

1 IRELL & MANELLA LLP
 2 Morgan Chu (70446)
 3 MChu@irell.com
 4 Benjamin W. Hattenbach (186455)
 5 BHattenbach@irell.com
 6 Samuel K. Lu (171969)
 7 SLu@irell.com
 8 Olivia L. Weber (319918)
 9 OWeber@irell.com
 10 1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900
 11 Los Angeles, California 90067-4276
 12 Telephone: (310) 277-1010
 13 Facsimile: (310) 203-7199

9 FOLIO LAW GROUP PLLC
 10 C. Maclain Wells (221609)
 11 Maclain@foliolaw.com
 12 2376 Pacific Ave.
 13 San Francisco, CA 94115
 14 (415) 562-8632

12 Attorneys for Defendant
 13 DEMARAY LLC

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 16 SAN JOSE DIVISION

18	APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.,)	Case No. 5:20-cv-09341-EJD
)	
19	Plaintiff,)	DEMARAY LLC'S RESPONSIVE CLAIM
)	CONSTRUCTION BRIEF
20	vs.)	
)	
21	DEMARAY LLC,)	
)	
22	Defendant.)	
)	

24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1	
2	
3 I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
4 II. THE DEMARAY PATENTS	1
5 III. DISPUTED CONSTRUCTIONS	2
6 A. "Narrow band rejection filter" ('657 Patent, cls. 1, 2, 20; '276 Patent,	
7 cls. 1, 6).....	2
8 1. This Term Does Not Require Construction.....	2
9 2. Applied Seeks To Add An Extraneous "Passing"	
10 Requirement	3
11 3. The Prosecution History Does Not Support Adding The	
12 "Passing" Limitation To "Narrow Band Rejection Filter"	3
13 B. Pulsed DC power/Pulsed DC power supply ('657 Patent, cls. 1, 2,	
14 11; '276 Patent, cls. 1, 6)	5
15 1. Patentee Acted As Its Own Lexicographer	5
16 2. Demaray's Construction Is Consistent With And Supported	
17 By The Patent Specification	7
18 3. Applied Seeks To Import The Square Wave Limitation, But	
19 Such Language Appears Nowhere In The Patent	
20 Specification.....	7
21 4. Applied Seeks To Import A Frequency Limitation, But The	
22 Intrinsic Evidence Does Not Support Such a Construction	11
23 5. Demaray's Claim Construction Would Not Render The	
24 Claim Language Superfluous	12
25 C. "A method of depositing an insulating film on a substrate,	
26 comprising:" ('657 patent, cl. 2 preamble)	14
27 D. "the insulating film" ('657 Patent, cl. 2).....	15
28 1. The Applicants Did Not Act As Their Own Lexicographers	
Or Make A Clear And Unmistakable Disavowal Of Claim	
Scope	16
2. In The Prosecution History Applicants Did Not Act As Their	
Own Lexicographers Or Make A Clear And Unmistakable	
Disavowal Of Claim Scope	18
3. Applied's Arguments Regarding Reactive Sputtering And	
The Poison Mode Do Not Change the Scope Of The Claims.....	19

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Page

E. "Insulating substrate" ('657 Patent, cl. 1)20

1. The Specification Discloses Insulating Substrates (Such As Silicon Wafers) And Non-Insulating Substrates (Such As Metal Substrates).....20

2. Applied's Claim Construction Arguments Misunderstand The Purpose Of The "Insulating Substrate" Limitation.....21

IV. CONCLUSION22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
Cases	
<i>Absolute Software, Inc. v. Stealth Signal, Inc.</i> , 659 F.3d 1121 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	17
<i>Bio-Rad Labs., Inc. v. 10X Genomics Inc.</i> , 967 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	14, 15
<i>CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.</i> , 288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	4, 5, 13
<i>Elbex Video, Ltd. v. Sensormatic Elecs. Corp.</i> , 508 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	4
<i>Finjan Inc. v. Symantec Corp.</i> , No.14-cv-02998, 2017 WL 550453 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 10, 2017)	1
<i>GE Lighting Sols., LLC v. AgiLight, Inc.</i> , 750 F.3d 1304 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	5, 7
<i>GPNE Corp. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 830 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	17
<i>NeoMagic Corp. v. Trident Microsystems, Inc.</i> , 287 F.3d 1062 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	9, 11
<i>O2 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	1
<i>Powell v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc.</i> , 663 F.3d 1221 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	8
<i>Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Int'l, Inc.</i> , 904 F.3d 965 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	10
<i>Tech. Prop. Ltd. LLC v. Huawei Techs. Co., Ltd.</i> , 849 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	3
<i>TomTom, Inc. v. Adolph</i> , 790 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	14, 15
<i>Wasica Fin. GmbH v. Cont'l Auto. Sys., Inc.</i> , 853 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	13
Other Authorities	
Modern Dictionary of Electronics.....	7

I. INTRODUCTION

The WDTX court has already construed each of the terms that Applied proposes for construction, and in each case, Judge Albright rejected either Applied's proposed construction or one that is substantively similar. Exs. C, D (WDTX Claim Construction Orders). The parties agree that the WDTX court's determinations are entitled to "reasoned deference." *Finjan Inc. v. Symantec Corp.*, No.14-cv-02998, 2017 WL 550453, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 10, 2017). Because claim construction "is not an obligatory exercise in redundancy" requiring courts to substitute other language for understandable claim terms, *O2 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.*, 521 F.3d 1351, 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2008), the WDTX court gave most of the disputed terms their plain and ordinary meaning. Consistent with those determinations, in Applied's four recent *inter partes* review petitions, it did not seek construction of even a single one of these claim terms. Wells ¶ 13.¹ The Court should see Applied's proposals for what they are—an invitation for conflicting rulings from a different court and an avenue for appeal. No further constructions are necessary.

II. THE DEMARAY PATENTS

The Demaray Patents² generally concern equipment and processes used to deposit thin films in the production of semiconductor products. Glew ¶ 18. Layers of those films, which are deposited in chambers within reactors, form structures such as transistors and electrical interconnections of the sort that make up modern integrated circuits. Glew ¶ 18.

The patents focus on a process called physical vapor deposition ("PVD") sputtering in which metal particles from a "target" create a plasma that deposits the films on a semiconductor wafer. Glew ¶ 19. The patents describe approaches for preventing undesired buildup of the

¹ All exhibits are attached to the Declaration of C. Maclain Wells ("Wells") filed herewith. Also referenced is the Declaration of Dr. Alexander Glew ("Glew") also filed herewith, Ex. K.

² The "Demaray Patents" are U.S. Patent Nos. 7,381,657 and 7,544,276 ("657 patent" and "276 patent," respectively) (Exs. A-B). Given that the specifications are substantively equivalent, example citations are provided to the '657 patent specification.

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.