

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC., RENESAS ELECTRONICS CORPORATION, RENESAS ELECTRONICS AMERICA, 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 IPR2014-01074
Patent 6,805,779 B2

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

CHANG, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

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

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioners (collectively, “AMD”) filed a Petition requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 7, 9, 20, 21, 38, and 44 of U.S. Patent No. 6,805,779 B2 (Ex. 1401, “the ’779 patent”). Paper 1 (“Pet.”). Zond, LLC (“Zond”), filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 8 (“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 AMD would prevail in challenging claims 7, 9, 20, 21, 38, and 44 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 7, 9, 20, 21, 38, and 44 of the ’779 patent.

A. Related District Court Proceedings

AMD indicates that the ’779 patent was asserted in *Zond, LLC v. Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.*, No.1:13-cv-11577-DPW (D. Mass.). Pet. 1. AMD also identifies other proceedings in which Zond asserted the ’779 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 IPR2014-00913; *Taiwan Semiconductor Mfg. Co., Ltd. v. Zond, LLC*, Case IPR2014-00917; *Fujitsu Semiconductor Ltd. v. Zond, LLC*, Case IPR2014-00918; and *The Gillette Co. v. Zond, LLC*, Case IPR2014-01025.

In IPR2014-00913, 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 Corp. and Zond. IPR2014-00913, Papers 6, 7; IPR2014-00598, Ex. 1013.

In each of IPR2014-0917 and IPR2014-00918, we instituted an *inter partes* review of claims 7, 9, 20, 21, 38, and 44 of the '779 patent, based on the following grounds of unpatentability (*see, e.g.*, IPR2014-00917, Paper 10 (“’917 Dec.”), 29):

Claims	Basis	References
7, 20	§ 103(a)	Iwamura, Angelbeck, Pinsley, and Wells
9, 21, 44	§ 103(a)	Iwamura, Angelbeck, Pinsley, and Gruber
38	§ 103(a)	Iwamura, Angelbeck, and Pinsley

We further joined IPR2014-00918 with IPR2014-00917, and terminated IPR2014-00918. IPR2014-00918, Paper 12.

AMD filed a revised Motion for Joinder, seeking to join with IPR2014-00917, and Zond filed an Opposition to AMD’s Motion. Papers 9,

10. In a separate decision, we grant AMD’s revised Motion for Joinder, joining the instant proceeding with IPR2014-00917, and terminating the instant proceeding.

C. Prior Art Relied Upon

AMD relies upon the following prior art references:

Pinsley	US 3,761,836	Sept. 25, 1973	(Ex. 1405)
Angelbeck	US 3,514,714	May 26, 1970	(Ex. 1406)
Iwamura	US 5,753,886	May 19, 1998	(Ex. 1407)
Gruber	EP 0146509	Jun. 26, 1985	(Ex. 1413)
Wells	PCT WO 83/01349	Apr. 14, 1983	(Ex. 1414)

D.V. Mozgrin, et al., *High-Current Low-Pressure Quasi-Stationary Discharge in a Magnetic Field: Experimental Research*, 21 PLASMA PHYSICS REPORTS, No. 5, 400–409 (1995) (Ex. 1403, “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 (1983) (Ex. 1404, “Kudryavtsev”).

D. Asserted Grounds of Unpatentability

AMD asserts the following grounds of unpatentability:

Claims	Basis	References
7, 20	§ 103(a)	Iwamura, Angelbeck, Pinsley, ¹ and Wells
9, 21, 44	§ 103(a)	Iwamura, Angelbeck, Pinsley, and Gruber
38	§ 103(a)	Iwamura, Angelbeck, and Pinsley
7, 20	§ 103(a)	Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, Pinsley, and Wells
9, 21, 44	§ 103(a)	Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, Pinsley, and Gruber
38	§ 103(a)	Mozgrin, Kudryavtsev, Pinsley, and Iwamura

II. ANALYSIS

A. Claim Construction

AMD makes the same claim interpretation arguments that TSMC made in IPR2014-00917. *Compare* Pet. 15–16, *with* IPR2014-00917, Paper 2 (“’917 Pet.”), 15–16; *Compare* Prelim. Resp. 18–19, *with* IPR2014-00917, Paper 8 (“’917 Prelim. Resp.”), 18–19.

We construed several claim terms in the Decision on Institution for IPR2014-00917. *See* ’917 Dec. 7–11. For the purposes of the instant

¹ Pinsley is omitted inadvertently from each statement of the asserted grounds of unpatentability based, in whole or in part, on the combination of Iwamura and Angelbeck, although included in the corresponding analysis. *See, e.g.*, Pet. 38, 46. Therefore, we treat the statements as mere harmless error and presume that AMD intended to include Pinsley in each of those asserted grounds of unpatentability.

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.