

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC., RENESAS ELECTRONICS CORPORATION, RENESAS ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., GLOBAL FOUNDRIES 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,

Petitioners

v.

ZOND, LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-00829¹
Patent 6,805,779

ZOND LLC'S PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

¹ Cases IPR2014-00859 and IPR2014-01072 have been joined with the instant proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND 7

 A. Overview Of Plasma Generation 7

 B. The '779 patent: Dr. Chistyakov invents a new plasma generator containing a feed gas source, an excited atom source with a magnet that traps electrons, a plasma chamber that confines excited atoms, and an energy source that ionizes the confined excited atoms in a multi-step ionization process. 9

 C. The Petitioners Mischaracterized The File History. 13

III. SUMMARY OF THE INSTITUTED GROUNDS FOR REVIEW 14

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION. 14

 A. The construction of “metastable atoms,” “multi step ionization,” and “excited atoms.” 15

 B. The construction of the means plus function limitations 16

V. THE PETITIONERS CANNOT PREVAIL ON ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM OF THE '779 PATENT 18

 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 '779 patent with a reasonable expectation of success or that combining the teachings of the prior art would have led to predictable results. 19

 1. Scope and content of prior art 21

 a. Iwamura 22

 b. Pinsley and Angelbeck 23

 2. The Petitioner Failed To Show That It Would Have Been Obvious To Combine The Laser Of Angelbeck Or Pinsley With The Plasma Treatment Apparatus Of Iwamura With A Reasonable Expectation Of Success. 24

 B. The Petition failed to demonstrate how the alleged combinations teach every element of the challenged claims. 27

1.	The combination of Iwamura and Angelbeck Does Not Teach “an excited atom source that receives ground state atoms from the feed from the ground state atoms,” As Recited In Claim 1 And As gas source ... the excited atom source generating excited atoms Similarly Recited In Independent Claim 18.	28
2.	The combination of Iwamura, Angelbeck and Pinsley does not teach “the excited atom source comprising a magnet that generates a magnetic field for substantially trapping electrons proximate to the ground state atoms” as recited in independent claim 1 and as similarly recited in independent claim 18.	31
3.	The combination of Iwamura, Angelbeck and Pinsley does not teach “a plasma chamber that is coupled to the excited atom source,” as recited in independent claim 1 and as similarly recited in independent claim 18.	36
4.	The combination of Iwamura, Angelbeck and Pinsley does not teach “the plasma chamber confining a volume of excited atoms generated by the excited atom source” as recited in independent claim 1 and as similarly recited in independent claim 18.	38
5.	The combination of Iwamura, Angelbeck and Pinsley does not teach “an energy source that is coupled to the volume of excited atoms confined by the plasma chamber” as recited in independent claim 1 and as similarly recited in independent claim 18.	39
6.	The combination of Iwamura, Angelbeck, and Pinsley does not teach “the energy source raising an energy of excited atoms in the volume of excited atoms so that at least a portion of the excited atoms in the volume of excited atoms is ionized,” as recited in independent claim 1 and as similarly recited in independent claim 18.	40
7.	The Combination of Iwamura, Angelbeck, and Pinsley Does Not Teach “an electron/ion absorber that receives the excited atoms from the excited atom source, the electron/ion absorber trapping electrons and ions,” as recited in dependent claim 16, and as similarly recited in dependent claims 28 and 42.	41
8.	The combination of Iwamura, Angelbeck and Pinsley Does Not Teach “means for generating a volume of metastable atoms from the volume of ground state atoms,” As Recited In Independent Claim 41, And As Similarly Recited in Claim 46	43
9.	The combination of Iwamura, Angelbeck and Pinsley does not teach “means for generating a magnetic field proximate to a volume of ground state atoms to substantially trap electrons proximate to the	

volume of ground state atoms,” as recited in independent claim 41 and as similarly recited in independent claim 46.47

10. The combination of Iwamura, Angelbeck, and Pinsley does not teach “means for raising an energy of the metastable atoms so that at least a portion of the volume of metastable atoms is ionized,” as recited in independent claim 41 and as similarly recited in independent claim 46.50

11. The combination of Iwamura, Angelbeck and Pinsley Does Not Teach “an excited atom source that is coupled to the feed gas source, the excited atom source generating excited atoms from the ground state atoms,” As Recited In Independent Claim 4552

12. The combination of Iwamura, Angelbeck and Pinsley does not teach “an electron/ion absorber that receives the excited atoms generated by the excited atom source and then traps electrons and ions,” as recited in independent claim 45.....53

13. The combination of Iwamura, Angelbeck and Pinsley does not teach “a plasma chamber that is coupled to the electron/ion absorber, the plasma chamber confining a volume of excited atoms generated by the excited atom source,” as recited in independent claim 45.55

14. The combination of Iwamura, Angelbeck and Pinsley does not teach “an energy source that is coupled to the volume of excited atoms confined by the plasma chamber,” as recited in independent claim 45.....56

15. The combination of Iwamura, Angelbeck, and Pinsley does not teach “the energy source raising an energy of excited atoms in the volume of excited atoms so that at least a portion of the excited atoms in the volume of excited atoms is ionized,” as recited in independent claim 45.57

C. Petitioner Failed To Demonstrate That Claim 46 Is Anticipated By Iwamura.....59

VI. CONCLUSION.....60

Exhibit List

Exhibit No.	Description
Ex. 2004	Transcript of deposition of Dr. Kortshagen, Petitioners' expert, for the '779 Patent, 1/16/2015.
Ex. 2005	Declaration of Dr. Hartsough, 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.