

DOCKET NO.: 0110198-00198US3

Filed on behalf of The Gillette Company

By: Michael A. Diener, Reg. No. 37,122

Larissa B. 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. 6,805,779

CHALLENGING CLAIMS 30-37, 39 AND 40

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	- 3 -
IV.	Brief Description of Technology	- 4 -
A.	Plasma.....	- 4 -
B.	Ions, excited atoms, and metastable atoms	- 4 -
V.	Overview of the ‘779 Patent.....	- 6 -
A.	Summary of Alleged Invention of the ‘779 Patent	- 6 -
B.	Prosecution History	- 10 -
C.	Claims 30 and 40.....	- 12 -
VI.	Overview of the primary prior art references	- 14 -
A.	Summary of the Prior Art.....	- 14 -
B.	Overview of Mozgrin	- 14 -
C.	Overview of Kudryavtsev	- 16 -
D.	Overview of Iwamura.....	- 16 -
E.	Overview of Pinsley and Angelbeck.....	- 17 -
VII.	Claim construction.....	- 18 -
A.	“multi-step ionization”	- 19 -
VIII.	Specific Grounds for Petition	- 19 -
A.	Ground I: Claims 30-33, 35, 37, and 40 would have been obvious in view of the combination of Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev and Pinsley ...	- 20 -

1.	Independent claim 30	- 20 -
2.	Independent claim 40	- 32 -
B.	Ground II: Claims 34, and 39 would have been obvious in view of the combination of Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, Pinsley, and Wells	- 38 -
C.	Ground III: Claim 36 would have been obvious in view of the combination of Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, Pinsley, and Lovelock	- 39 -
D.	Ground IV: Claim 30-33, 35, 37, and 40 would have been obvious in view of Iwamura and Angelbeck	- 41 -
1.	Independent claim 30	- 41 -
2.	Independent claim 40	- 52 -
3.	Dependent claims 31-33, 35, and 37.....	- 53 -
E.	Ground V: Claims 34, and 39 are obvious in view of the combination of Iwamura, Angelbeck, and Wells.....	- 57 -
F.	Ground VI: Claim 36 would have been obvious in view of the combination of Iwamura, Angelbeck and Lovelock.....	- 58 -
IX.	Conclusion	- 60 -

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

In re ICON Health & Fitness, Inc., 496 F.3d 1374, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2007) 19

Rules

Rules 42.104..... 2, 20

Rule 42.22(a)(1) 2

Regulations

35 U.S.C. § 103 3

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) 3

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) 18 , 19

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. 6,805,779 (“‘779 Patent”) (Ex. 1201) 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 also filed IPR 2014-00598 and IPR 2014-00686 for other claims of the ‘779 Patent.

The below-listed claims of the ‘779 Patent are presently the subject of a substantially identical petition for *inter partes* review styled Intel Corporation v. Zond, Inc., which was filed May 16, 2014 and assigned Case No. IPR2014-00765. 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 (Reg. No. 59,051)

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.