

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

APPLE INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

KOSS CORPORATION,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2021-00600  
Patent 10,298,451

---

**PATENT OWNER RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. BACKGROUND .....	3
A. Summary of the '451 Patent.....	3
B. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	7
C. Petitioner's Invalidation Grounds and Evidence .....	9
1. Scherzer.....	13
2. Subramaniam .....	21
3. The Scherzer-Subramaniam Combination.....	23
D. Relevant Issues for Obviousness Determination.....	29
E. A POSITA Would Not Attempt to Use Scherzer's Access Credentials with an Unrecognized Device.....	32
1. Transmission and Use of Scherzer's Access Credentials by an Unrecognized Device Ignores the Account Acceptability Requirement and Associated Tracking in Scherzer.....	32
a. Scherzer's Account Acceptability Requirement and Associated Tracking Precludes Petitioner's Scherzer- Subramaniam Combination .....	33
b. Petitioner's Scherzer-Subramaniam Combination Ignores Scherzer's Account Acceptability Requirement and Tracking .....	37
2. Scherzer and Subramaniam, As a Whole, Discourage Unfettered Dissemination of Access Credentials to Unrecognized Devices .....	40
3. Subramaniam's Configuration Techniques Apply to In- Home Wireless Networks .....	41

4.	A Simpler Approach to Obtaining the Scherzer Software Client Exists .....	43
F.	The Petition’s Obviousness Analysis Relies on Impermissible Hindsight Reconstruction.....	43
1.	Defects in Petitioner’s First Example .....	44
2.	Defects in Petitioner’s Second Example.....	47
3.	Defects in Cooperstock’s Testimony .....	49
G.	The Petitioner’s Flawed Analysis Obscures Any Comparison of Scherzer and Subramaniam to the Challenged Claims .....	55
III.	OBJECTIVE INDICIA OF NONOBVIOUSNESS CONFIRM THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE PATENTABLE .....	56
A.	Background .....	56
B.	Legal Principles.....	57
C.	There is a Nexus Between the HomePods and the Claims of ’451 Patent .....	59
D.	There is Evidence that the HomePods Have Achieved Commercial Success Since their Debut .....	62
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	63

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>AG v. Nike, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00921, Paper 21 (PTAB Oct. 19, 2017).....	54
<i>Apple Inc. v. Koss Corp.</i> , IPR2021-00600, Paper 9 (PTAB Sept. 1, 2021).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Apple Inc. v. Koss Corp.</i> , IPR2021-00600, Paper 19 (PTAB Nov. 24, 2021).....	59
<i>In re Applied Materials, Inc.</i> , 692 F.3d 1289 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	63
<i>BMW of N. Am., LLC v. Stragent, LLC</i> , IPR2017-00677, Paper 32 (PTAB June 13, 2018) .....	12, 52
<i>Demaco Corp. v. F. Von Langsdorff Licensing Ltd.</i> , 851 F.2d 1387 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....	58, 60
<i>Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. California Edison Co.</i> , 227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	52, 58
<i>FMC Tech. Inc. v. OneSubsea IP UK Ltd.</i> , IPR2019-00935, Paper 45 (PTAB Oct. 14, 2020).....	54
<i>Fox Factory, Inc. v. SRAM, LLC</i> , 944 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	58
<i>Goodyear Tire &amp; Rubber Co. v. Ray-O-Vac Co.</i> , 321 U.S. 275 (1944).....	2, 58
<i>Graham v John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>In re Huang</i> , 100 F.3d 135 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	63

<i>In re Keller</i> , 642 F.2d 413 (C.C.P.A. 1981) .....	30
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	8
<i>Merck &amp; Co., Inc. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	58
<i>Mintz v. Dietz &amp; Watson, Inc.</i> , 679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	55
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	11, 47
<i>Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.</i> , 810 F.3d 1561 (Fed. Cir. 1987) .....	52
<i>In re Schweickert</i> , 676 F. App'x. 988 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	47
<i>SightSound Techs., LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , 809 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	58
<i>Silicon Labs., Inc. v. Cresta Tech. Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00809, Paper 56 (PTAB Oct. 21, 2015).....	54
<i>Unified Patent Inc. v. Plectrum LLC</i> , IPR2017-01430, Paper 30 (Nov. 13, 2018).....	12
<i>W.L. Gore &amp; Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.</i> , 721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983) .....	9, 35
<b>Other Authorities</b>	
37 C.F.R. § 42.120 .....	1

# 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.