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

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INT	RODUCTION1			
II.	BACKGROUND3				
	A.	The '934 Patent			
	B.	Related Patents4			
	C.	Litigation Matters5			
	D.	PTAB Matters7			
III.		THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE OF CO- PENDING LITIGATION INVOLVING THE '934 PATENT7			
	A.	Factor 1: The District Court Has Not Issued a Stay9			
	B.	Factor 2: Proximity of the Scheduled Trial Date to the Board's Statutory Deadline for Written Decision			
	C.	Factor 3: The Parties and Court in the Apple Litigation Will Have Invested Substantial Resources Prior to the Institution Decision13			
	D.	Factor 4: The Issues Raised in the Petition Overlap Substantially with Issues Raised in the Apple Litigation			
	E.	Factor 5: Petitioner is a Defendant in Co-Pending Litigation17			
	F.	Factor 6: Other Considerations That Influence the Board's Exercise of Discretion Weigh in Favor of Denying Institution18			
	G.	Holistic Assessment of <i>Fintiv</i> Factors			
IV.	LIK	PETITION DOES NOT ESTABLISH A REASONABLE ELIHOOD THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS WOULD HAVE N OBVIOUS23			
	A.	Grounds 1A-1D Do Not Show that the Challenged Claims Would Have Been Obvious			



		1.	Configured to Interact with Two Other Systems25
		2.	Schrager Does Not Teach a Remote, Network-Connected Server in Wireless Communications with a Mobile DAP26
		3.	Goldstein Does Not Teach a Remote, Network-Connected Server in Wireless Communications with a Mobile DAP28
		4.	The Schrager-Goldstein Combination Does Not Teach a Remote Network-Connected Server in Wireless Communication with a Mobile DAP
	В.		nds 2A-2D Do Not Show that the Challenged Claims Would Been Obvious
		1.	Rezvani-446 Does Not Teach a Mobile DAP in Wireless Communication with Both a Headphone Assembly and a Remote, Network-Connected Server
		2.	Rezvani-875 Does Not Teach a Mobile DAP in Wireless Communication with Both a Headphone Assembly and a Remote, Network-Connected Server
		3.	The Proposed Rezvani-Rezvani-Skulley-Hind Combination Does Not Teach a Mobile DAP in Wireless Communication with Both a Headphone Assembly and a Remote, Network- Connected Server
		4.	The Proposed Combinations for Grounds 2A-2D Rely on Hindsight Reconstruction
V.	CON	CLUS	ION48



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)
Cases
Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH, IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2020)
Amazon.com, Inc. v. Barnesandnoble.com, Inc., 239 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2001)
Apple Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc., IPR2015-00445, Paper 9 (PTAB July 9, 2015)47
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)
Apple Inc. v. Koss Corp., IPR2021-00305, Paper 14 (PTAB June 3, 2021)
Apple Inc. v. Koss Corp., IPR2021-00381, Paper 15 (PTAB July 2, 2021)13, 15, 16, 24
Belden Inv. v. Berk-Tek LLC, 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)
Bose Corporation v. Koss Corporation, IPR2021-00297, Paper 16 (PTAB Jun. 3, 2021)passim
General Plastic Industrial Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha, IPR2016-01357, Paper 19, 16-17 (PTAB Sept. 6, 2017)
Google LLC v. Personalized Media Commc'ns, LLC, IPR2020-00724, Paper 19 (PTAB Aug. 31, 2020)12
Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)



Intel Corp. v. VLSI Tech. LLC, IPR2019-01192, Paper 15 (PTAB Jan. 9, 2020)
KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398
Nautilus Hyosung Inc. v. Diebold, Inc., IPR2016-00633, Paper 9 (PTAB Aug. 22, 2016)
NHK Spring Co. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc., IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018)
Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Ancora Techs., Inc., IPR2020-01184, Paper 11 (PTAB Jan. 5, 2021)
SK Hynix v. Netlist, IPR2020-01421, Paper 10 (Mar. 16, 2021)
Supercell Oy v. Gree, Inc., IPR2020-01628, Paper 9, 14-15 (PTAB February 17, 2021)14
Verizon Bus. Network Servs. LLC v. Huawei Techs. Co., IPR2020-01292, Paper 13 (PTAB Jan. 25, 2021)
Statutes
35 U.S.C. § 103
35 U.S.C. § 314
35 U.S.C. § 316
Other Authorities
37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c)10



DOCKET

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.

