

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FUJITSU SEMICONDUCTOR LIMITED, FUJITSU SEMICONDUCTOR AMERICA, INC., 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., TOSHIBA CORPORATION, and THE GILLETTE COMPANY,
Petitioner,

v.

ZOND, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2014-00808¹
Patent 7,604,716 B2

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

CHAGNON, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

FINAL WRITTEN DECISION
35 U.S.C. § 318(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73

¹ Cases IPR2014-00849, IPR2014-00975, and IPR2014-01067 have been joined with the instant proceeding.

I. INTRODUCTION

We have jurisdiction to hear this *inter partes* review under 35 U.S.C. § 6(c). This Final Written Decision is issued pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 318(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73. For the reasons discussed herein, we determine that Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that claims 19–24 of U.S. Patent No. 7,604,716 B2 (Ex. 1301, “the ’716 patent”) are unpatentable.

A. *Procedural History*

Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company, Ltd. and TSMC North America Corp. (collectively, “TSMC”) filed a Petitioner (Paper 1, “Pet.”) seeking *inter partes* review of claims 19–24 (“the challenged claims”) of the ’716 patent. TSMC included a Declaration of Uwe Kortshagen, Ph.D. (Ex. 1302) to support its positions. Zond (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response (Paper 8, “Prelim. Resp.”). Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), on October 14, 2014, we instituted an *inter partes* review of the challenged claims on the following grounds: claim 21 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over the combination of Wang² and Kudryavtsev³; claims 19 and 20 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over the combination of Wang, Kudryavtsev, and Lantsman⁴; and claims 22–24 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as

² U.S. Patent No. 6,413,382 B1, issued July 2, 2002 (Ex. 1304).

³ A.A. Kudryavtsev and V.N. Skerbov, *Ionization Relaxation in a Plasma Produced by a Pulsed Inert-Gas Discharge*, 28 SOV. PHYS. TECH. PHYS. 30–35 (Jan. 1983) (Ex. 1305).

⁴ U.S. Patent No. 6,190,512 B1, issued Feb. 20, 2001 (Ex. 1306).

IPR2014-00808
Patent 7,604,716 B2

obvious over the combination of Wang, Kudryavtsev, and Mozgrin.⁵
Paper 9 (“Inst. Dec.”).

Subsequent to institution, we granted revised Motions for Joinder filed by other Petitioners listed in the Caption above, joining Cases IPR2014-00849, IPR2014-00975, and IPR2014-01067 with the instant trial (Papers 12–14), and also granted a Joint Motion to Terminate with respect to TSMC (Paper 34).⁶ Patent Owner filed a Patent Owner Response (Paper 28, “PO Resp.”), along with a Declaration of Larry D. Hartsough, Ph.D. (Ex. 2004) to support its positions. Petitioner filed a Reply (Paper 42, “Reply”) to the Patent Owner Response, along with a supplemental Declaration of Dr. Kortshagen (Ex. 1330). An oral hearing⁷ was held on June 12, 2015. A transcript of the hearing is included in the record. Paper 50 (“Tr.”).

B. Related Proceedings

The parties indicate that the ’716 patent was asserted against Petitioner, as well as other defendants, in seven district court lawsuits pending in the District of Massachusetts. Pet. 1; Paper 5.

⁵ 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. 1303).

⁶ We refer to the remaining parties, listed in the Caption above, collectively, as “Petitioner” throughout this Decision.

⁷ The oral arguments for IPR2014-00807, IPR2014-00808, IPR2014-00818, IPR2014-00819, IPR2014-00821, IPR2014-00827, IPR2014-01098, IPR2014-01099, and IPR2014-01100 were consolidated.

C. The '716 Patent

The '716 patent relates to a method and apparatus for generating a strongly-ionized plasma, for use in various plasma processes. Ex. 1301, Abstract, 7:30–47. For example, at the time of the invention, plasma sputtering was a widely used technique for depositing films on substrates. *Id.* at 1:24–25. As discussed in the '716 patent, prior art magnetron sputtering systems deposited films having low uniformity and poor target utilization (the target material erodes in a non-uniform manner). *Id.* at 3:20–33. The '716 patent discloses that increasing the power applied to the plasma, in an attempt to increase the plasma uniformity and density, can also “increase the probability of generating an electrical breakdown condition leading to an undesirable electrical discharge (an electrical arc) in the chamber.” *Id.* at 3:34–40.

The '716 patent further discloses that using pulsed DC power can reduce the probability of establishing such an electrical breakdown condition, but that large power pulses still can result in undesirable electrical discharges. *Id.* at 3:42–52. According to the '716 patent, however, first forming a weakly-ionized plasma “substantially eliminates the probability of establishing a breakdown condition in the chamber when high-power pulses are applied between the cathode . . . and the anode.” *Id.* at 6:16–19. The “probability of establishing a breakdown condition is substantially eliminated because the weakly-ionized plasma . . . has a low-level of ionization that provides electrical conductivity through the plasma. This

conductivity substantially prevents the setup of a breakdown condition, even when high power is applied to the plasma.” *Id.* at 6:20–25.

D. Illustrative Claims

Challenged claims 19–24 each depend from claim 14, which is not challenged in the present Petition. Claims 14 and 21 are illustrative, and are reproduced as follows:

14. A method for generating a strongly -ionized plasma, the method comprising:

a. ionizing a feed gas in a chamber to form a weakly-ionized plasma that substantially eliminates the probability of developing an electrical breakdown condition in the chamber; and

b. supplying an electrical pulse across the weakly-ionized plasma that excites atoms in the weakly-ionized plasma, thereby generating a strongly-ionized plasma without developing an electrical breakdown condition in the chamber.

Ex. 1301, 21:1–11.

21. The method of claim 14 wherein the supplying the electrical pulse comprises applying a quasi-static electric field across the weakly-ionized plasma.

Id. at 21:36–38.

II. ANALYSIS

A. *Claim Construction*

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); *see In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC*, 793 F.3d 1268, 1275–79 (Fed. Cir. 2015). Claim terms

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.