

DOCKET NO.: 0110198.00201US1  
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](mailto:Michael.Diener@wilmerhale.com)  
[Larissa.Park@wilmerhale.com](mailto: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. 7,808,184  
CHALLENGING CLAIMS 1-5 AND 11-15  
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.....	2
D.	Service Information.....	2
II.	Certification of Grounds for Standing.....	2
III.	Overview of Challenge and Relief Requested .....	2
A.	Prior Art Patents and Printed Publications.....	3
B.	Grounds for Challenge .....	4
IV.	Brief Description of Technology.....	4
A.	Plasma.....	4
B.	Ions and Excited Atoms .....	5
V.	Overview of the ‘184 Patent .....	7
A.	Summary of Alleged Invention of the ‘184 Patent .....	7
B.	Prosecution History .....	7
VI.	Overview of the Primary Prior Art References.....	8
A.	Summary of the Prior Art.....	8
B.	Overview of Mozgrin.....	9
C.	Overview of Kudryavtsev .....	11
D.	Overview of Wang .....	12
VII.	Claim Construction.....	13
A.	“Strongly-ionized plasma” and “weakly-ionized plasma”.....	14
VIII.	Specific Ground for Petition .....	15
A.	Ground I: Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 11, 12, 14 and 15 are obvious in view of the combination of Mozgrin and Kudryavtsev .....	15
1.	Independent claim 1 .....	15
2.	Independent claim 11 .....	27

3.	Dependent claims 2, 4, 5 and 12, 14 and 15 are obvious in view of the combination of Mozgrin and Kudryavtsev .....	30
B.	Ground II: Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 11, 12, 14 and 15 are obvious in view of the combination of Mozgrin and the Mozgrin Thesis .....	34
1.	Independent claim 1 .....	35
2.	Independent claim 11 .....	38
3.	Dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 12, 14 and 15 .....	39
C.	Ground III: Claim 3 and 13 are obvious in view of the combination of Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev and Wang .....	40
D.	Ground IV: Claim 3 and 13 are obvious in view of the combination of Mozgrin, Mozgrin Thesis and Wang .....	41
E.	Ground V: Claims 1-5 and 11-15 are obvious in view of the combination of Wang and Kudryavtsev .....	43
1.	Independent claim 1 .....	43
2.	Independent claim 11 .....	52
3.	Dependent claims 2-5 and 12-15 are obvious in view of the combination of Wang and Kudryavtsev .....	53
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. 7,808,184 (“’184 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. 1024). Petitioner is also filing additional Petitions for *Inter Partes* review in several patents related<sup>1</sup> to the ‘184 Patent.

The below-listed claims of the ‘184 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 27, 2014 and assigned Case No. IPR2014–00455. 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).

---

<sup>1</sup> The related patents, e.g., name the same alleged inventor.

# 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.