

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GLOBAL FOUNDRIES U.S., INC., GLOBALFOUNDRIES DRESDEN
MODULE ONE LLC & CO. KG, GLOBALFOUNDRIES DRESDEN MODULE
TWO LLC & CO. KG, and THE GILLETTE COMPANY

Petitioners

v.

ZOND, LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-01100¹
Patent 7,604,716 B2

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE
35 USC §§ 316 AND 37 CFR § 42.120

¹ Case IPR2014-00973, has been joined with the instant proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND 6

 A. Plasma Fundamentals. 6

 B. Plasma Ignition 8

 C. High-Density Plasmas..... 10

III. THE '716 PATENT 11

IV. ARGUMENT. 14

 A. Wang..... 17

 B. Lantsman..... 22

 C. *Wang* Does Not Teach Transforming a Weakly-Ionized Plasma into a Strongly-Ionized Plasma *Without Developing an Electrical Breakdown Condition* as Required by the Challenged Claims of the '716 Patent. 24

 D. It Would Not Have Been Obvious To Combine the Teachings of *Wang* and *Lantsman* To Achieve the Invention Recited in Claims 12 and 13 of the '716 Patent. 27

V. CONCLUSION..... 29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Alza Corp. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.,
464 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2006) 17

CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Int’l. Corp.,
349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003) 29

Cross Med. Prods., Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.,
424 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2005) 16

Heart Failure Technologies, LLC v. Cardiokinetix, Inc.,
IPR2013-00183 (P.T.A.B. July 31, 2013) 16

In re Wilson,
424 F.2d 1382 (CCPA 1970) 29

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007) 16

Mintz v. Dietz & Watson, Inc.,
679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 15

Proctor & Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.,
566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009) 15

EXHIBIT LIST

| Exhibit No. | Description |
|--------------------|--|
| Ex. 2001 | Affidavit of Etai Lahav in Support of Patent Owner's Motion for Pro Hac Vice Admission |
| Ex. 2002 | Affidavit of Maria Granovsky in Support of Patent Owner's Motion for Pro Hac Vice Admission |
| Ex. 2003 | Affidavit of Tigran Vardanian in Support of Patent Owner's Motion for Pro Hac Vice Admission |
| Ex. 2004 | Declaration of Larry D. Hartsough, Ph.D. |
| Ex. 2005 | Transcript of Deposition of Dr. Uwe Kortshagen, IPR2014-00807, -00808, -01099 & -01100, Dec. 22, 2014. |
| Ex. 2006 | Eronini Umez-Eronini, SYSTEM DYNAMICS AND CONTROL, Brooks/Cole Publishing Co. (1999), pp. 10-13. |
| Ex. 2007 | Robert C. Weyrick, FUNDAMENTALS OF AUTOMATIC CONTROL, McGraw-Hill Book Company (1975), pp. 10-13. |
| Ex. 2008 | Chiang et al., U.S. Patent 6,398,929. |

I. INTRODUCTION

All of the challenged claims are patentable over *Wang* and *Lantsman*. The ‘716 patent requires transforming a weakly-ionized plasma to a strongly-ionized plasma *without developing an electrical breakdown condition* in a chamber.¹

Wang, however, merely describes techniques for reducing, but not eliminating, electrical breakdown conditions such as arcing. The two are not the same.

Lantsman fails to cure these deficiencies.

Wang describes applying DC *power* pulses to a plasma when sputtering material from a target, but fails to teach or suggest controlling *voltage* during such activities or when generating a high-density plasma. In fact, *Wang* does not explain any electrodynamics of high-density plasmas.² Control of power (as in *Wang*) is very different from controlling voltage,³ and even *Wang* acknowledges this distinction.⁴ Thus, unlike the ‘716 patent, in which the rise time of the electric field is chosen to increase an ionization rate of excited atoms in a weakly-ionized

¹ *Ex. 1101* at 20:23-27; 22:47-50 (emphasis added).

² *Ex. 2004* at ¶¶ 12, 71.

³ *Id.* at ¶¶ 58-62.

⁴ *Ex. 1104* at 5:52-54 (“Where chamber impedance is changing, the power pulse width is preferably specified rather than the current or voltage pulse widths.”).

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.