

DOCKET NO.: 0107131-00270US1

Filed on behalf of Intel Corporation

By: Michael A. Diener, Reg. No. 37,122
Michael H. Smith, Reg. No. 71,190
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
Tel: (617) 526-6000
Email: Michael.Diener@wilmerhale.com
MichaelH.Smith@wilmerhale.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTEL CORPORATION
Petitioner

v.

ZOND, INC.
Patent Owner

IPR Trial No. TBD

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 6,806,652
CHALLENGING CLAIMS 1-17
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 312 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.104**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Mandatory Notices.....	1
A. Real Party-in-Interest	1
B. Related Matters.....	1
C. Counsel	1
D. Service Information.....	1
II. Certification of GROUNDS FOR STANDING.....	2
III. OVERVIEW OF CHALLENGE AND RELIEF REQUESTED.....	2
A. Prior Art Patents and Printed Publications.....	2
B. Grounds for Challenge	3
C. Legal Principles.....	4
IV. brief description of technology.....	6
A. Plasma.....	7
B. Excited atoms	7
V. Overview of the ‘652 Patent.....	9
A. Summary of Alleged Invention of the ‘652 Patent	9
VI. Claim construction.....	12
A. Introduction	12
B. “Super-ionizing the initial plasma” (all claims).....	13
VII. Overview of the primary prior art references	14
A. Overview of Mozgrin	14
B. Overview of Kudryavtsev	16
C. Overview of Fahey	19
D. Overview of Iwamura.....	19
VIII. Specific Grounds for Petition	20
A. Ground I: Claims 1-14, 16, and 17 would have been obvious in view of the combination of Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, and Fahey.	21
1. Independent claim 1	21

2.	Dependent claims 2-14, 16, and 17.....	34
B.	Ground II: Claim 5 would have been obvious in view of the combination of Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, Fahey, and Vratny	48
C.	Ground III: Claims 8-10 would have been obvious in view of the combination of Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, Fahey, and Lantsman	50
D.	Ground IV: Claim 15 would have been obvious in view of the combination of Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, Fahey, and Wang.....	53
E.	Ground V: Claims 1-14, 16, and 17 would have been obvious over the references cited for Ground I (Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, and Fahey) and Iwamura.....	55
F.	Ground VI: Claim 5 would have been obvious over the references cited for Ground V (Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, Fahey, and Iwamura) and Vratny	58
G.	Ground VII: Claims 8-10 would have been obvious the references cited for Ground V (Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, Fahey, and Iwamura) and Lantsman	59
H.	Ground VIII: Claim 15 would have been obvious over the references cited for Ground V (Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, Fahey, and Iwamura) and Wang.....	60
IX.	Conclusion	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

ICON Health & Fitness, Inc., 496 F.3d 1374, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....13
In *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 415 (2007).....4
KSR..... 4, 5, 27, 33, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 58, 59, 60
Rockwell Int’l Corp. v. United States, 147 F.3d 1358, 1364 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....4

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 1034
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)4

Rules

Rule 42.104(a).....2
Rules 42.22(a)(1) and 42.104(b)(1)-(2)2
Rule 42.104(b)(4)-(5).....20

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)12
77 Fed. Reg. 48764 (Aug. 14, 2012)13

I. MANDATORY NOTICES

A. Real Party-in-Interest

Intel Corporation (“Petitioner”) is the real party-in-interest.

B. Related Matters

Zond has asserted U.S. Patent No. 6,806,652 (“the ‘652 Patent”) (Ex. 1001) against numerous parties in the District of Massachusetts, 1:13-cv-11570-RGS (*Zond v. Intel*); 1:13-cv-11577-DPW (*Zond v. AMD, Inc., et al*); 1:13-cv-11581-DJC (*Zond v. Toshiba Am. Elec. Comp. Inc.*); 1:13-cv-11591-RGS (*Zond v. SK Hynix, Inc.*); 1:13-cv-11625-NMG (*Zond v. Renesas Elec. Corp.*); 1:13-cv-11634-WGY (*Zond v. Fujitsu, et al.*); and 1:13-cv-11567-DJC (*Zond v. Gillette, Co.*). Petitioner has filed Petitions IPR2014-00843 and IPR2014-00923 for *Inter Partes* review for other claims of the ‘652 Patent.

C. Counsel

Lead Counsel: Michael A. Diener (Registration No. 37,122)

Backup Counsel: Michael H. Smith (Registration No. 71,190)

D. Service Information

E-mail: Michael.Diener@wilmerhale.com

MichaelH.Smith@wilmerhale.com

Post and hand delivery: Wilmer, Cutler, Pickering, Hale and Dorr, LLP

60 State Street

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.