

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FUJITSU SEMICONDUCTOR LIMITED AND
FUJITSU SEMICONDUCTOR AMERICA, INC.

Petitioner

v.

ZOND, LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-00859
Patent 6,805,779

ZOND LLC'S PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND	9
A. Overview Of Plasma Generation	9
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.	11
C. The Petitioner Mischaracterized The File History.....	15
III. SUMMARY OF THE PETITIONER’S PROPOSED GROUNDS FOR REVIEW	17
IV. PATENT OWNER’S CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS.....	18
A. The construction of “multi-step ionization process”.	19
V. THERE IS NO REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PETITIONER PREVAILING AS TO A CHALLENGED CLAIM OF THE '779 PATENT.	19
A. The Petition failed to demonstrate any motivation to combine.	21
1. Scope and content of prior art.....	23
a. Mozgrin.....	24
b. Kudravytsev	26
c. Iwamura	29
d. Pinsley and Angelbeck.....	30
2. The Petitioner Fails To Show That It Would Have Been Obvious To Combine Either Kudravytsev’s Cylindrical Device Without A Magnet or Pinsley’s Gas Laser With The Magnetron System Of Mozgrin.	32
3. The Petitioner Failed To Show That It Would Have Been Obvious To Combine Angelbeck’s Gas Laser With The Plasma Treatment Apparatus Of Iwamura.	37
B. The Petition failed to demonstrate how the alleged combinations teach every element of the challenged claims.....	38
1. The combination of Mozgrin, Kudravytsev, Pinsley, and Iwamura does not teach “an excited atom source that receives ground state atoms from the	

feed gas source” as recited in independent claim 1 and as similarly recited in independent claim 45.	39
2. The combination of Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, Pinsley and Iwamura 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 claims 41 and 46.	40
3. The combination of Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, Pinsley, and Iwamura does not teach “a plasma chamber that is coupled to the excited atom source, 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 45.	41
4. The combination of Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, Pinsley, and Iwamura 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 45.	42
5. The combination of Iwamura and Angelbeck does not teach a “plasma generator that generates a plasma with a multi-step ionization process,” as recited in independent claim 1 and as similarly recited in claims 41, and 45.	42
6. The combination of Iwamura and Angelbeck 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 claim 41.	43
7. The combination of Iwamura and Angelbeck 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 claims 41 and 45.	45
C. The Petition Failed to Identify Any Compelling Rationale for Adopting Redundant Grounds of Rejection.	46
D. The Petition failed to set forth a proper obviousness analysis.	50
E. Petitioner Failed To Demonstrate That Claim 46 Is Anticipated By Iwamura.	52
VI. CONCLUSION.	54

I. INTRODUCTION

The Petitioner has represented in a motion for joinder that this petition “is identical to the Intel IPR2014-00829 in all substantive respects, includes identical exhibits, and relies upon the same expert declarant.” Accordingly, based upon that representation, the Patent Owner opposes review on the same basis presented in opposition to Intel’s request no. IPR2014-00829, which is repeated below:

The Board should deny the present request for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 6,805,779 (“the ’779 patent”) because there is not a reasonable likelihood that the Petitioner will prevail at trial with respect to at least one claim of the ’779 patent.¹

Indeed, there are five different and independent groups of reasons why the Petitioner cannot prevail. First, the reference that is primarily relied upon by the Petitioner (*i.e.*, Mozgrin) was already considered by the Examiner and overcome during the prosecution of the application that led to the issuance of the ’779 patent. Indeed, Mozgrin was considered by 6 different examiners and

¹ 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).

overcome during the prosecution of 9 other patents that are related to the '779 patent over nearly a 10 year period.²

Second, the Petitioner's obviousness rejections are all predicated on the false assumption that a skilled artisan could have achieved the combination of (i) a feed gas source comprising ground state atoms; (ii) an excited atom source that generates excited atoms from the ground state atoms and has a magnet that traps electrons near the ground state atoms; (iii) a plasma chamber that confines excited atoms; and (iv) an energy source that ionizes the confined excited atoms in a multi-step ionization process, as required by independent claims 1, 41, 45 and 46 of the '779 patent by combining the teachings of Mozgrin with Kudryavtsev and Pinsley.³

² Examiners Douglas Owens, Tung X. Le, Rodney McDonald, Wilson Lee, Don Wong, and Tuyet T. Vo allowed U.S. Patents 7,147,759, 7,808,184, 7,811,421, 8,125,155, 6,853,142, 7,604,716, 6,896,775, 6,896,773, 6,805,779, and 6,806,652 over Mozgrin and Wang over nearly a decade from the time that the application for the '759 patent was filed on 9/30/2002 to the time that the '155 patent issued on 2/28/2012.

³ Petition at pp. 20-42.

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.