

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

INTEL CORPORATION  
Petitioner

v.

ZOND, LLC  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2014-00473  
Patent 7,811,421 B2

---

Before KEVIN F. TURNER, DEBRA K. STEPHENS, JONI Y. CHANG,  
SUSAN L. C. MITCHELL, and JENNIFER M. MEYER,  
*Administrative Patent Judges.*

STEPHENS, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION  
Institution of *Inter Partes* Review  
37 C.F.R. § 42.108

## I. INTRODUCTION

On March 7, 2014, Intel Corporation (“Intel”) filed a Petition requesting *inter partes* review of claims 3–7, 18–20, 31, 32, 36, 40, 41, 44, and 45 of U.S. Patent No. 7,811,421 B2 (“the ’421 patent”). Paper 2 (“Pet.”). Zond, LLC (“Zond”) filed a Patent Owner Preliminary Response. Paper 10 (“Prelim. Resp.”). We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 314.

The standard for instituting an *inter partes* review is set forth in 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), which provides:

**THRESHOLD.**—The Director may not authorize an *inter partes* review to be instituted unless the Director determines that the information presented in the petition filed under section 311 and any response filed under section 313 shows that there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.

Taking into account Zond’s Patent Owner Preliminary Response, we conclude that the information presented in the Petition demonstrates there is a reasonable likelihood that Intel would prevail in challenging claims 3–7, 18–20, 31, 32, 36, 40, 41, 44, and 45 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314, we hereby authorize an *inter partes* review to be instituted as to claims 3–7, 18–20, 31, 32, 36, 40, 41, 44, and 45 of the ’421 patent.

### A. *Related Matters*

Intel indicates the ’421 patent was asserted in *Zond, LLC v. Intel Corp.*, No.1:13-cv-11570-RGS (D. Mass.). Pet. 1 and Paper 5. Intel also

identifies other matters where Zond asserted the claims of the '421 patent against third parties. *Id.*

### *B. The '421 Patent*

The '421 patent relates to a high-deposition sputtering apparatus. Ex. 1101, Abs. At the time of the invention, sputtering was a well-known technique for depositing films on semiconductor substrates. *Id.* at 1:15–16. The '421 patent indicates prior art magnetron sputtering systems deposit films having low uniformity, poor target utilization (the target material erodes in a non-uniform manner), and relatively low deposition rate (low amount of material deposited on the substrate per unit time). *Id.* at 1:63–2:14. To address these problems, the '421 patent discloses that increasing the power applied between the target and anode can increase the amount of ionized gas, therefore, increasing the target utilization and sputtering yield. *Id.* at 3:20–22. However, increasing the power also “increases the probability of establishing an undesirable electrical discharge (an electrical arc) in the process chamber.” *Id.* at 3:23–29.

According to the '421 patent, magnetron sputtering apparatus 200 includes cathode assembly 216, which includes cathode 218 and sputtering target 220. *Id.* at 6:46–49. Pulsed power supply 234 is directly coupled to cathode assembly 216. *Id.* at 7:7–9. Pulsed power supply 234 generates peak voltage levels of between about 5 kV and about 30 kV, and operating voltages are generally between about 50 V and 1 kV. *Id.* at 7:17–20.

The '421 patent forms a weakly-ionized or pre-ionized plasma that substantially eliminates the probability of establishing a breakdown

condition in the chamber when high-power pulses are applied between the cathode and anode. *Id.* at 9:16–19. Once the weakly-ionized plasma is formed, high-power pulses are applied between the cathode and anode to generate a strongly-ionized plasma from the weakly-ionized plasma. *Id.* at 9:29–31, 10:8–9.

### *C. Illustrative Claims*

Of the challenged claims, none are independent. Claims 3–7, 18–20, 31, 32, 36, 40, 41, 44, and 45 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 17, and 34. Claims 1 and 3, reproduced below, are illustrative:

1. A sputtering source comprising:
  - a) a cathode assembly comprising a sputtering target that is positioned adjacent to an anode; and
  - b) a *power supply that generates a voltage pulse* between the anode and the cathode assembly that creates a weakly-ionized plasma and then a strongly-ionized plasma from the weakly-ionized plasma *without an occurrence of arcing* between the anode and the cathode assembly, an amplitude, a duration and a rise time of the voltage pulse being chosen to increase a density of ions in the strongly-ionized plasma.
3. The sputtering source of claim 1 wherein the increase of the density of ions in the strongly-ionized plasma is enough to generate sufficient thermal energy in a surface of the sputtering target to cause a sputtering yield to be related to a temperature of the sputtering target.

Ex. 1101, 22:14–24, 29–33 (emphases added).

*D. The Prior Art Relied Upon*

Intel relies upon the following prior art references:

Wang	US 6,413,382 B1	July 2, 2002	(Ex. 1104)
Lantsman	US 6,190,512 B1	Feb. 20, 2001	(Ex. 1105)
Kawamata	US 5,958,155	Sep. 28, 1999	(Ex. 1109)

D.V. Mozgrin, et al., *High-Current Low-Pressure Quasi-Stationary Discharge in a Magnetic Field: Experimental Research*, 21 PLASMA PHYSICS REPORTS 400–409 (1995) (Ex. 1103) (hereinafter “Mozgrin”).

*E. The Asserted Grounds of Unpatentability*

Intel asserts the following grounds of unpatentability:

<b>Claim</b>	<b>Basis</b>	<b>References</b>
3–5, 36, 40, and 41	§ 103	Mozgrin and Kawamata
3–5, 18–20, 36, 40, and 41	§ 103	Wang and Kawamata
6, 31, 44, and 45	§ 103	Mozgrin and Lantsman
7, 18–20, and 32	§ 103	Mozgrin, Lantsman, and Kawamata
6, 31, 44, and 45	§ 103	Wang and Lantsman
7 and 32	§ 103	Wang, Lantsman, and Kawamata

II. DISCUSSION

*A. Claim Interpretation*

In an *inter partes* review, claim terms in an unexpired patent are given their broadest reasonable construction in light of the specification of the patent in which they appear. 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b). Claim terms are given

# 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.