UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

KOSS CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

CASE: IPR2021-00626
U.S. PATENT NO. 10,206,025

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 4

A. The '025 Patent 4

B. Related Patents 5

C. Related Matters 5

III. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE OF CO-PENDING LITIGATION INVOLVING THE '025 PATENT 7

A. Factor 1: The District Court Has Not Issued a Stay 9

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 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 21

G. Holistic Assessment of *Fintiv* Factors 24

IV. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED DISCRETIONARILY UNDER *GENERAL PLASTIC* 26

A. Factor 1: Whether the Same Petitioner Previously Filed a Petition Directed to the Same Claims of the Same Patent 28

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

B. Factor 2: Whether at the Time of Filing of the First Petition the Petitioner Knew of the Prior Art Asserted in the Second Petition or Should Have Known of It....29

C. Factor 3: Whether at the Time of Filing of the Second Petition the Petitioner Already Received the Patent Owner's Preliminary Response to the First Petition or Received the Board's Decision on Whether to Institute Review of the First Petition....31

D. Factor 4: The Length of Time that Elapsed Between the Time the Petitioner Learned of the Prior Art Asserted in the Second Petition and the Filing of the Second Petition....32

E. Factor 5: Whether the Petitioner Provides Adequate Explanation for the Time Elapsed Between the Filings of Multiple Petitions Directed to the Same Claims of the Same Patent....33

F. Factors 6 and 7: The Finite Resources of the Board, and the Requirement to Issue a Final Determination Not Later Than One Year After the Date on Which the Director Notices Institution of Review....34

V. THE PETITION FAILS TO SHOW THAT THERE IS REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT PETITIONER WILL PREVAIL ON A SINGLE CLAIM....36

A. The Petition Fails to Show that the Haupt-Seshadri-716 Combination Satisfies All Elements of Claim 1....37

1. The Petition Fails to Show that the Haupt-Seshadri-716 Combination Satisfies "a remote, network-connected server that is in wireless communication with the mobile, digital audio player" as Recited in Claim 1....38

2. The Petition Fails to Show that the Haupt-Seshadri-716 Combination Satisfies "the processor for, upon activation of a user-control of the headphone assembly, initiating transmission of a request to ***the*** remote, network-connected, server"....41

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

3. The Petition Fails to Show that the Haupt-Seshadri-716 Combination Satisfies "a rechargeable battery for powering the headphone assembly" 42

B. The Petition's Rationales for Combining Haupt and Seshadri-716 are Defective.....47

1. The Petition's Rationales for Combining Haupt and Seshadri-716 are Inconsistent and Conclusory.....47

2. The Petition Does Not Identify a Recognized Rationale for Combining References 49

3. The Proposed Haupt-Seshadri-716 Combination Relies on Hindsight Reconstruction.....51

C. The Petition Did Not Follow the Proper Framework for Assessing Obviousness 53

1. Legal Framework for Assessing Obviousness.....53

2. The Petition Does Not Identify the Differences Between the Claimed Subject Matter and the Cited References 56

3. The Petition's Improper Obviousness Analysis Places an Undue Burden on the Board 58

VI. CONCLUSION.....60

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Activevideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.,
694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 50, 51

Adaptics Ltd. v. Perfect Co.,
IPR 2018-01596, Paper 20 (PTAB March 6, 2019) 58

Adaptics Ltd. v. Perfect Co.,
IPR2018-01596, Paper 20 (PTAB Mar. 6, 2019) 59

Advanced Display Systems, Inc. v. Kent State Univ.,
212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000) 30

Amazon.com, Inc. v. Barnesandnoble.com, Inc.,
239 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2001) 51

Apple Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.,
IPR2015-00445, Paper 9 (PTAB July 9, 2015) 51

Apple Inc. v. Corephotonics Ltd.,
IPR2018-01356, Paper 9 at 8 (PTAB Feb. 5, 2019).....32, 33

Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.,
IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB March 20, 2020) .....*passim*

Apple Inc. v. Koss Corp.,
IPR2021-00255, Paper 22 (PTAB June 3, 2021) .....*passim*

Apple Inc. v. Koss Corp.,
IPR2021-00305, Paper 14 (PTAB June 3, 2021) 6, 18, 24

Apple Inc. v. Koss Corp.,
IPR2021-00381, Paper 15 (PTAB July 2, 2021).....*passim*

Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.,
832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 45, 46

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.