

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

KOSS CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

CASE: IPR2021-00693
U.S. PATENT NO. 10,469,934

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND	5
	A. The '934 Patent	5
	B. Related Proceedings	6
III.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE OF CO- PENDING LITIGATION INVOLVING THE '934 PATENT.....	8
	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.....	12
	C. Factor 3: The Parties and Court Will Have Invested Substantial Resources in the Texas Litigation Prior to the Institution Decision.....	15
	D. Factor 4: The Issues Raised in the Petition Overlap Substantially with Issues Raised in the Texas Litigation.....	17
	E. Factor 5: Petitioner is a Defendant in the Texas Litigation	21
	F. Factor 6: Other Considerations That Influence the Board's Exercise of Discretion Weigh in Favor of Denying Institution	22
	G. Holistic Assessment of <i>Fintiv</i> Factors.....	23
IV.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED DISCRETIONARILY UNDER <i>GENERAL PLASTIC</i>	25
	A. Factor 1: Whether the Same Petitioner Previously Filed a Petition Directed to the Same Claims of the Same Patent	27
	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.....	28

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	30
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.....	31
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	32
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	33
V.	THE PETITION FAILS TO SHOW THAT THERE IS REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT PETITIONER WILL PREVAIL ON A SINGLE CLAIM	35
A.	The Petition Fails to Show that the Proposed Combinations Satisfy "the processor is configured to, upon activation of a user-control of the headphone assembly, initiate transmission of a request to a remote, network-connected server that is in wireless communication with the mobile, digital audio player"	36
B.	The Petition Fails to Show that the Proposed Combinations Satisfy "a rechargeable battery for powering the headphone assembly"	40
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	44

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Advanced Display Systems, Inc. v. Kent State Univ.</i> , 212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	29
<i>Apple Inc. v. Corephotonics Ltd.</i> , IPR2018-01356, Paper 9 (PTAB Feb. 5, 2019).....	31, 32
<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>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	42, 43
<i>B/E Aerospace, Inc. v. C&D Zodiac, Inc.</i> , 962 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	42
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Monarch Networking Sols. LLC</i> , IPR2020-01226, Paper 11, 15 (PTAB Mar. 4, 2021)	21
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Ramot at Tel Aviv Univ. Ltd.</i> , IPR2020-00122, Paper 15 (PTAB May 15, 2020)	13
<i>Club Champion LLC v. True Spec Golf LLC</i> , IPR2019-01569, Paper 9 (PTAB March 17, 2020)	33, 34
<i>General Plastic Indus. Co. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (PTAB Sept. 6, 2017).....	<i>passim</i>

<i>Goggle LLC v. Realtime Adaptive Streaming, LLC</i> , IPR2018-01342, Paper 47 (PTAB Feb. 27, 2020).....	33
<i>Google LLC v. Personalized Media Commc'ns, LLC</i> , IPR2020-00724, Paper 19 (PTAB Aug. 31, 2020).....	9
<i>Guest-Tek Interactive Entertainment Ltd. v. Nomadix, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01668, Paper 6 (PTAB April 16, 2019)	32
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	8
<i>Intel Corp. v. VLSI Tech. LLC</i> , IPR2019-01192, Paper 15 (PTAB Jan. 9, 2020)	8
<i>K/S Himpp v. Hear-Wear Techs., LLC</i> , 751 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	42
<i>MediaTek Inc. v. Nippon Tel. and Tel. Corp.</i> , IPR2020-01607, Paper 12 (PTAB April 2, 2021)	9
<i>Metall Zug AG v. Carl Zeiss Meditec AG</i> , IPR2020-01074, Paper 8 (PTAB Jan. 5, 2021)	28
<i>In re Mouttet</i> , 686 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	20
<i>NHK Spring Co. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018).....	2
<i>Perfect Web Techs., Inc. v. InfoUSA, Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	43, 44
<i>In re Rijckaet</i> , 9 F.3d 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993)	43
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Ancora Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2020-01184, Paper 11 (PTAB Jan. 5, 2021)	9, 21, 22

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.