

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 IPR2014-01075
Patent 6,853,142 B2

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

TURNER, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

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

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioners (collectively, “AMD”) filed a Petition requesting *inter partes* review of claims 1, 3–10, 12, 15, 17–20, and 42 of U.S. Patent No. 6,853,142 B2 (“the ’142 Patent”). Paper 1 (“Pet.”). Zond, LLC (“Zond”) timely filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 7 (“Prelim. Resp.”). We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 314, which provides that an *inter partes* review may not be instituted “unless . . . there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.” 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).

Upon consideration of the information presented in the Petition and the Preliminary Response, we determine that there is a reasonable likelihood that Petitioner would prevail in challenging claims 1, 3–10, 12, 15, 17–20, and 42. Accordingly, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314, we authorize an *inter partes* review to be instituted as to the challenged claims.

A. Related District Court Proceedings

AMD indicates that the ’142 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 ’142 Patent. *Id.* at 1–2.

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 IPR2014-00494; *Taiwan Semiconductor Manuf. Co., v. Zond, LLC.*, Case IPR2014-00818;

Fujitsu Semiconductor, Ltd. v Zond, LLC, Case IPR2014-00866; and *The Gillette Co. v. Zond, LLC*, Case IPR2014-01012.

In IPR2014-00494, we terminated the proceeding, prior to institution, in light of the Joint Motion to Terminate and Written Settlement Agreement filed by Intel and Zond in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(b). IPR2014-00494, Paper 7; Ex. 1018.

In IPR2014-00818, we instituted *inter partes* review of claims 1, 3–10, 12, 15, 17–20, and 42 of the '142 Patent, based on the following grounds of unpatentability:

Claims	Basis	References
1, 3–7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 19, 20, and 42	§ 103(a)	Wang and Lantsman
8, 17, and 18	§ 103(a)	Wang, Lantsman, and Mozgrin

AMD filed a revised Motion for Joinder with IPR2014-00818. Paper 9. In a separate Decision, we grant AMD's revised Motion, joining the instant proceeding with IPR2014-00818, and terminating the instant proceeding.

C. Prior Art Relied Upon

AMD relies upon the following prior art references:

Lantsman	US 6,190,512	Feb. 20, 2001	(Ex. 1004)
Wang	US 6,413,382	July 2, 2002	(Ex. 1005)

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. 1003) (hereinafter “Mozgrin”).

D. Asserted Grounds of Unpatentability

AMD asserts the following grounds of unpatentability:

Claims	Basis	References
1, 3–10, 12, 15, 17–20, and 42	§ 103(a)	Mozgrin and Lantsman
1, 3–7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 19, 20, and 42	§ 103(a)	Wang and Lantsman
8, 17, and 18	§ 103(a)	Wang, Lantsman, and Mozgrin

II. ANALYSIS

A. Claim Construction

The parties make the same claim construction arguments that Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company, Ltd. and TSMC North America Corp. (collectively, “TSMC”) and Zond made in IPR2014-00818. *Compare* Pet. 12–14, *with* ’818 Pet. 12–14; *compare* Prelim. Resp. 19–22, *with* ’818 Prelim. Resp. 19–22.

We construed several claim terms identified by TSMC and Zond in IPR2014-00818. *See* ’818 Dec. 5–7. For the purposes of the instant decision, we incorporate our previous analysis and apply those claim constructions here.

B. Obviousness over Wang and Lantsman

In its Petition, AMD asserts the same ground of unpatentability based on the combination of Wang and Lantsman, as that on which a trial was instituted in IPR2014-00818. *See* Pet. 39–57; ’818 Dec. 23. AMD’s arguments are substantively identical to the arguments made by TSMC in

IPR2014-00818. *Compare* Pet. 39–57, *with* '818 Pet. 39–57. AMD also proffers the same Declaration of Dr. Uwe Kortshagen that TSMC submitted in support of its Petition. *Compare* Ex. 1002, *with* IPR2014-00818 Ex. 1002. Zond's arguments in the Preliminary Response are essentially identical to those arguments that it made in IPR2014-00818. *Compare* Prelim. Resp. 22–48, *with* '818 Prelim. Resp. 22–48.

We incorporate our previous analysis regarding the asserted ground of unpatentability based on the combination of Wang and Lantsman ('818 Dec. 9–20), and determine that AMD has demonstrated a reasonable likelihood of prevailing on this ground of unpatentability.

C. Obviousness over Wang, Lantsman, and Mozgrin

In its Petition, AMD asserts the same ground of unpatentability based on the combination of Wang, Lantsman, and Mozgrin, as that on which a trial was instituted in IPR2014-00818. *See* Pet. 57–59; '818 Dec. 23. AMD's arguments are substantively identical to the arguments made by TSMC in IPR2014-00818. *Compare* Pet. 57–59, *with* '818 Pet. 57–59. Zond opposes this latter ground (Prelim. Resp. 52-53), but essentially relies upon the same arguments presented in connection with the prior ground that we do not find persuasive.

We incorporate our previous analysis regarding the asserted ground of unpatentability based on the combination of Wang, Lantsman, and Mozgrin ('818 Dec. 20–21), and determine that AMD has demonstrated a reasonable likelihood of prevailing on this ground 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.