

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent of: Michael J. Koss, et al.
U.S. Patent No.: 10,506,325 Attorney Docket No.: 50095-0022IP1/0022IP2
Issue Date: December 10, 2019
Appl. Serial No.: 16/528,703
Filing Date: August 1, 2019
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. 10,506,325

Petitioner now has two concurrent petitions challenging the validity of all claims of U.S. Patent No. 10,506,325 (“the ’325 patent”): IPR2021-00305 filed 12/15/2020 and IPR2021-00679 filed March 19 (herewith). As explained below, each petition challenges a different set of the 18 claims Koss asserted against Apple 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 18 claims that Koss asserted against Apple in the co-pending district court litigation. Nonetheless, to the extent required, Apple requests that the Board consider the petitions in the following order:

Rank	PTAB Case No.	Challenged Claims
1	IPR2021-00305 (First Petition)	1-4, 9, 10, 14-20
2	IPR2021-00679	5-8, 11-13

	(Second Petition)	
--	-------------------	--

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, Koss has taken no steps to narrow the dispute, and has instead asserted all 18 claims of the ’325 Patent against Apple in the co-pending litigation.

Each of the petitions of the first and second petitions cover different claims. Specifically, the first petition challenges claims 1-4, 9, 10, and 14-20, which is all claims except those dependent claims that recite that “the processor circuits are configured to transition from playing streaming audio content received wirelessly from a first digital audio source via a first communication link to playing streaming audio content received wirelessly from a second digital audio source via a second communication link based on, at least in part, a signal strength for the second wireless communication link” (i.e., the “signal strength claims”). The second petition relies upon the disclosure of Seshadri, in addition to the prior art relied upon in

IPR2021-00305, with the intent of demonstrating the unpatentability of the signal strength claims (i.e., claims 5-8, 11-13). Given the dependencies of the signal strength claims, however, the primary difference between the first and second petitions is found in sections of the second petition that address the signal strength claims. This is a concise addition to deal with the 7 signal strength claims, the inclusion of which was entirely precipitated by Koss's allegation that Apple infringes all 18 claims of the '325 patent. APPLE-1014. Apple has judiciously moderated any increase in burden from the two petitions, such that any increase in burden is a direct result of Koss's conduct in the co-pending litigation.

Lastly, in an effort to avoid any prejudice to Koss, Apple is willing to subscribe to two scheduling adjustments in IPR2021-00305 and IPR2021-00679 relative to the model scheduling order: (1) in IPR2021-00679, the deadline for Petitioner's reply (DUE DATE 2) is shortened by 6 weeks; and (2) in IPR2021-00305, the deadline for Patent Owner's sur-reply (DUE DATE 3) is lengthened to fall on the same day as the deadline for Petitioner's reply (DUE DATE 2) in the present proceeding. In this way, Koss's sur-reply in IPR2021-00305 and Petitioner's reply in IPR2021-00679 are due on the same day, eliminating any possibility of Apple gaining any advantage due to the timing differences between the two proceedings.

For each of these reasons, Apple respectfully requests institution of both of its concurrently filed IPR petitions against the '325 patent.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated 3-22-21

/W. Karl Renner/

W. Karl Renner, Reg. No. 41,265
Roberto Devoto, Reg. No. 55,108
Ryan Chowdhury, Reg. No. 74,466
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.