

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

KOSS CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

CASE: IPR2022-00053
U.S. PATENT NO. 10,206,025

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 3

 A. Timeline of Events 3

 B. Summary of the Petition for the Third Apple IPR and the Joinder Motion 6

 C. Summary of '025 Patent..... 9

III. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED DISCRETIONARILY UNDER *GENERAL PLASTIC*..... 9

 A. Applicable Legal Principles 9

 B. Analysis of *General Plastic* Factors 11

 1. Factor 1: Whether the Same Petitioner Previously Filed a Petition Directed to the Same Claims of the Same Patent..... 11

 2. Factor 2: Whether at the Time of Filing of the Earlier Petitions the Petitioner Knew of the Prior Art Asserted in the Later Petition or Should Have Known of It..... 12

 3. Factor 3: Whether at the Time of Filing of the Follow-On Petition the Petitioner Already Received the Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response to the Initial Petition or Received the Board’s Decision on Whether to Institute Review of the Initial Petition 16

 4. Factor 4: The Length of Time that Elapsed Between the Time the Petitioner Learned of the Prior Art Asserted in the Follow-On Petition and the Filing of the Follow-On Petition 17

 5. 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..... 18

6.	Factor 6: The Finite Resources of the Board	19
7.	Factor 7: The Requirement to Issue a Final Determination Not Later Than One Year After the Date on Which the Director Notices Institution of Review	19
8.	Holistic Review of <i>General Plastic</i> Factors	20
IV.	PETITIONER MISCHARACTERIZED THE BOARD’S REASONING AND LANGUAGE IN <i>UNILOC</i>	20
A.	Petitioner Contorted a Criticism of Apple’s Serial Attacks in <i>Uniloc</i> into a Test for Evaluating the <i>General Plastic</i> Factors	20
B.	Petitioner Altered the Board’s Quotes in <i>Uniloc</i> to Benefit Petitioner’s Flawed Arguments	23
V.	CONCLUSION.....	26

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Corephotonics Ltd.</i> , IPR2018-01356, Paper 9 (PTAB Feb. 5, 2019).....	18
<i>Apple Inc. v. Koss Corp.</i> , IPR2021-00546, Paper 10 (PTAB Sept. 7, 2021).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Apple Inc. v. Koss Corp.</i> , IPR2021-00626, Paper 10 (PTAB Sept. 30, 2021).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Apple Inc. v. Uniloc 2017 LLC</i> , IPR2020-00854, Paper 9 (PTAB Oct. 28, 2020).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Bose Corp. v. Koss Corp.</i> , IPR2021-00612, Paper 15 (PTAB Sept. 15, 2021).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>General Plastic Industrial Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (PTAB Sept. 6, 2017).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Guest-Tek Interactive Entertainment Ltd. v. Nomadix, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01668, Paper 6 (PTAB April 16, 2019)	18
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	9, 10, 19
Other Authorities	
37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a).....	1
37 C.F.R. §42.122(b)	25
84 Fed. Reg. 33,925 at 26 (July 16, 2019).....	10

EXHIBIT LISTING

Exhibit	Description
KOSS-2001	Annotated listing of related cases in mandatory notices of Petition
KOSS-2002	Google Patents for U.S. Patent No. 7,072,686 B1 (“Schrager”), available at patents.google.com/patent/US7072686B1/en?q=7072686 (last accessed Dec. 13, 2021)
KOSS-2003	Information Disclosure Statement, Serial No. 13/725,616, filed June 30, 2014
KOSS-2004	Information Disclosure Statement, Serial No. 14/846,574, filed Jan. 7, 2016
KOSS-2005	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, <i>Apple Inc. v. Koss Corp.</i> , IPR2021-00546, Paper 2 (Feb. 22, 2021)
KOSS-2006	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, <i>Bose Corp. v. Koss Corp.</i> , IPR2021-00612, Paper 2 (Mar. 3, 2021)
KOSS-2007	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, <i>Apple Inc. v. Koss Corp.</i> , IPR2021-00626, Paper 3 (Mar. 17, 2021)
KOSS-2008	Mandatory Notices by Patent Owner, <i>Apple Inc. v. Koss Corp.</i> , IPR2021-00626, Paper 4 (Mar. 24, 2021)
KOSS-2009	Patent Owner’s Updated Mandatory Notices, <i>Apple Inc. v. Koss Corp.</i> , IPR2021-00546, Paper 6 (Mar. 25, 2021)
KOSS-2010	Decision, <i>Apple Inc. v. Koss Corp.</i> , IPR2021-00546, Paper 10 (Sept. 7, 2021)
KOSS-2011	Decision, <i>Bose Corp. v. Koss Corp.</i> , IPR2021-00612, Paper 15 (Sept. 15, 2021)

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.