

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent of: Michael J. Koss, et al.  
U.S. Patent No.: 10,206,025 Attorney Docket No.: 50095-0021IP1/0021IP2  
Issue Date: February 12, 2019  
Appl. Serial No.: 15/962,305  
Filing Date: April 25, 2018  
Title: SYSTEM WITH WIRELESS EARPHONES

**Mail Stop Patent Board**

Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**PETITIONER'S NOTICE RANKING PETITIONS**  
**AND EXPLAINING MATERIAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN**  
**PETITIONS AGAINST U.S. PATENT NO. 10,206,025**

Petitioner now has two concurrent petitions challenging the validity of all claims of U.S. Patent No. 10,206,025 (“the ’025 patent”): IPR2021-00546 filed February 22 and IPR2021-00626 filed March 17 (herewith). As explained below, each petition challenges a different set of the 56 claims Patent Owner asserted against Petitioner in the co-pending litigation. APPLE-1014. Pursuant to the Board’s July 2019 Trial Practice Guide Update, Petitioner submits this paper to “identify: (1) a ranking of the Petitions in the order in which it wishes the Board to consider the merits..., and (2) a succinct explanation of the differences between the Petitions, why the issues addressed by the differences are material, and why the Board should exercise its discretion to institute additional petitions.”

## I. Ordering of Petitions

Petitioner believes that both petitions are meritorious and justified, especially because (as explained further below), both petitions are necessary to address the 56 claims that Patent Owner asserted against Petitioner in the co-pending district court litigation. Nonetheless, to the extent required, Petitioner requests that the Board consider the petitions in the following order:

Rank	PTAB Case No.	Challenged Claims
1	IPR2021-00546  (First Petition)	1-3, 6, 8, 10-13,  16, 18, 20-22, 25,  27, 29-31, 34, 36,

		38-43, 46, 48, and 51-56
2	IPR2021-00626 (Second Petition)	1-6, 9, 11-17, 19- 26, 28-35, 37, 40- 50

## II. Material Differences that Compel Permitting Multiple Petitions

The Board’s “Trial Practice Guide” notes that “the Board recognizes that there may be circumstances in which more than one petition may be necessary, including, for example, when the patent owner has asserted a large number of claims.” Consolidated TPG at 59 (Nov. 2019). This case presents a prototypical case where “patent owner has asserted a large number of claims.” As explained in Section V of both petitions, Patent Owner asserted all 56 claims of the ’025 Patent against Petitioner in the co-pending litigation.

Each of the petitions of the first and second petitions cover different claims. Specifically, the first petition challenges claims 1-3, 6, 8, 10-13, 16, 18, 20-22, 25, 27, 29-31, 34, 36, 38-43, 46, 48, and 51-56, which is all claims except those dependent claims that recite that “the headphone assembly transitions to play digital audio content received wirelessly from the second digital audio source . . . based

on, at least, a signal strength level . . .” (i.e., the “signal strength claims”). The second petition relies upon the disclosure of Seshadri-818, in addition to the prior art relied upon in IPR2021-00546, with the intent of demonstrating the unpatentability of the signal strength claims (i.e., claims 4, 5, 7, 9, 14-15, 17, 19, 23-24, 26, 28, 32-33, 35, 37, 44-45, 47, 49-50). Given the dependencies of the signal strength claims, however, there is substantial overlap between the first and second petitions. As a result, the primary difference between the first and second petitions is an approximately six page section of the second petition that addresses the signal strength claims (*see* pp. 35-41 of the second petition). This is a concise addition to deal with the 21 identical signal strength claims, the inclusion of which was entirely precipitated by Koss’s allegation that Apple infringes all 56 claims of the ’025 patent—a number of claims that could not reasonably be addressed in a single petition. APPLE-1014. Thus, Apple has judiciously moderated any increase in burden from the two petitions, and such increase in burden is a direct result of Koss’s conduct in the co-pending litigation.

In cases like this one where a patent owner asserts more than 30 claims against a petitioner, the Board has regularly allowed for the filing of multiple petitions to challenge the excessive number of asserted claims. *See, e.g., Apple Inc. v. Seven Networks, LLC*, IPR2020-00707, Paper 11 at 19-21 (PTAB Oct. 22, 2020) (granting two petitions filed against 44 asserted claims); *Dolby Laboratories, Inc.*

*v. Intertrust Technologies Corp.*, IPR2020-01106, Paper 12 at 19-21 (PTAB Jan 5, 2021) (granting two petitions filed against 18 claims); *Adobe Inc. v. Synkcloud Technologies, LLC*, Paper 8 at 8-10 (PTAB Mar. 11, 2021) (granting two petitions filed against 20 “lengthy” and “complex” asserted claims). Further, the petitions of IPR2021-00546 and IPR2021-00626 were each filed relatively close in time (approximately three weeks apart), providing the Board an opportunity to gain efficiencies by issuing a single scheduling order that sets the same due dates for both proceedings, ultimately culminating in a consolidated oral hearing. *See id.* Thus, Petitioner submits that any additional burden on the finite resources of the Board is reasonable in light of the circumstances.

For each of these reasons, Petitioner respectfully requests institution of both of its concurrently filed IPR petitions against the ’025 patent.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated March 17, 2021

/W. Karl Renner/  
W. Karl Renner, Reg. No. 41,265  
David Holt, Reg. No. 65,161  
Joel A. Henry, Reg. No. 72,970  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
3200 RBC Plaza, 60 South Sixth Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
T: 202-783-5070  
F: 877-769-7945

Attorneys for Petitioner

# 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.