

DOCKET NO.: 0110198.00196US1

Filed on behalf of The Gillette Company

By: Michael A. Diener, Reg. No. 37,122
Larissa Bifano Park, Reg. No. 59,051
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
Tel: (617) 526-6000
Email: Michael.Diener@wilmerhale.com
Larissa.park@wilmerhale.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

THE GILLETTE COMPANY
Petitioner

v.

ZOND, INC.
Patent Owner

IPR Trial No. TBD

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 7,147,759
CHALLENGING CLAIMS 1, 4, 10-12, 17, 18 and 44
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 312 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.104**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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	4
IV.	Brief Description of Technology.....	4
A.	Plasma.....	4
B.	Ions and Excited Atoms	6
V.	Overview of the ‘759 Patent	7
A.	Summary of Alleged Invention of the ‘759 Patent	7
B.	Prosecution History	7
1.	The Patent Owner mischaracterized the prior art Mozgrin reference.....	7
2.	Adding the “without forming an arc” limitation resulted in allowance.....	8
VI.	Overview of the Primary Prior Art References	9
A.	Summary of the Prior Art.....	9
B.	Overview of Mozgrin	9
1.	Summary	9
2.	Mozgrin teaches avoiding arcs.....	11
C.	Overview of Kudryavtsev	13
D.	Overview of Wang	14
VII.	Claim construction	15
A.	“weakly-ionized plasma” and “strongly-ionized plasma”	15
B.	“multi-step ionization process”	17
VIII.	Specific Grounds for Petition.....	18

A.	Ground I: Claims 1, 10 and 18 are obvious in view of the combination of Mozgrin and Kudryavtsev.....	18
1.	Independent claim 1	19
2.	Dependent claim 10 is obvious in view of the combination of Mozgrin and Kudryavtsev	31
B.	Ground II: Claims 4 and 44 are obvious in view of the combination of Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, and the Mozgrin Thesis	33
C.	Ground III: Dependent claims 10-12 are obvious in view of the combination of Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev and Li.....	36
D.	Ground IV: Dependent claim 17 is obvious in view of the combination of Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev and Muller-Horsche.....	39
E.	Ground V: Claims 1, 4, 10 and 12 are obvious in view of the combination of Wang and Kudryavtsev	41
1.	Independent claim 1	41
2.	Dependent claims 4, 10 and 12 are obvious in view of the combination of Wang and Kudryavtsev.....	51
F.	Ground VI: Dependent claim 11 is obvious in view of the combination of Wang, Kudryavtsev and Li	54
G.	Ground VII: Dependent claim 17 is obvious in view of the combination of Wang, Kudryavtsev and Muller-Horsche	54
H.	Ground VIII: Dependent claim 18 is obvious in view of the combination of Wang, Kudryavtsev and Kobayashi.....	55
I.	Ground IX: Dependent claim 44 is obvious in view of the combination of Wang, Kudryavtsev, and the Mozgrin Thesis.....	56
IX.	Conclusion	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

In re ICON Health & Fitness, Inc., 496 F.3d 1374, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2007).

37 C.F.R. §42.22(a)(1)

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)

37 C.F.R. §42.104(a)

37 C.F.R. §42.104(b)(1)-(5)

77 Fed. Reg. 48764 (Aug. 14, 2012).

35 U.S.C. § 315(c)

37 C.F.R. §§ 42.22 and 42.122(b)

I. MANDATORY NOTICES

A. Real Party-in-Interest

The Gillette Company (“Petitioner”), a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Procter & Gamble Co., is the real party-in-interest.

B. Related Matters

Zond has asserted U.S. Patent No. 7,147,759 (“759 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.*) (Ex. 1034).

The below-listed claims of the ‘759 Patent are presently the subject of a substantially identical petition for *inter partes* review styled The Gillette Company v. Zond, Inc., which was filed February 20, 2014 and assigned Case No. IPR2014–00443. Petitioner will seek joinder with that *inter partes* review under 35 U.S.C. § 315(c), 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.22 and 42.122(b).

C. Counsel

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

Backup Counsel: Larissa B. Park (Registration No. 59,051)

D. Service Information

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.