

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BOSE CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

KOSS CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

CASE: IPR2021-00680
U.S. PATENT NO. 10,469,934 B2

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND	2
A.	SUMMARY OF '934 PATENT	2
B.	HEADPHONE FORM FACTORS	4
C.	PERSON HAVING ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	7
D.	PETITIONER'S EVIDENCE	8
1.	REFERENCES.....	8
2.	TESTIMONY.....	11
III.	PETITIONER FAILED TO SHOW THAT CLAIM 1 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS	14
A.	PETITIONER FAILED TO SHOW THAT CLAIM 1 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS UNDER GROUND 1A.....	15
B.	PETITIONER FAILED TO SHOW THAT CLAIM 1 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS UNDER GROUND 2A.....	21
1.	PETITIONER FAILED TO SHOW FIRMWARE UPGRADES FOR WIRELESS EARPHONES.....	21
2.	REZVANI-875 DOES NOT DEPICT A HEADSET.....	23
IV.	PETITIONER FAILED TO SHOW THAT THE "SIGNAL STRENGTH" CLAIMS WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS.....	26
A.	HARADA DOES NOT TEACH OR SUGGEST THE "TRANSITIONING" OF THE SIGNAL STRENGTH CLAIMS	29
B.	A POSA WOULD NOT USE HARADA'S DATABASE IN WIRELESS EARPHONES.....	34
V.	PETITIONER FAILED TO SHOW THAT CLAIMS 34-41 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS	37
A.	PETITIONER FAILED TO SHOW THAT CLAIMS 34-41 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS UNDER GROUNDS 1A AND 1C.....	39

B.	PETITIONER FAILED TO SHOW THAT CLAIMS 34-41 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS UNDER GROUNDS 2C AND 2D.....	40
VI.	PETITIONER FAILED TO SHOW THAT DEPENDENT CLAIMS 56-57 WOULD BE OBVIOUS	43
A.	GROUND 1A	44
B.	GROUND 2C	48
C.	CLAIM 56 WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS	50
VII.	COMMERCIAL SUCCESS OF AIRPODS PRODUCTS SUPPORTS NONOBVIOUSNESS OF OTHER CHALLENGED DEPENDENT CLAIMS	52
1.	BACKGROUND	52
2.	LEGAL PRINCIPLES	53
3.	THE AIRPODS PRODUCTS ARE A COMMERCIAL SUCCESS	55
4.	NEXUS BETWEEN THE AIRPODS PRODUCTS AND THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS.....	56
5.	PETITIONER’S EXPERT DELIBERATELY IGNORED THE COMMERCIAL SUCCESS EVIDENCE	61
VIII.	WILLIAMS’S DIRECT TESTIMONY SHOULD BE ENTITLED TO LITTLE IF ANY WEIGHT.....	62
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	65

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Koss Corp.</i> , IPR2021-00546, Paper 10 (PTAB Sept. 7, 2021).....	21
<i>In re Applied Materials, Inc.</i> , 692 F.3d 1289 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	56
<i>Baran v. Med. Device Techs, Inc.</i> , 616 F.3d 1309 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	42
<i>Becton, Dickinson and Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Group, LP</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	37
<i>BMW of N. Am., LLC v. Stragent, LLC</i> , IPR2017-00676, Paper 33 (PTAB June 14, 2018)	64
<i>Bose Corp. v. Koss Corp.</i> , IPR2021-00680, Paper 15 (Oct. 13, 2021)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Commvault Sys., Inc. v. Realtime Data LLC</i> , IPR2017-02006, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 19, 2018)	22
<i>Demaco Corp. v. F. Von Langsdorff Licensing Ltd.</i> , 851 F.2d 1387 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	55, 57, 59
<i>Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. Cal. Edison Co.</i> , 227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	54
<i>Engel Indus., Inc. v. Lockformer Co.</i> , 96 F.3d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	38
<i>Environmental Designs, Ltd. v. Union Oil Co.</i> , 713 F.2d 693 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	64
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Sound View Innovations, LLC</i> , IPR2017-01003, Paper 14 (PTAB Sep. 1, 2017).....	65

<i>In re Fine</i> , 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	14
<i>Fox Factory, Inc. v. SRAM, LLC</i> , 994 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	55
<i>Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.</i> , 737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	34
<i>Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. v. Ray-O-Vac Co.</i> , 321 U.S. 275 (1944).....	1, 54, 60
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	54
<i>In re Huang</i> , 100 F.3d 135 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	54
<i>SK hynix Inc. v. Netlist, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-00561, Paper 36 (PTAB Jul. 5, 2018).....	63
<i>Indivior Inc. v. Dr. Reddy's Labs, SA</i> , 930 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	64
<i>Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	54, 60
<i>Netflix, Inc. v. DivX, LLC</i> , IPR2020-00648, Paper 28 (PTAB Sep. 27, 2021).....	22
<i>Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.</i> , 463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	54
<i>Pentec, Inc. v. Graphic Controls Corp.</i> , 776 F.2d 309 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	54
<i>PPV Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Commc'ns RF, LLC</i> , 815 F.3d 747 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	42
<i>SightSound Techs., LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , 809 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	55

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.