

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 IPR2015-01377
U.S. Patent No. 7,435,982

DECLARATION OF PHILIP H. BUCKSBAUM, PH.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS	3
III. QUALIFICATIONS.....	3
IV. MATERIALS REVIEWED	12
V. LEGAL STANDARDS.....	13
A. Anticipation	14
B. Obviousness.....	16
C. Prior Art.....	22
VI. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	23
A. Active Workers In The Field And The Inventor.....	23
B. Problems In The Art, Prior Art Solutions, Rapidity with Which Innovations are Made, and Sophistication of the Technology	24
C. Petitioners Provide <i>No</i> Factual Support for their Definition and Do Not Rely On Any of the Relevant Factors.....	24
VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	25
A. Light Source	26
B. High Brightness Light	29
C. Sustained.....	32
VIII. BACKGROUND TECHNOLOGY OVERVIEW	35
A. Plasma Light Background	35
1. Plasma Basics	35
2. Spectral Brightness, Spectral Intensity, Brightness, Intensity, Power of a Plasma, Emissivity, and Radiation Temperature	36
IX. INVENTION OVERVIEW	40
X. SUMMARY OF PETITIONERS’ ARGUMENT	41
XI. FACTUAL ASSESSMENT OF INSTITUTED GROUNDS	42
A. Overview of Gärtner.....	43
B. Gärtner does not anticipate the challenged claims reciting a “high brightness light” because it does not enable the claims	44

1. Gärtner does not provide one skilled in the art with sufficient direction or guidance to obtain the claimed “high brightness light” without undue experimentation.....44

2. Gärtner’s lack of guidance regarding working examples weighs heavily against a finding that it enables the claimed “high brightness light”47

3. The state of the prior art (arc lamps) further supports a lack of enablement48

C. The Gärtner does not render obvious the claims challenged in the consolidated IPR2015-01300 proceeding49

D. The combination of Gärtner and Beterov does not render obvious the claims challenged in the IPR2015-01377 proceeding.....49

E. The combination of Gärtner and Ershov does not render obvious the claims challenged in the IPR2015-01279 proceeding50

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 in consolidated IPR2015-01300 and IPR2015-01303 (“IPR ’1300”) as to claims 1, 3, 4, 10, 16, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 34, 37, 42, 43, 49, 55, 61, 62, 63, 64, 67, 68, 71, 72, 74, and 78, and IPR2015-01377 (“IPR ’1377”) as to claims 23 and 60, of U.S. Patent No. 7,435,982 (the “’982 Patent”). I understand that the ’982 Patent is titled “Laser-Driven Light Source” by Donald K. Smith and that the ’982 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, IPR2015-01279 (“IPR ’1279”) as to claims 19, 39, 40, and 41 of U.S. Patent No. 7,786,455 (the “’455 Patent”). I understand that the ’455 Patent is titled “Laser-Driven Light Source” by Donald K. Smith and that the ’455 Patent is currently assigned to Energetiq Technology, Inc. of Woburn,

MA (“Energetiq”).

4. I have been retained on behalf of Energetiq as an independent expert in this *inter partes* review proceeding to provide expert opinions on the technology at issue. Specifically, I have been asked to provide my expert opinion relating to the patentability of claims 1, 3, 4, 10, 16, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 34, 37, 42, 43, 49, 55, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 67, 68, 71, 72, and 78 of the '982 Patent and the patentability of claims 19, 39, 40, and 41 of the '455 Patent relative to the instituted grounds. Unless specifically stated, my opinions herein apply to the claimed technology in both the '982 Patent and the '455 Patent.

5. I understand that Petitioners have submitted expert Declarations by Dr. J. Gary Eden (“Declaration”) in support of their Petitions to assert that the claims at issue are invalid.

6. I confirm to the best of my knowledge the exhibits cited in this declaration are true and accurate copies of what they purport to be, and that an artisan in the field would reasonably rely on them to formulate opinions such as those set forth in this declaration.

7. For my time consulting on this matter, I am being compensated at my customary consulting rate. I am also being reimbursed for reasonable expenses incurred for my work on this matter. My compensation does not depend on the conclusions I reach in this declaration nor does it depend on the outcome of this

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.