

DOCKET NO: 0107131.00271US5  
'142 PATENT

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

PATENT: 6,853,142, CLAIMS 40 and 41

INVENTOR: ROMAN CHISTYAKOV

FILED: NOV. 4, 2002

ISSUED: FEB. 8, 2005

TITLE: METHODS AND APPARATUS FOR GENERATING HIGH-DENSITY PLASMA

---

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**DECLARATION OF UWE KORTSHAGEN, PH.D., REGARDING  
CLAIMS 40 and 41 OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,853,142**

I, Uwe Kortshagen, declare as follows:

1. My name is Uwe Kortshagen.
2. I received my Diploma in Physics from the University of Bochum in Germany in 1988. I received my Ph.D. in Physics from University of Bochum in 1991 and my Habilitation in Experimental Physics from University of Bochum in 1995.
3. I am a Distinguished McKnight University Professor at the University of Minnesota. I have been the Head of the Mechanical Engineering Department at

the University of Minnesota since July 2008. I have been a Professor at the Mechanical Engineering Department at the University of Minnesota since August 2003. Between August 1999 and August 2003, I was an Associate Professor at the Mechanical Engineering Department at the University of Minnesota. Between July 1996 and August 1999, I was an Assistant Professor at the Mechanical Engineering Department at the University of Minnesota. Between April 1996 and July 1996, I was a Lecturer at the Department of Physics and Astronomy at the University of Bochum, Germany. Between August 2006 and June 2008, I was the Director of Graduate Studies at the Mechanical Engineering Department at the University of Minnesota.

4. I have taught courses on Introduction to Plasma Technology and Advanced Plasma Technology. These courses include significant amounts of material on plasma technology. In addition, I have taught a Special Topics class on Plasma Nanotechnology.

5. Plasma processes for advanced technological applications has been the primary area of my professional research for over 30 years. Most of my Ph.D. students go on to work on plasmas either in academia or the semiconductor industry.

6. A copy of my latest *curriculum vitae* (CV) is attached as Appendix A.

7. I have reviewed the specification, claims, and file history of U.S. Patent No. 6,853,142 (the "'142 patent") (Ex. 1401). I understand that the '142 patent was filed on November 4, 2002. I understand that, for purposes of determining whether a publication will qualify as prior art, the earliest date that the '142 patent could be entitled to is November 4, 2002.

8. I have reviewed the following publications:

- D.V. Mozgrin, *et al.*, High-Current Low-Pressure Quasi-Stationary Discharge in a Magnetic Field: Experimental Research, Plasma Physics Reports, Vol. 21, No. 5, pp. 400-409, 1995 ("Mozgrin" (Ex. 1403)).
- U.S. Pat. No. 6,413,382 ("Wang" (Ex. 1405)).
- U.S. Pat. No. 6,190,512 ("Lantsman" (Ex. 1406)).
- A. A. Kudryavtsev and V.N. Skerbov, Ionization relaxation in a plasma produced by a pulsed inert-gas discharge, Sov. Phys. Tech. Phys. 28(1), pp. 30-35, January 1983 ("Kudryavtsev" (Ex. 1404)).

9. I have read and understood each of the above publications. The disclosure of each of these publications provides sufficient information for someone to make and use the plasma generation and sputtering processes that are described in the above publications.

10. I have considered certain issues from the perspective of a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the '142 patent application was filed. In my

opinion, a person of ordinary skill in the art for the '142 patent would have found the '142 patent invalid.

11. I have been retained by Intel Corporation (“Intel” or “Petitioner”) as an expert in the field of plasma technology. I am being compensated at my normal consulting rate of \$350/hour for my time. My compensation is not dependent on and in no way affects the substance of my statements in this Declaration.

12. I have no financial interest in the Petitioner. I similarly have no financial interest in the '142 patent, and have had no contact with the named inventor of the '142 patent.

## **I. RELEVANT LAW**

13. I am not an attorney. For the purposes of this declaration, I have been informed about certain aspects of the law that are relevant to my opinions. My understanding of the law is as follows:

### **A. Claim Construction**

14. I have been informed that claim construction is a matter of law and that the final claim construction will ultimately be determined by the Board. For the purposes of my invalidity analysis in this proceeding and with respect to the prior art, I have applied the broadest reasonable construction of the claim terms as they would be understood by one skilled in the relevant art.

15. I have been informed and understand that a claim in *inter partes* review is given the “broadest reasonable construction in light of the specification.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b). I have also been informed and understand that any claim term that lacks a definition in the specification is therefore also given a broad interpretation.

16. I understand that some claim limitations can be presented in “means plus function” format. I understand that when a means plus function format is present in a claim term of challenged claim, the Board will interpret the claim term using a statutory construction (under 35 U.S.C. § 112(f)) and the Board will determine the function recited in the claim and identify any structure disclosed in the specification for performing the recited function and equivalent structure as the meaning of the limitation of the claim.

**B. Obviousness**

17. I have been informed and understand that a patent claim can be considered to have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was filed. This means that, even if all of the requirements of a claim are not found in a single prior art reference, the claim is not patentable if the differences between the subject matter in the prior art and the subject matter in the claim would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was filed.

# 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.