

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

THE GILLETTE COMPANY
Petitioner

v.

ZOND, LLC
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 7,811,421

Inter Partes Review Case No. 2014-00990

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 CFR § 42.107(a)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....4

II. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND9

 A. Overview of Sputtering Systems 10

 B. The ‘421 Patent: Dr. Chistyakov Invents an Improved Sputtering Source. 12

III. SUMMARY OF PETITIONER’S PROPOSED GROUNDS17

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.104(B)(3).....17

 A. Construction of “Weakly Ionized Plasma” and “Strongly Ionized Plasma” 18

V. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING.19

 A. Overview of Challenged Claims. 20

 B. All of Petition’s Obviousness Grounds Fail to Follow the Proper Legal Framework For an Obviousness Analysis..... 21

 C. All Grounds Rely on Claim Charts Submitted in Violation of Rules 42.24(a)(i) and 42.6(a)(3) 22

 D. Defects in the Challenges to the “Group A” Claims. 23

 1. Defects in Ground I: Petitioner Failed To Demonstrate That the Group A Claims Are Obvious In View of Mozgrin and Kawatama..... 25

 a. Mozgrin Does Not Anticipate Parent Claims 1, 34 26

 i. Overview of Mozgrin 24

 ii. Mozgrin Does Not Teach a Sputtering Source Comprising a Cathode Assembly Having a

Sputtering Target Positioned Adjacent to an Anode	28
iii. Mozgrin Does Not Describe the Claimed Pulse for Creating a Weak Plasma and Then a Strongly-Ionized Plasma From the Weak	31
iv. Mozgrin Does Not Teach The Claimed Generation of a Pulse whose Amplitude and Rise Time Are Chosen to Increase Ion Density Without Arcing	32
v. Conclusion: Petitioner Has Not Shown a Reasonable Likelihood of Success that Parent Claims are Anticipated by Mozgrin	34
b. The Petition Fails to Show a Reasonable Likelihood that the Group A Claims are Obvious in View of Mozgrin Combined with Kawamata.....	36
i. General Scope of Kawamata	36
ii. Differences Between Kawamata and the Claims.....	37
iii. Claim 5	39
iv. Claim 36.....	41
v. Conclusion:	43
2. Defects In Ground II: Petitioner Failed To Demonstrate A Reasonable Likelihood That The Group A Claims Are Obvious in View of Wang Combined with Kawamata.....	44
a. Defects in Ground II: Wang Does not Anticipate Parent Claims 1, 17, 34.....	45
i. Wang Does Not Show the Claimed Pulse for Creating a Weak Plasma and Then a Strongly-Ionized Plasma From the Weak Without An Occurrence of Arcing.	45

ii.	Wang Does Not Teach The Claimed Generation of a Pulse Whose Rise Time Is Chosen to Increase Ion Density Without Arcing.....	46
iii.	Conclusion: Petitioner Has Not Shown a Reasonable Likelihood of Success that Parent Claims 1, 21, and 34 are Anticipated by Wang as Required By Ground V	47
b.	Defects In Ground II: The Petition Fails to Show a Reasonable Likelihood that The Group A Claims are Obvious in View of Wang Combined with Kawamata	49
i.	Differences Between Kawamata and the Claims.....	49
E.	Defects in the Challenges to the Group B Claims.	49
1.	Differences Between the Claims and the Art	49
2.	Conclusion Regarding Group B Claims	52
VI.	FINAL CONCLUSION.....	52

I. Introduction

The Petitioner has represented in a motion to joinder that this petition “is identical to the Intel IRP no. IPR2014-00473 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. IPR2014-00473, which is reproduced below:

The present petition is the last of three petitions filed by Intel Inc. for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 7,811,421 (“the ‘421 patent”). The first (IPR 2014-00468) seeks cancellation of all independent claims (1, 17, 34, 46, 47, and 48), and selected dependent claims. The second petition (IPR 2014-00468) seeks cancellation of six dependent claims, and this third petition (IPR 2014-00473) seeks cancellation of the remainder.

This third petition relies on the same arguments and evidence presented against the parent claims in IPR 2014-00468, but for the dependent claims, adds new arguments and evidence. Therefore, this third petition should be categorically denied for the exact same reasons given by the Patent Owner in

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.