

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.  
Petitioner,

v.

DEMARAY LLC  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2021-00103  
Patent No. 7,544,276

---

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

***Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"***  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. The Unique Insights Of The '276 Inventions.....	3
III. Claim Construction.....	9
IV. Hirose Is Not Prior Art .....	11
A. Legal Standards .....	12
B. Evidence Of Conception And Reduction To Practice .....	15
1. The Conception, Design, And Construction Of The Claimed Reactor System.....	15
2. Testing Confirms The Claimed Reactor System .....	29
3. The Evidence Maps To The Challenged Claims .....	32
V. The Petition Fails To Demonstrate That Any Challenged Claim Is Invalid Based On Barber And Hirose.....	41
A. Prior Art Neither Teaches, Nor Suggests, The Claimed Narrow Band-Rejection Filter.....	43
1. The combination does not disclose a filter between “coupled between the pulsed DC power supply and the target area” .....	44
2. The combination does not disclose a filter that rejects or operates “at a frequency of the RF bias power supply” .....	46
B. A POSITA Would Not Have Included The Claimed Filter In Barber’s System .....	49

**Page**

1.	Prior art never suggested using a narrowband-rejection filter in series with a bipolar pulsed DC power supply to reject RF power.....	51
2.	There is no competent evidence of risk of damage to Barber’s power source 230 due to RF coupling .....	63
3.	The lack of teaching and suggestion of the need for a claimed filter in the claimed reactor system shows objective evidence of non-obviousness .....	70
C.	Same Deficiencies In Analysis Of Other Claims.....	72
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	72

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b><u>Page(s)</u></b>
<b><u>Cases</u></b>	
<i>Apator Miitors ApS v. Kamstrup A/S</i> , 887 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	30
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	1, 49
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014).....	8
<i>Cooper v. Goldfarb</i> , 154 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	13, 30
<i>E.I. du Pont De Nemours &amp; Co. v. Unifrax I LLC</i> , 921 F.3d 1060 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	14
<i>Fleming v. Escort Inc.</i> , 774 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	14
<i>In re Giacomini</i> , 612 F.3d 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	12
<i>Harris Corp. v. IXYS Corp.</i> , 114 F.3d 1149 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	11
<i>In re Hilmer</i> , 359 F.2d 859 (CCPA 1966).....	12
<i>Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.</i> , 802 F.2d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 1986) .....	29
<i>Hyosung TNS Inc. v. Int’l Trade Commission</i> , 926 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	44
<i>Linear Tech. Corp. v. Impala Linear Corp.</i> , 379 F.3d 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	14

<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Enfish, LLC</i> , 662 Fed. App'x 981 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	62
<i>Mintz v. Dietz &amp; Watson, Inc.</i> , 679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	72
<i>NFC Tech., LLC v. Matal</i> , 871 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	28
<i>Otsuka Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 678 F. 3d 1280 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	2, 8
<i>Perfect Surgical Techniques, Inc. v. Olympus Am., Inc.</i> , 841 F.3d 1004 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	13
<i>South-Tek Sys., LLC v. Eng'g Corrosion Sols., LLC</i> , 748 F. App'x. 1003 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	69
<i>Spansion, Inc. v. ITC</i> , 629 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	12
<i>Star Sci., Inc. v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.</i> , 655 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	43
<i>Taurus IP, LLC v. DaimlerChrysler Corp.</i> , 726 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	13
<i>Tomecek v. Stimpson</i> , 513 F.2d 614 (C.C.P.A. 1975) .....	12
<i>In re Van Os</i> , 844 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	70
<b>Statutes</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 102(e) .....	11, 12
<b>Other Authorities</b>	
37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3) .....	8
IPR2021-00104, Paper 13, 38 .....	9, 10
MPEP § 2136 .....	12

# 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.