

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

KOSS CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

CASE: IPR2021-00600
U.S. PATENT NO. 10,298,451

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. BACKGROUND..... 4

 A. ’451 Patent 4

 B. Related Matters 6

III. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE OF CO-PENDING LITIGATION INVOLVING THE ’451 PATENT..... 7

 A. Factor 1: The District Court Has Not Issued a Stay..... 8

 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 .. 14

 D. Factor 4: The Issues Raised in the Petition Overlap Substantially with Issues Raised in the Texas Litigation..... 17

 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 21

 G. Holistic Assessment of *Fintiv* Factors 22

IV. THE PETITION DOES NOT ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS..... 24

 A. Overview of the Petition’s Obviousness Analysis 26

 B. Defects In The Petition’s First Example Scenario 28

 C. Defects In The Petition’s Second Example Scenario..... 31

D. The Examples Do Not Demonstrate a POSITA Would Contemplate the Scherzer-Subramaniam Combination 36

E. The Petition's Flawed Analysis Obscures Any Comparison of Scherzer and Subramaniam to the Challenged Claims 37

V. CONCLUSION 38

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Apple Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00449, Paper 10, (PTAB July 15, 2015).....	37
<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 14 (PTAB June 3, 2021)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Monarch Networking Sols. LLC</i> , IPR2020-01226, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 4, 2021).....	20
<i>Google LLC v. Personalized Media Commc'ns, LLC</i> , IPR2020-00724, Paper 19 (PTAB Aug. 31, 2020).....	8
<i>Graham v. John Deere</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	7
<i>Intel Corp. v. VLSI Tech. LLC</i> , IPR2019-01192, Paper 15 (PTAB Jan. 9, 2020)	7
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	25
<i>MediaTek Inc. v. Nippon Tel. and Tel. Corp.</i> , IPR2020-01607, Paper 12 (PTAB April 2, 2021)	9
<i>Mintz v. Dietz & Watson, Inc.</i> , 679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	37

<i>In re Mouttet</i> , 686 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	19
<i>Nautilus Hyosung Inc. v. Diebold, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00633, Paper 9 (PTAB Aug. 22, 2016).....	36
<i>NHK Spring Co. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018)	1
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	25, 31
<i>Plas-Pak Indus., Inc. v. Sulzer Mixpac AG</i> , 600 Fed. App'x 755 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	34
<i>In re Ratti</i> , 270 F.2d 810 (CCPA 1959).....	34
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Ancora Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2020-01184, Paper 11 (PTAB Jan. 5, 2021)	8, 18, 20, 21
<i>Sand Revolution II, LLC v. Continental Intermodal Grp. Trucking LLC</i> , IPR2019-01393, Paper 24 (PTAB June 16, 2020)	9, 12, 13, 23
<i>In re Schweickert</i> , 676 F. App'x. 988 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	30
<i>SK Hynix v. Netlist</i> , IPR2020-01421, Paper 10 (Mar. 16, 2021)	15
<i>Sotera Wireless, Inc. v. Masimo Corp.</i> , IPR2020-01019, Paper 12 (PTAB Dec. 1, 2020)	20
<i>Verizon Bus. Network Servs. LLC v. Huawei Techs. Co.</i> , IPR2020-01292, Paper 13 (PTAB Jan. 25, 2021)	15, 16, 21
<i>Verizon Bus. Network Svs., LLC v. Huawei Tech. Co.</i> , IPR2020-01278, Paper 12, 13 (PTAB Jan. 26, 2021)	20

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.