

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

THE GILLETTE COMPANY,  
Petitioner,

v.

ZOND, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2014-00988  
Patent 7,147,759 B2

---

Before KEVIN F. TURNER, DEBRA K. STEPHENS, JONI Y. CHANG,  
SUSAN L.C. MITCHELL, and JENNIFER M. MEYER,  
*Administrative Patent Judges.*

CHANG, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION  
Institution of *Inter Partes* Review  
37 C.F.R. § 42.108

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Gillette Company (“Gillette”) filed a Petition requesting an *inter partes* review of claim 40 of U.S. Patent No. 7,147,759 B2 (Ex. 1401, “the ’759 patent”). Paper 3 (“Pet.”). Zond, LLC (“Zond”), filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 7 (“Prelim. Resp.”).

We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 314. The standard for instituting an *inter partes* review is set forth in 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), which provides:

**THRESHOLD.**—The Director may not authorize an *inter partes* review to be instituted unless the Director determines that the information presented in the petition filed under section 311 and any response filed under section 313 shows that there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.

Upon consideration of the Petition and Preliminary Response, we conclude that the information presented in the Petition demonstrates that there is a reasonable likelihood that Gillette would prevail in challenging claim 40 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314, we hereby authorize an *inter partes* review to be instituted as to claim 40 of the ’759 patent.

### A. *Related District Court Proceedings*

Gillette indicates that the ’759 patent was asserted in *Zond, LLC v. Gillette*, No.1:13-cv-11570-RGS (D. Mass.). Pet. 1. Gillette also identifies other proceedings in which Zond asserted the ’759 patent. *Id.*

*B. Related Inter Partes Reviews*

The following Petitions for *inter partes* review also challenge the same claim based on the same grounds of unpatentability as those in the instant proceeding: *Intel Corp. v. Zond, LLC.*, Case IPR2014-00447; *GLOBALFOUNDRIES U.S., Inc. v. Zond, LLC.*, Case IPR2014-01083.

In each of IPR2014-00447 and IPR2014-01083, we instituted an *inter partes* review of claim 40 of the '759 patent, based on the sole ground that claim 40 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Wang and Kudryavtsev.

In IPR2014-00447, we terminated the proceeding in light of the Written Settlement Agreement, made in connection with the termination of the proceeding in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(b), between Intel and Zond. IPR2014-00447, Papers 15, 16; IPR2014-00443, Ex. 1035.

Gillette filed a revised Motion for Joinder with IPR2014-01083. Paper 10. In a separate decision, we grant Gillette's revised Motion for Joinder, joining the instant proceeding with IPR2014-01083, and terminating the instant proceeding.

*C. Prior Art Relied Upon*

Gillette relies upon the following prior art references:

Wang                      US 6,413,382 B1      July 2, 2002      (Ex. 1405)

D.V. Mozgrin et al., *High-Current Low-Pressure Quasi-Stationary Discharge in a Magnetic Field: Experimental Research*, 21 PLASMA PHYSICS REPORTS 400–409 (1995) (Ex. 1403, "Mozgrin").

A. A. Kudryavtsev and V.N. Skrebov, *Ionization Relaxation in a Plasma Produced by a Pulsed Inert-Gas Discharge*, 28(1) SOV. PHYS. TECH. PHYS. 30–35 (1983) (Ex. 1404, “Kudryavtsev”).

*D. Asserted Grounds of Unpatentability*

Gillette asserts the following grounds of unpatentability:

Claim	Basis	References
40	§ 103(a)	Mozgrin and Kudryavtsev
40	§ 103(a)	Wang and Kudryavtsev

II. ANALYSIS

*A. Claim Construction*

The parties make the same claim interpretation arguments that GlobalFoundries and Zond made in IPR2014-01083. *Compare* Pet. 15–20, *with* IPR2014-01083, Paper 2 (“1083 Pet.”), 14–20; *compare* Prelim. Resp. 16–26, *with* IPR2014-01083, Paper 7 (“1083 Prelim. Resp.”), 16–26.

We construed the claim terms identified by GlobalFoundries and Zond in IPR2014-001083. *See* IPR2014-01083, Paper 9 (“1083 Dec.”), 6–14. For the purposes of the instant decision, we incorporate our previous analysis and apply those claim constructions here.

*B. Obviousness over the Combination Wang and Kudryavtsev*

In its Petition, Gillette asserts the same ground of unpatentability based on the combination of Wang and Kudryavtsev, as the ground of unpatentability on which a trial was instituted in IPR2014-001083.

*See* Pet. 39–54; ’1083 Dec. 30. Gillette’s arguments are substantially identical to the arguments made by GlobalFoundries in IPR2014-001083. *Compare* Pet. 39–54, *with* ’1083 Pet. 38–53. Gillette also proffers the same Declaration of Dr. Uwe Kortshagen that GlobalFoundries submitted in support of its Petition. *Compare* Ex. 1402, *with* IPR2014-001083, Ex. 1402. Zond’s arguments in the Preliminary Response are essentially identical to those arguments that it made in IPR2014-001083. *Compare* Prelim. Resp. 26–55, *with* ’1083 Prelim. Resp. 26–55.

We incorporate our previous analysis regarding the asserted ground of unpatentability based on the combination of Wang and Kudryavtsev (’1083 Dec. 14–29), and determine that Gillette has demonstrated a reasonable likelihood of prevailing on the asserted ground of unpatentability.

### *C. Other Asserted Ground of Unpatentability*

Gillette also asserts that claim 40 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Mozgrin and Kudryavtsev. The Board’s rules for *inter partes* review proceedings, including those pertaining to institution, are “construed to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of every proceeding.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b); *see also* 35 U.S.C. § 316(b) (regulations for *inter partes* review proceedings take into account “the efficient administration of the Office” and “the ability of the Office to timely complete [instituted] proceedings”). Therefore, we exercise our discretion and do not institute a review based on this asserted ground for reasons of administrative necessity to ensure timely completion of the instituted proceeding. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.108(a).

# 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.