

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ASML NETHERLANDS B.V., EXCELITAS TECHNOLOGIES CORP., AND
QIOPTIQ PHOTONICS GMBH & CO. KG,
Petitioners

v.

ENERGETIQ TECHNOLOGY, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-01362
U.S. Patent No. 8,969,841

DECLARATION OF PHILIP H. BUCKSBAUM, PH.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS	3
III. QUALIFICATIONS.....	3
IV. MATERIALS REVIEWED	12
V. LEGAL STANDARDS.....	13
A. Obviousness.....	14
B. Prior Art.....	20
VI. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	20
A. Active Workers In The Field And The Inventor	21
B. Problems In The Art, Prior Art Solutions, Rapidity with Which Innovations are Made, and Sophistication of the Technology.....	21
C. Petitioners Provides <i>No</i> Factual Support for their Definition and Do Not Rely On Any Of The Relevant Factors	22
VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	23
A. Light	24
B. Light Source	26
C. Laser Driven Light Source	26
D. Sustain	27
VIII. BACKGROUND TECHNOLOGY OVERVIEW	30
A. Plasma Light Background	31
1. Plasma Basics.....	31
2. Spectral Brightness, Spectral Intensity, Brightness, Intensity, and Power of a Plasma	32
B. Powering Plasma Light Sources.....	36
1. Sustained plasma absorption of laser energy under inverse bremsstrahlung	38
2. Wavelength’s effect on brightness under inverse bremsstrahlung	40
3. Effect of laser power on brightness under inverse bremsstrahlung	49
4. Plasma absorption of laser energy for other types of plasma	50
IX. INVENTION OVERVIEW	52
X. SUMMARY OF PETITIONERS’ ARGUMENT	55

XI. FACTUAL ASSESSMENT OF INSTITUTED GROUNDS	56
A. Overview of Cited References	57
1. Gärtner	57
2. Mourou	59
3. Kensuke	61
4. Silfvast	62
B. The Claims Would Not Have Been Obvious Over The Combination Of Gärtner In View Of Mourou Or Kensuke And Silfvast	63
1. An ordinary artisan would not have redesigned Gärtner by replacing its laser with a shorter wavelength laser	63
2. The claimed invention revealed unexpected results	75
C. Petitioners Fail To Demonstrate Why An Ordinary Artisan Would Have Combined Gärtner With Mourou of Kensuke and Silfvast	80
1. Petitioners’ argument that suitable shorter wavelength lasers had only become available at the time of the invention is incorrect	80
2. There would have been no expectation of success using a shorter wavelength laser to sustain a plasma	84
3. A device resulting from the proposed combination would have been inoperative for its intended purpose	85
4. Combining Gärtner with either Mourou or Kensuke and Silfvast would not have “sustained” a plasma as required by the claims	86
D. A Person Skilled In The Art Would Also Have Been Discouraged From Modifying Gärtner’s System to Increase Pressure	91
XII. OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE SHOWS THAT THE CLAIMS WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS	97
A. Nexus	98
B. Long-Felt Need	99
C. Industry Skepticism And Failure Of Others	100
D. Commercial Success	102
E. Industry Praise	104
F. Copying	106
G. Licensing	107
H. Investment In R&D	108

XIII. PETITIONERS INCORRECTLY ASSERT THAT THE '000 PATENT IS NOT ENTITLED TO A PRIORITY CLAIM TO THE '455 PATENT109

I, Philip H. Bucksbaum, Ph.D., hereby declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Philip H. Bucksbaum.

2. I understand that in response to a Petition submitted by ASML Netherlands B.V., Excelitas Technologies Corp., and Qioptiq Photonics GmbH & Co. KG (collectively, “Petitioners”), the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“Board”) instituted an *inter partes* review, IPR2015-01375 (“IPR ’1375”), as to claims 1, 15, and 18 of U.S. Patent No. 9,048,000 (the ’000 Patent). I understand that the ’000 Patent is titled “High Brightness Laser-Driven Light Source” by Donald K. Smith and that the ’000 Patent is currently assigned to Energetiq Technology, Inc. of Woburn, MA (“Energetiq”).

3. I also understand that in response to a Petition submitted by ASML Netherlands B.V., Excelitas Technologies Corp., and Qioptiq Photonics GmbH & Co. KG (collectively, “Petitioners”), the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“Board”) instituted an *inter partes* review, IPR2015-01362 (“IPR ’1362”), as to claims 1, 2, 3, and 7 of U.S. Patent No. 8,969,841 (the ’841 Patent). I understand that the ’841 Patent is titled “Light Source for Generating Light from a Laser Sustained plasma in a Above-Atmospheric Pressure Chamber” by Donald K. Smith and that the ’841 Patent is currently assigned to Energetiq Technology, Inc. of Woburn, MA (“Energetiq”).

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.