

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

TAIWAN SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING COMPANY, LTD.,  
TSMC NORTH AMERICA CORPORATION, FUJITSU  
SEMICONDUCTOR LIMITED, FUJITSU SEMICONDUCTOR  
AMERICA, INC., THE GILLETTE COMPANY, ADVANCED MICRO  
DEVICES, INC., RENESAS ELECTRONICS CORPORATION, RENESAS  
ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., GLOBALFOUNDRIES U.S., INC.,  
GLOBALFOUNDRIES DRESDEN MODULE ONE LLC & CO. KG,  
GLOBALFOUNDRIES DRESDEN MODULE TWO LLC & CO. KG,  
TOSHIBA AMERICA ELECTRONIC COMPONENTS, INC., TOSHIBA  
AMERICA INC., TOSHIBA AMERICA INFORMATION SYSTEMS,  
INC., and TOSHIBA CORPORATION,

Petitioner

v.

ZOND, LLC  
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 7,808,184

---

*Inter Partes* Review Case No. 2014-00803<sup>1</sup>

---

**PATENT OWNER RESPONSE  
UNDER 37 CFR § 42.220**

---

<sup>1</sup> Cases IPR2014-00858, IPR2014-00996, and IPR2014-01061 have been joined with the instant proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND ..... 5

    A. The ‘184 patent: Dr. Chistyakov’s Pulse Control Technique..... 5

III. SUMMARY OF PETITIONER’S PROPOSED GROUNDS..... 15

IV. THE BOARD’S COMPARISON OF THE CLAIMS TO THE  
PRIOR ART EFFECTIVELY APPLIES AN ERRONEOUS  
SCOPE TO THE CLAIMS..... 16

    A. Construction of “Voltage Pulse Having At Least One of a  
    Controlled Amplitude and a Controlled Rise Time.” ..... 16

V. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO PROVE BY A  
PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE THAT CLAIMS 1 –  
20 ARE OBVIOUS..... 26

    A. The Challenge Directed to Parent Claims 1 and 11..... 26

        1. Neither Wang nor Kudryavtsev Teach the Claimed Control  
        of Voltage Amplitude or Rise Time to Avoid Arc When  
        Rapidly Forming a Strongly Ionized Plasma..... 26

        2. Scope of Cited Art and Differences Between the Claims and the Art. 27

            i. General Scope of Wang ..... 27

            ii. General Scope of Kudryavtsev ..... 34

        3. Differences Between Wang and the Claims ..... 41

        4. Differences Between Kudryavtsev and the Claims ..... 47

        5. Incompatibilities Between Kudryavtsev and Wang ..... 51

        6. Secondary Considerations ..... 54

        7. Conclusion: Petitioner Has Not Proven by a Preponderance  
        of the Evidence that Claims 1, 11 are Obvious. .... 55

B. The Challenge Directed to Dependent Claims 7 and 17..... 55

VI. CONCLUSION ..... 58

## I. Introduction

The present petition challenges dependent claims 6 – 10, and 16 – 20. The patentability of parent claims 1 and 11 was already discussed at length in the Patent Owner’s Response in IPR2014-00799. The present response therefore repeats much of the analysis from the response in IPR2014-00803, but also adds some key additional arguments directed to the unique aspects of dependent claims 7, 17.

Petitioner’s arguments hinge on fanciful misreadings of the prior art by its proffered expert, Mr. Richard DeVito.<sup>2</sup> As will be shown below, neither Wang nor Kudryavtsev teach *controlling the amplitude or rise time of a voltage pulse* in order to increase the “ionization rate so that a rapid increase in electron density and a formation of a strongly-ionized plasma occurs without forming an arc,” as required by the claims of the ‘184 patent. Once the Board recognizes that Mr. DeVito essentially invented some of the alleged

---

<sup>2</sup> In its Institution Decision, the Board erroneously referred to Mr. DeVito as “Dr. DeVito.” IPR2014-00799, Decision to Institute, page 9. However, Mr. DeVito was never awarded a doctorate of any kind. *See* Ex. 1102, De Vito Declaration ¶¶2 - ¶4.

“teachings” in Wang and Kudryavtsev to suit the Petitioner’s objectives, the Board should agree to confirm the challenged claims.

Neither Wang nor Kudryavtsev teach the claimed voltage control. The ‘184 patent discloses carefully “controlling” the amplitude and rise time of a voltage pulse. The patent shows that, with proper control of voltage amplitude and rise time, the inventor, Dr. Chistyakov, was able to ignite a plasma *without arcing*, rapidly grow that plasma to a high density, and sustain that density for a relatively long duration, again all without arcing.<sup>3</sup> Mr. DeVito and Petitioners erroneously argue that incidental, *uncontrolled* variations in voltage that occur in Wang and Kudryavtsev meet this limitation.

Importantly, Wang’s system controls the *power* of its pulses to a constant target level, as opposed to the claimed control of pulse *voltage* in order to avoid arcing during the *transition to a strongly ionized plasma*. Constant power pulses, such as used in Wang, have a voltage and current that will vary *uncontrollably* as the system attempts to control the power (*i.e.*, the product of voltage and current) to a desired level. Since such power supplies are designed to control the *product* of voltage and current to a target level—and not voltage, the power supplies will allow the voltage to reach extremely high values when the current

---

<sup>3</sup> Ex. 2015, Declaration of Patent Owner’s Expert.

# 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.