

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,  
Petitioners,

v.

ZOND, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2014-01066  
Patent 6,806,652 B1

---

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

MITCHELL, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

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

## I. INTRODUCTION

Renesas Electronics Corporation, Renesas Electronics America, Inc., Advanced Micro Devices, Inc., GlobalFoundries U.S., Inc., GlobalFoundries Dresden Module One LLC & Co., KG, Global Foundries Dresden Module Two LLC & Co. KG, Toshiba America Electronic Components, Inc., Toshiba America Inc., Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc., and Toshiba Corporation (collectively, “Renasas”) filed a Petition requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 18–34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,806,652 B1 (Ex. 1101, “the ’652 patent”). Paper 1 (“Pet.”). Zond, LLC (“Zond”), filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 13 (“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 Renesas would prevail in challenging claims 18–34 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 claims 18–34 of the ’652 patent.

*A. Related District Court Proceedings*

Renesas indicates that the '652 patent was asserted in *Zond, LLC v. Renesas Elec. Corp.*, No.1:13-cv-11634-WGY (D. Mass.). Pet. 1. Renesas also identifies other proceedings in which Zond asserted the '652 patent. *Id.*

*B. Related Inter Partes Reviews*

The following Petitions for *inter partes* review also challenge the same claims based on the same grounds of unpatentability as those in the instant proceeding: *Intel Corp. v. Zond, LLC*, Case IPR2014-00843; *Taiwan Semiconductor Mfg. Co., Ltd. v. Zond, LLC*, Case IPR2014-00861; *Fujitsu Semiconductor Ltd. v. Zond, LLC*, Case IPR2014-00864; and *Gillette Co. v. Zond, LLC*, Case IPR2014-01003.

In IPR2014-00843, we terminated the proceeding, prior to institution, in light of the Joint Motion to Terminate and 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 Corporation and Zond. *Intel Corp. v. Zond*, Case IPR2014-00843 (Papers 7, 8; Ex. 1115).

Renesas also filed a revised Motion for Joinder, seeking to join the instant proceeding with *Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company, Ltd. v. Zond, LLC*, Case IPR2014-00861 ("IPR2014-00861"). Paper 11 ("Mot."). In a separate decision, we grant Renesas's revised Motion for Joinder, joining the instant proceeding with IPR2014-00861, and terminating the instant proceeding.

*C. Prior Art Relied Upon*

Renesas relies upon the following prior art references:

Iwamura et al. US 5,753,886 May 19, 1998 (Ex. 1108)

Campbell et al. US 5,429,070 July 4, 1995 (Ex. 1114)

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. 1103) (“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 (Jan. 1983) (Ex. 1106) (“Kudryavtsev”).

D. W. Fahey, W. F. Parks, and L. D. Schearer, *High Flux Beam Source of Thermal Rare-Gas Metastable Atoms*, 13 J. PHYS. E: SCI. INSTRUM. 381–383 (1980) (Ex. 1105) (“Fahey”).

*D. Asserted Grounds of Unpatentability*

Renesas asserts the following grounds of unpatentability:

Claims	Basis	References
18–30, 33, and 34	§ 103(a)	Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, and Fahey
31 and 32	§ 103(a)	Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, Fahey, and Campbell
18–30, 33, and 34	§ 103(a)	Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, Fahey, and Iwamura
31 and 32	§ 103(a)	Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, Fahey, Campbell, and Iwamura
18–30	§ 103(a)	Mozgrin and Iwamura
31 and 32	§ 103(a)	Mozgrin, Iwamura, and Campbell
33 and 34	§ 103(a)	Mozgrin, Iwamura, and Fahey

## II. ANALYSIS

### A. Claim Construction

The parties make the same claim interpretation arguments that Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company, Ltd. and TSMC North America Corporation (collectively, “TSMC”) and Zond made in IPR2014-00861. *Compare* Pet. 11–13, *with* ’861 Pet. 11–12; *compare* Prelim. Resp. 9–13, *with* ’861 Prelim. Resp. 8–11.

We addressed the proposed constructions of the claim terms identified by TSMC and Zond in IPR2014-00861. *See* ’861 Dec. 9–13. For the purposes of the instant decision, we incorporate our previous analysis and apply those claim constructions here.

### B. Obviousness over Mozgrin in Combination with Other Cited References

In its Petition, Renesas asserts the same grounds of unpatentability as those on which a trial was instituted in IPR2014-00861. *See* Pet. 45–60; ’861 Dec. 31. These grounds are set forth in the table below.

Claims	Basis	References
18–30, 33, and 34	§ 103(a)	Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, Fahey, and Iwamura
31 and 32	§ 103(a)	Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, Fahey, Campbell, and Iwamura
18–30	§ 103(a)	Mozgrin and Iwamura
31 and 32	§ 103(a)	Mozgrin, Iwamura, and Campbell
33 and 34	§ 103(a)	Mozgrin, Iwamura, and Fahey

# 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.