

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

RENESAS ELECTRONICS CORPORATION, RENESAS ELECTRONICS
AMERICA, INC., ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC.,
GLOBALFOUNDRIES U.S., INC., GLOBALFOUNDRIES DRESDEN
MODULE ONE LLC & CO. KG, GLOBALFOUNDRIES DRESDEN MODULE
TWO LLC & CO. KG, TOSHIBA AMERICA ELECTRONIC COMPONENTS,
INC., TOSHIBA AMERICA INC., TOSHIBA AMERICA INFORMATION
SYSTEMS, INC., AND TOSHIBA CORPORATION

Petitioner

v.

ZOND, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-01066

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 6,806,652
CHALLENGING CLAIMS 18-34
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.....3

III. OVERVIEW OF CHALLENGE AND RELIEF REQUESTED.....3

 A. Prior Art Patents and Printed Publications.....3

 B. Grounds for Challenge.....4

IV. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF TECHNOLOGY.....5

 A. Plasma.....5

 B. Excited atoms.....6

V. OVERVIEW OF THE '652 PATENT.....8

 A. Summary of Alleged Invention of the '652 Patent.....8

VI. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....11

 A. Introduction.....11

 B. “transporting the initial plasma and excited atoms proximate to a cathode assembly”.....12

 C. “super-ionizing the initial plasma proximate to the cathode assembly”.....13

VII. OVERVIEW OF THE PRIMARY PRIOR ART REFERENCES.....13

 A. Summary of the prior art.....13

 B. Overview of Mozgrin.....13

 C. Overview of Kudryavtsev.....17

 D. Overview of Fahey.....19

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| E. | Overview of Iwamura | 20 |
| VIII. | SPECIFIC GROUNDS FOR PETITION | 20 |
| A. | Ground I: Claims 18-30 and 33-34 would have been obvious over Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, and Fahey..... | 21 |
| 1. | Independent claim 18 | 21 |
| 2. | Dependent claims 19-30, 33, and 34 | 32 |
| B. | Ground II: Claims 31 and 32 would have been obvious over Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, Fahey, and Campbell | 42 |
| C. | Ground III: Claims 18-30 and 33-34 would have been obvious over the references cited for Ground I (Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, and Fahey) and Iwamura | 46 |
| D. | Ground IV: Claims 31 and 32 would have been obvious over the references cited for Ground II (Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, Fahey, and Campbell) and Iwamura | 48 |
| E. | Ground V: Claims 18-30 would have been obvious over Mozgrin and Iwamura | 48 |
| 1. | Independent claim 18 | 48 |
| 2. | Dependent claims 19-30 | 53 |
| F. | Ground VI: Claims 31 and 32 would have been obvious over Mozgrin, Iwamura, and Campbell | 60 |
| G. | Ground VII: Claims 33 and 34 would have been obvious over Mozgrin, Iwamura, and Fahey..... | 60 |
| IX. | CONCLUSION..... | 60 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

In re ICON Health & Fitness, Inc., 496 F.3d 1374, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2007)11

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)4
35 U.S.C. §1033

Rules

Rule 42.104(a).....2
Rule 42.104(b)(4)-(5).....19

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) 10, 11
77 Fed. Reg. 48764 (Aug. 14, 2012)11

I. MANDATORY NOTICES

A. Real Party-in-Interest

Renesas Electronics Corporation, Renesas Electronics America, Inc., Advanced Micro Devices, Inc., GLOBALFOUNDRIES U.S., Inc., GLOBALFOUNDRIES Dresden Module One LLC & Co. KG, GLOBALFOUNDRIES Dresden Module Two LLC & Co. KG, Toshiba America Electronic Components, Inc., Toshiba America Inc., Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc., and Toshiba Corporation (collectively “Petitioner”) are the real parties-in-interest.

B. Related Matters

Zond has asserted U.S. Patent No. 6,806,652 (“the ’652 Patent”) (Ex. 1101) 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 is also filing additional Petitions for *Inter Partes* review in several patents by the same named inventor as the ’652 Patent.

The below-listed claims of the ’652 Patent are presently the subject of a substantially identical petition for *inter partes* review styled *Intel Corporation v. Zond, Inc.*, which was filed May 29, 2014 and assigned Case No. IPR2014-00843.

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.