B. The Petition Fails to Show that the Haupt-Seshadri-Rao Combination Satisfies “a rechargeable battery for powering the headphone assembly”44

VI. CONCLUSION.....48

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geraete GmbH,</i> IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2020).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.,</i> IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB March 20, 2020)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Apple Inc. v. Koss Corp.,</i> IPR2021-00255, Paper 22 (PTAB June 3, 2021)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Apple Inc. v. Koss Corp.,</i> IPR2021-00305, Paper 22 (PTAB June 3, 2021)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Aquestive Therapeutics, Inc. v. Neurelis, Inc.,</i> IPR2019-00450, Paper 8 (PTAB Aug. 1, 2019).....	38, 39
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.,</i> 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	46, 47, 48
<i>B/E Aerospace, Inc. v. C&D Zodiac, Inc.,</i> 962 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	46
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG,</i> IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (PTAB Dec. 15, 2017)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Monarch Networking Sols. LLC,</i> IPR2020-01226, Paper 11, 15 (PTAB Mar. 4, 2021).....	19
<i>GlaxoSmithKline Consumer Healthcare Holdings (US) LLC v. Cipla Ltd.,</i> IPR2020-00369, Paper 7 (PTAB July 31, 2020).....	26
<i>Google LLC v. Personalized Media Commc'ns, LLC,</i> IPR2020-00724, Paper 19 (PTAB Aug. 31, 2020).....	7

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.