

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

KOSS CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

CASE: IPR2021-00686
U.S. PATENT NO. 10,491,982

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND	5
	A. The ’982 Patent	5
	B. Related Proceedings	6
III.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE OF CO- PENDING LITIGATION INVOLVING THE ’982 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.....	11
	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	19
	F. Factor 6: Other Considerations That Influence the Board’s Exercise of Discretion Weigh in Favor of Denying Institution	20
	G. Holistic Assessment of <i>Fintiv</i> Factors.....	21
IV.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED DISCRETIONARILY UNDER <i>GENERAL PLASTIC</i>	23
	A. Factor 1: Whether the Same Petitioner Previously Filed a Petition Directed to the Same Claims of the Same Patent	25
	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.....	25
	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	28
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.....	28
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	29
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	30
V.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE THE PETITION PRESENTS SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME ART PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED BY THE OFFICE AND HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED A MATERIAL ERROR BY THE OFFICE	32
A.	Rosener Was Considered in the Original Examination and the Petitioner did not Demonstrate a Material Error in the Office's Evaluation of Rosener	35
1.	<i>Becton, Dickinson</i> Factor (c) Shows the Asserted Art Was Considered During Original Examination	36
2.	<i>Becton, Dickinson</i> Factor (e) Shows the Petition Did Not Establish any Error by the Office	37
3.	The Petition Does Not Provide Any Additional Evidence for <i>Becton, Dickinson</i> Factor (f).....	42
B.	Haupt-749 is Cumulative of Haupt-209 and the Petition Did Not Demonstrate a Material Error in the Office's Consideration of Haupt-209.....	43
C.	Seshadri-716 is Cumulative of Seshadri-839 and the Petitioner did not Demonstrate a Material Error in the Office's Consideration of Seshadri-839	44

D.	Hankey is Cumulative of Johnson and Glezerman and the Petitioner did not Demonstrate a Material Error in the Office's Consideration of Johnson and Glezerman.....	46
1.	<i>Becton, Dickinson</i> Factors (a) and (b) Show the Asserted Art Is Substantially Similar to and Cumulative of Previously-Considered Art	46
2.	<i>Becton, Dickinson</i> Factor (d) Shows the Petitioner's Reliance on Hankey Substantially Mirrors the Examiner's Application of Johnson	53
E.	Dyer is Cumulative of Johnson and the Petitioner did not Demonstrate a Material Error in the Office's Consideration of Johnson.....	55
F.	Price Does Not Cure the Deficiencies of Rosener, Hankey, Haupt-749, Seshadri-716, and Dyer With Respect to Claims 6 and 11	56
VI.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE THE PETITION FAILS TO SHOW THAT THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE PETITIONER WILL PREVAIL ON A SINGLE CLAIM	58
A.	The Petition Fails to Show that the Rosener-Hankey-Haupt-749-Seshadri-716 Combination Satisfies All Elements of Claim 11	59
B.	The Petition's Rationales for Combining Seshadri '716 and Seshadri '818 are Conclusory	64
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	67

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Activevideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312, 1327-1328 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	67
<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geraete GmbH</i> , IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2020).....	32, 33
<i>Apple Inc. v. Corephotonics Ltd.</i> , IPR2018-01356, Paper 9 at 8 (PTAB Feb. 5, 2019).....	28, 30
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB March 20, 2020)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Apple Inc. v. Koss Corp.</i> , IPR2021-00255, Paper 22 (PTAB June 3, 2021)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Apple Inc. v. Koss Corp.</i> , IPR2021-00305, Paper 14 (PTAB June 3, 2021)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Apple Inc. v. Koss Corp.</i> , IPR2021-00381, Paper 15 (PTAB July 2, 2021)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Aquestive Therapeutics, Inc. v. Neurelis, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00450, Paper 8 (PTAB Aug. 1, 2019).....	42, 57
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (PTAB Dec. 15, 2017)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Monarch Networking Sols. LLC</i> , IPR2020-01226, Paper 11, 15 (PTAB Mar. 4, 2021).....	19
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Ramot at Tel Aviv Univ. Ltd</i> , IPR2020-00122, Paper 15 (PTAB May 15, 2020)	12
<i>Club Champion LLC v. True Spec Golf LLC</i> , IPR2019-01569, Paper 9 (PTAB March 17, 2020)	31

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.