

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BOSE CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

KOSS CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

CASE: IPR2021-00612
U.S. PATENT NO. 10,206,025

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 3

 A. '025 Patent..... 3

 B. Related Patents 4

 C. Related Matters..... 4

III. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE OF THE
CO-PENDING LITIGATIONS..... 6

 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 Bose Litigation Prior to the Institution
Decision..... 15

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

 E. Factor 5: Petitioner is a Defendant in the Bose 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 BOARD SHOULD DECLINE TO INSTITUTE UNDER 35
U.S.C. § 325(D)..... 24

 A. The Same or Substantially the Same Prior Art or Arguments
Previously Were Presented to the Patent Office 25

1.	The Similarities and Material Differences Between the Asserted Art and the Prior Art Involving During Examination	25
2.	The Cumulative Nature of the Asserted Art and the Prior Art Evaluated During Examination	28
3.	The Extent of Overlap Between the Arguments Made During Examination and the Manner in Which Petitioner Relies on the Prior Art	29
B.	Whether the Patent Office Materially Erred in Evaluation the Art or Arguments.....	30
1.	The Extent to Which the Asserted Art Was Evaluated During Examination Including Whether the Prior Art Was the Basis for Rejection.....	30
2.	Whether Petitioner Has Pointed Out Sufficiently How the Examiner Erred in its Evaluation of the Asserted Prior Art	31
3.	The Extent to Which Additional Evidence and Facts are Presented in the Petition Warrant Reconsideration of the Prior Art or Arguments	32
C.	Conclusion.....	32
V.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE THERE IS NOT A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT PETITIONER WILL PREVAIL ON ONE CHALLENGED CLAIM	32
A.	For Ground 1A, the Petition's Rationales for Combining Rezvani-446, Rezvani-875 and Skulley are Defective	33
1.	The Proposed Motivation to Combine Rezvani-446, Rezvani-875, and Skulley is Conclusory.....	33
2.	The Proposed Rezvani-446, Rezvani-875, and Skulley Combination Relies on Hindsight Reconstruction	35

B.	For Ground 2A, the Petition's Rationales for Combining Schrager and Goldstein are Defective.....	38
1.	The Petition Inappropriately Characterizes the Personal Audio Assistant (PAA) of Goldstein	39
2.	The Proposed Motivation to Combine Schrager and Goldstein is Inaccurate and Conclusory	41
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	42

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH,</i> IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (PTAB Feb 13, 2020).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Amazon.com, Inc. v. Barnesandnoble.com, Inc.,</i> 239 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	36
<i>Apple Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.,</i> IPR2015-00445, Paper 9 (PTAB July 9, 2015)	35
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.,</i> IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB March 20, 2020)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Apple Inc. v Koss Corporation,</i> IPR2021-00255, Paper 22 (PTAB June 3, 2021)	13, 14
<i>Belden Inv. v. Berk-Tek LLC,</i> 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	36
<i>Bose Corp. v. Koss Corp.,</i> IPR2021-00297, Paper 16 (PTAB June 3, 2021)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Cellco P'ship v. Huawei Tech. Co.,</i> IPR2020-01356, Paper 13, 14 (PTAB Mar. 5, 2021)	19
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Monarch Networking Sols. LLC,</i> IPR2020-01226, Paper 11, 15 (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 Co.,</i> 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	18, 36

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.