

Exhibit 1243

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
2 BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

3
4 THE GILLETTE COMPANY,
5 et al.,
6 Petitioners,

Patent No. 6,896,775

IPR 2014-00578

7 vs.

IPR 2014-00604

IPR 2014-01482

8 ZOND, LLC,

IPR 2014-01494

9 Patent Owner.
10 -----
11
12

13 VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF LARRY D. HARTSOUGH, Ph.D.

14 Berkeley, California

15 Thursday, February 19, 2015
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 REPORTED BY:

TAVIA MANNING, CSR No. 13294, CLR, CCRR, RPR

25 JOB NO. 90259

1 February 19, 2015
2 10:08 A.M.

3
4
5
6 Deposition of LARRY D. HARTSOUGH, Ph.D.,
7 taken on behalf of Petitioners at 200
8 Marina Boulevard, Berkeley, California,
9 before Tavia Manning, Certified Shorthand
10 Reporter No. 13294, Certified LiveNote
11 Reporter, California Certified Realtime
12 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 APPEARANCES:
2
3 FOR TAIWAN SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING COMPANY,
4 LIMITED and TSMC NORTH AMERICA and FUJITSU:
5 HAYNES AND BOONE
6 BY: GREGORY HUH, ESQ.
7 2505 North Plano Road
8 Richardson, Texas 75082
9
10
11
12
13

14 FOR THE GILLETTE COMPANY:
15 WILMERHALE
16 BY: COSMIN MAIER, ESQ.
17 7 World Trade Center
18 250 Greenwich Street
19 New York, New York 10007
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 APPEARANCES (CONTINUED):
2
3

4 FOR THE PATENT OWNER ZOND, LLC:
5 RADULESCU
6 BY: ETAI LAHAV, ESQ.
7 TIGRAN VARDANIAN, ESQ.
8 The Empire State Building
9 350 Fifth Avenue
10 New York, New York 10118
11
12
13
14
15

16 Also present: Jeff Manly, Videographer
17
18 ***
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA;
2 THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 2015; 10:08 A.M.
3

4 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is the start of
5 tape labeled Number 1, of the videotaped deposition
6 of Hartsough in the matter of Gillette Company
7 versus Zond, in the Court of the Patent Trial and
8 Appeal Board, and Case Numbers IPR 2014-01482, IPR
9 2014-01494, IPR 2014-00578, IPR 2014-00604.

10 This deposition is being held at 200 Marina
11 Boulevard in Berkeley, California on February 19th,
12 2014 at approximately 10:09 a.m.

13 My name is Jeff Manly from TSG Reporting,
14 and I am the legal video specialist.

15 The court reporter is Tavia Manning in
16 association with TSG Reporting.

17 Will counsel please introduce yourself.

18 MR. MAIER: Cosmin Maier of WilmerHale on
19 behalf of The Gillette Company, and on the phone is
20 my colleague Sam Ha.

21 MR. HUH: Gregory Huh, from Haynes and
22 Boone, on behalf of TSMC and Fujitsu.

23 MR. LAHAV: Etai Lahav, from Radulescu,
24 LLP, on behalf of patent owner Zond and the witness.

25 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Will the court reporter

1 please swear in the witness.

2
3 LARRY D. HARTSOUGH, Ph.D.,
4 having been first duly sworn by the court reporter,
5 testified as follows:

6
7 EXAMINATION

8 BY MR. MAIER:

9 Q. Good morning, sir.

10 A. Good morning.

11 Q. Any reason you can't give your best and
12 truthful testimony here today?

13 A. No.

14 Q. And, again, as we discussed yesterday, if I
15 ask a question and you answer it, I'll assume you
16 understood it; is that fair?

17 A. Fair.

18 Q. And, again, we'll do our best to -- to not
19 talk over each other.

20 Okay?

21 A. Right.

22 Q. Did you do anything to prepare for today's
23 deposition?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. What did you do?

1 A. Met with counsel and --

2 Q. Okay.

3 A. -- and reviewed some of the documents of
4 the -- associated with this case.

5 Q. Who did you meet with?

6 A. Mr. Lahav and Mr. Vardanian.

7 Q. About how long did you meet with them?

8 A. Well, we spent some time on Sunday, not --
9 not the entire time that we met, and some time on
10 Tuesday, during that day, and about a couple of
11 hours last night after the deposition was over
12 yesterday.

13 Q. About how many hours did you spend last
14 night?

15 A. Two.

16 Oh, meaning with them?

17 Q. Yes.

18 A. That's what you meant?

19 Yes.

20 Q. Okay. I'm going to hand you what's been
21 marked as Exhibit 2006 in the 604 IPR, which is your
22 declaration.

23 Do you recognize Exhibit 2006?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. This is a declaration you submitted in

1 connection with the '775 IPRs?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And I notice that there's only one IPR
4 number listed for the Gillette matters on the cover,
5 but I understand that -- that this declaration is
6 your opinion for both IPRs that Gillette submitted;
7 right?

8 A. That -- that is my understanding, yes.

9 Q. Okay. And you'll understand if I refer to
10 U.S. Patent 6,896,775 as the '775 patent?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Turn to page 12 of your declaration.

13 It's page 12 --

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. -- not paragraph.

16 A. I am there.

17 Q. On this page, you're discussing the board's
18 construction for the term "means for ionizing a feed
19 gas" and "means for ionizing a volume of feed gas"
20 in connection with Claims 36 and 37 respectively;
21 correct?

22 A. Let -- let me just -- that -- that's what I
23 see on that page. I just wanted to look -- look
24 back here a little bit.

25 (Witness reviewing document.)

1 So your question was...

2 Q. On page 12 of your declaration, you are
3 discussing the Board's construction for the term
4 "means for ionizing a feed gas," which was in Claim
5 36 --

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. -- and "means for ionizing a volume of feed
8 gas," which was in Claim 37.

9 A. I'm discussing those, yes.

10 Q. And the Board adopted the broadest
11 reasonable interpretation of these claim terms;
12 correct?

13 MR. LAHAV: Objection; form.

14 THE WITNESS: That was -- I -- I -- that
15 was the Board's opinion, I guess.

16 BY MR. MAIER:

17 Q. And the Board concluded that the structure
18 for these terms is a power supply electrically
19 connected to a cathode, an anode, and/or an
20 electrode; correct?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And you disagree with the Board's
23 construction; correct?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. You state in page -- on page 12 in the

1 second sentence, "In my opinion, the Board's
2 construction of this term is flawed"; right?

3 A. Yeah, insofar as it fails to account for
4 the important cathode-to-anode arrangement that's
5 described by Dr. Chistyakov in this patent -- in
6 this patent.

7 Q. You think the Board's construction is
8 flawed; right?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. So you did not apply the construction
11 adopted by the Board to your analysis of the '775
12 patent; correct?

13 MR. LAHAV: Objection; form.

14 THE WITNESS: I disagreed with it, yes, and
15 I did not apply that.

16 BY MR. MAIER:

17 Q. You applied a different construction to
18 your analysis of the '775 patent; correct?

19 MR. LAHAV: Objection; form.

20 THE WITNESS: I disagreed with the Board,
21 yes. And I applied this -- the construction that I
22 quote at the bottom of -- on page 12:

23 "... means for ionizing a volume of feed
24 gas as a power supply electrically
25 connected to a cathode separated from an

1 anode and/or an electrode by a gap there
2 between."

3 BY MR. MAIER:

4 Q. And you disagreed, and, therefore, did not
5 apply the Board's construction, because it fails to
6 account for the important cathode/anode arrangement
7 that is described by Dr. Chistyakov; right?

8 MR. LAHAV: Objection; form.

9 THE WITNESS: Correct.

10 BY MR. MAIER:

11 Q. This important cathode/anode arrangement
12 that you think is missing from the Board's
13 construction is the notion of the gap between the
14 anode and cathode; right?

15 MR. LAHAV: Objection; form.

16 THE WITNESS: As Doctor -- as -- as
17 described in the patent.

18 BY MR. MAIER:

19 Q. I'm not sure that quite answers the
20 question.

21 So the important cathode arrangement that
22 you think is missing from the Board's construction
23 is the notion of the gap and the volume resulting
24 therefrom between the anode and cathode; right?

25 MR. LAHAV: Objection; form.

1 THE WITNESS: That -- that's not the entire
2 description of the importance of that gap.

3 BY MR. MAIER:

4 Q. Well, what do you contend is missing from
5 the Board's construction?

6 MR. LAHAV: Objection; form.

7 Go ahead.

8 I lodged my objection. Go ahead.

9 THE WITNESS: You're done?

10 MR. LAHAV: Yes.

11 THE WITNESS: I would prefer to look at the
12 patent to show -- to be able to accurately and
13 precisely tell you the -- the other attribute of
14 the -- of the gap.

15 BY MR. MAIER:

16 Q. Well, sir, you understand that your
17 opinions have to be in your declaration; right?

18 MR. LAHAV: Objection; form.

19 THE WITNESS: I -- I said that the
20 structure is and the construction is separated by a
21 gap there between, yes.

22 And you talked about a gap. You just --
23 you said a gap had a distance and a volume.

24 BY MR. MAIER:

25 Q. No, you said that, sir. You said:

1 "... because the gap and the volume
2 resulting therefrom between the anode and
3 cathode."

4 Do you see where I am reading from?

5 A. So let me -- I -- I can read it here --
6 from here. I would prefer to quote it directly, but
7 since this is a quote:

8 "So as to form a gap between the cathode or
9 the anode that is sufficient to allow
10 current to flow through a region between
11 the anode and the cathode."

12 So that's an additional attribute, that gap
13 has to be sufficient to allow current to flow --

14 Q. Well, you didn't --

15 A. -- through a region 245 between the anode
16 238 and the cathode 216.

17 Q. You didn't put that in your construction,
18 did you?

19 MR. LAHAV: Objection; form.

20 BY MR. MAIER:

21 Q. Look at your construction.

22 A. It is not -- it is not in the construction.

23 Q. So what you've added to the Board's
24 construction, by way of your own construction, is
25 the notion of a gap separating the anode and an

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.