

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TAIWAN SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING COMPANY,
LTD., TSMC NORTH AMERICA CORP., 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

Petitioners

v.

ZOND, LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-00827¹
Patent 6,853,142

ZOND LLC'S PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

¹ Cases IPR2014-00865, IPR2014-01015, and IPR2014-01063 have been joined with the instance proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND 7

 A. Overview Of Magnetron Sputtering Systems. 7

 B. The '142 patent: Dr. Chistyakov invents a new apparatus containing an anode; a cathode positioned adjacent to the anode to form a gap there between; an ionization source for generating weakly-ionized plasma, and a pulsed power supply that produces an electric field across the gap to generate excited atoms in the weakly-ionized plasma and secondary electrons from the cathode, the secondary electrons ionizing the excited atoms, thereby creating the strongly ionized plasma. 8

 C. The Petitioners Mischaracterized The File History. 12

III. SUMMARY OF THE PETITIONERS' PROPOSED GROUNDS FOR REVIEW 15

IV. PATENT OWNER'S CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS 16

 A. The construction of "weakly ionized plasma" and "strongly ionized plasma." 17

V. THE PETITIONERS CANNOT PREVAIL ON ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM OF THE '142 PATENT 17

 A. The Petition failed to demonstrate that a skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the teachings of the prior art references to achieve the claimed invention of the '142 patent with a reasonable expectation of success or that combining the teachings of the prior art would have led to predictable results. 18

 1. Scope and content of prior art. 21

 a. Kudryavtsev – 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 (Ex. 1304). 21

 b. Wang – U.S. Patent No. 6,413,382 (Exhibit 1305)..... 24

 2. The Petitioner Failed To Show That It Would Have Been Obvious To Combine The Cylindrical Tube Laser Without A Magnet Of Kudryavtsev With The Wang Magnetron Sputtering System. 25

 B. The Petition fails to demonstrate how the alleged combinations teach every element of the challenged claims. 34

1.	The cited references do not teach “a cathode that is positioned adjacent to the anode and forming a gap there between,” as recited in independent claim 21.....	35
2.	The cited references do not teach that “the power supply generates a constant power,” as recited in dependent claim 22.....	40
3.	The cited references do not teach “applying the electric field at a constant power,” as recited in dependent claim 33.....	41
4.	The cited references do not teach that “the power supply generates a constant voltage,” as recited in claim 23, and as similarly recited in claim 34.....	43
5.	The cited references do not teach “a pulsed electric field,” as recited in claim 25.....	46
6.	The cited references do not teach that “the ionization source is chosen from the group comprising an electrode coupled to a DC power supply ...,” as required by dependent claim 29.....	47
7.	The cited references do not teach “selecting at least one of a pulse amplitude and a pulse width of the electrical pulse in order to increase an ionization rate of the strongly-ionized plasma,” as required by dependent claim 36.....	50
VI. CONCLUSION.....		51

I. INTRODUCTION

The Petitioners' arguments hinge on fanciful misreadings of the prior art by their proffered expert, Dr. Uwe Kortshagen. As will be shown below, neither Wang nor Kudryavtsev teach "a cathode that is positioned adjacent to the anode and forming a gap there between" as required by independent claim 21 of the '142 patent. Once the Board recognizes that Dr. Kortshagen essentially invented some of the alleged "teachings" in Wang and Kudryavtsev to suit the Petitioners' objectives, the Board should agree to confirm the challenged claims.

The '142 patent discloses and illustrates in FIG. 2A a cathode 204 positioned adjacent to an anode 216 and a gap labeled 220 as an area formed between the cathode 204 and the anode 216.² The '142 patent requires the generation of a weakly-ionized plasma between this gap and the application of an electric field across the gap and the weakly-ionized plasma, which then creates a strongly-ionized plasma.³ Importantly, this gap is *not* the area between the target cathode and the substrate, which is the traditional positioning of the plasma in a magnetron sputtering system and is not claimed

² Exhibit 1301, '142 patent, FIG. 2A, col. 4, ll. 34-42.

³ *Id.* at claim 21.

by the '142 patent. Wang does not teach the claimed gap. In fact, the only area disclosed in Wang in which any plasma is created is the traditional area between the target and substrate. Unlike the '142 patent, Wang contains no teaching for creating a plasma in the claimed gap.

In fact, both the Petitioners and their expert, Dr. Kortshagen, initially agreed that Wang does not teach the claimed gap. Petitioners admitted that Wang does not disclose the '142 claim limitations regarding a gap: “[i]n Wang, the cathode 14 and anode 24 are not positioned so as to form a gap, as shown in the '142 Patent.”⁴ Dr. Kortshagen took the position in his Declaration that one of ordinary skill in the art could have added and/or rearranged components in Wang’s device to achieve the claimed invention of the '142 patent: “it would have been obvious to either add a separate anode electrode in Wang’s chamber between the cathode and the grounded shield 24 and to position the separate anode electrode adjacent to the cathode or to move the grounded shield 24 so as to form a gap, as shown in the '142 Patent.”⁵

Later at his deposition, however, Dr. Kortshagen did *an about-face and took an entirely different position* by stating that the traditional area between the

⁴ Petition, p. 40; Exhibit 1302, Kortshagen Declaration, ¶ 110.

⁵ Exhibit 1302, Kortshagen Declaration, ¶ 110.

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.