

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTEL CORPORATION
Petitioner

v.

ZOND, LLC
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 7,811,421

Inter Partes Review Case No. 2014-00468

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 CFR § 42.107(a)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND 4

 A. Overview of Sputtering Systems..... 4

 B. The ‘421 Patent: Dr. Chistyakov Invents an Improved Sputtering Source. 6

III. SUMMARY OF PETITIONER’S PROPOSED GROUNDS..... 12

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.104(B)(3) 12

 A. Construction of “Weakly Ionized Plasma” and “Strongly Ionized Plasma” 12

V. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING..... 14

 A. All Grounds Rely on Claim Charts Submitted in Violation of Rules 42.24(a)(i) and 42.6(a)(3)..... 14

 B. Defects in Ground I: Petitioner Failed To Demonstrate That Claims 1, 2, 8, 10 - 13, 15, 16, 34, 38, 39, 43, and 46 - 48 Are Anticipated by Mozgrin..... 16

 1. Overview of Mozgrin..... 17

 2. Petitioner Fails to Show a Reasonable Likelihood that Mozgrin Expressly or Inherently Teaches Each and Every Aspect of the Challenged Claims. 19

 a. Mozgrin Does Not Teach a Sputtering Source Comprising a Cathode Assembly Having a Sputtering Target Positioned Adjacent to an Anode..... 19

 b. Mozgrin Does Not Describe the Claimed Pulse for Creating a Weak Plasma and Then a Strongly-Ionized Plasma From the Weak..... 21

 c. Mozgrin Does Not Teach The Claimed Generation of a Pulse whose Amplitude and Rise Time Are Chosen to Increase Ion Density Without Arcing 23

 d. Conclusion: Petitioner Has Not Shown a Reasonable Likelihood of Success on Any Claim Challenged in Ground I. 25

C.	Defects In Ground II: Petitioner Failed To Demonstrate A Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 1, 2, 8, 10 - 13, 16, 17, 22-25, 33, 34, 39, 42, 43, and 46 - 48 Are Anticipated by Wang.....	25
a.	Wang Does Not Show the Claimed Pulse for Creating a Weak Plasma and Then a Strongly-Ionized Plasma From the Weak Without Arcing.	26
b.	Wang Does Not Teach The Claimed Generation of a Pulse Whose Rise Time Is Chosen to Increase Ion Density Without Arcing.	27
D.	Petitioner’s Grounds Based Upon Obviousness.	28
1.	Petition’s Grounds III and IV Fail to Follow the Proper Legal Framework For an Obviousness Analysis.	29
2.	Defects In Ground III: Petitioner Failed To Demonstrate A Reasonable Likelihood That Independent Claim 17 and its Dependent Claims 22 – 25, 27 – 30, 33 and 42 Are Obvious Over Mozgrin and Lantsman under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	30
3.	Petitioner Fails to Show a Reasonable Likelihood of success on any Claim in Ground III for the Same Reasons Recited in Opposition to Ground I.	30
4.	Defects In Ground IV: Petitioner Failed To Demonstrate A Reasonable Likelihood That Dependent Claims 15, 27 and 38 Are Obvious Over Wang and Mozgrin under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).....	32
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	34

I. Introduction

The present petition for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 7,811,421 (“the ‘421 patent”) relies primarily on two prior art references, Mozgrin¹ and Wang² that were already considered by the Patent Office³ and offers no persuasive reasons why the Board should reach a different conclusion here.

The claims are directed to a sputtering source for sputtering material from a sputter target, and a method for high deposition rate sputtering. The claimed source and method generate a voltage pulse for creating the ions needed for sputtering, wherein the pulse’s shape is chosen or adjusted to create a weakly ionized plasma and then a strongly ionized plasma from the weak, but without arcing. The Petition first argues that Mozgrin anticipates such claims, even though it is a research paper that does not describe a sputter source for sputtering material from a target, and never discloses any experiments that teach the particular type of pulse technique claimed.

The Petition next cites to Wang. Wang at least describes sputtering from a target, but as Petitioner acknowledges, “Wang teaches that arcing may occur

¹ Ex. 1003, Mozgrin.

² Ex. 1004, Wang patent No. 6,413,382 (“Wang”).

³ Ex. 1001, ‘421 Patent, list of cited references cited.

during ignition” of the plasma.⁴ This is blatantly at odds with the claimed requirement that the generated pulse “create a weakly ionized plasma ... without an occurrence of arcing.” The Petition tries to diminish the significance of this shortcoming by citing to Wang’s observation that “the initial plasma ignition needs to be performed only once.”⁵ But this changes nothing in an anticipation analysis.

Furthermore, when the Petition resorts to its backup obviousness theories using these same references, it never cures the shortcomings of the references. In fact, it does not address these shortcoming or any differences between the claims and the art, as required by the Supreme Court for a proper obviousness analysis. It also relies upon several claim charts filed in violation of rules §42.24(a)(i) and §42.6.⁶

⁴ Petition at 36.

⁵ Petition at page 36, quoting Ex. 1004, Wang.

⁶ *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18, 148 USPQ 459, 467 (1966); *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 399 (2007) (“[T]he [Graham] factors define the controlling inquiry”); *Liberty Mutual v. Progressive Casualty*, CMB-2012-00003, paper 7 at 2 – 3.

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.