#### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

\_\_\_\_\_

### BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLIED MATERIALS, INC. Petitioner,

v.

DEMARAY LLC Patent Owner.

\_\_\_\_\_

Case IPR2021-00106 Patent No. 7,381,657

### PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY 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**

		rage		
I.	Introduction			
II.	Fintiv Factors Favor Discretionary Denial Of Institution Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a)			
	A.	Fintiv Factor #1: No Evidence That The District Court Would Grant A Stay If A Proceeding Is Instituted		
	B.	Fintiv Factor #2: Jury Trial Is Expected To Occur Before The Final Written Decision		
	C.	Fintiv Factor #3: There Has Been Immense "Investment In The Parallel Proceeding By The Court And Parties"		
	D.	Fintiv Factor #4: There Is Substantial "Overlap Between Issues Raised In The Petition And In The Parallel Proceeding"		
	Е.	Fintiv Factor #5: The Defendants In The Texas Litigations Are Real-Parties-In-Interest		
	F.	Fintiv Factor #6: "Other circumstances that impact the Board's exercise of discretion, including the merits" favor non-institution.		
III.	Technology Background			
	A.	The '657 Invention Describes A Unique Combination That Solves A Problem Unique To Reactive Sputtering		
	В.	Prior Art Fails To Teach The Solution Claimed By the '657 Patent		
		<ol> <li>Licata Does Not Disclose A Pulsed DC Alternating</li> <li>Between Negative And Positive Voltages Or A Narrow Band</li> <li>Rejection Filter</li></ol>		
		2. Kelly Does Not Disclose A Filter Coupled Between The Target And Its Pulsed DC Power Supply To The Target 18		



		Pag	<u> 2e</u>
		3. Collins Does Not Suggest The Use Of The Claimed Filter Type Or The Claimed Reactor Process	)
IV.	The	Petition Fails To Show A Likelihood Of Success	)
	A.	Petitioner's Proposed Inclusion Of A Bipolar Pulsed DC Power Source In Licata And Poisoned Mode Fails To Consider Licata's Mechanism For Forming TiN Film (Elements 1(c), 1(f), 2(c) and 2(f))	2
	B.	Petitioner Fails To Explain Why A POSITA Would Have Used Licata-Kelly System For Depositing Films On An Insulating Substrate (Claims 2 And Dependent Claims)	L
	C.	Prior Art Does Not Disclose Or Suggest Using A Claimed Filter With The Claimed Reactor Process (Elements 1(c)-(d) and 2(c)-(d))	2
		1. Collins does not suggest using a narrow band rejection filter for the Kelly-Licata combination	3
		2. None of the other references suggests using a narrow band rejection filter for the Kelly-Licata combination	}
		3. Petitioner has failed to articulate a reason to combine Collins with Licata-Kelly	ó
	D.	Petitioner's analysis of other claims do not cure the deficiencies above	L
V.	The Petition Should Be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d)		2
	A.	The Petition Relies On The Same Or Substantially The Same Arguments Overcome During Prosecution	<u>)</u>
	В.	The Petition Fails To Show That The Office Erred In A Manner Material To The Patentability Of The Challenged Claims	)
VI	Conc	clusion 70	`



## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

Page(s) Cases ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Comm'ns, Inc., 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .......24, 27, 28, 44 Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH. Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc., IPR2020-00019, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. May 13, 2020) ......passim Arendi. Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG, Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC. Bentley Motors Ltd. v. Jaguar Land Rover Ltd., IPR2019-01539, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 2, 2020)......6 Cont'l Intermodal Grp. – Trucking LLC v. Sand Revolution LLC, Case No. 7:18-cv-00147-ADA (July 22, 2020)......4 InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGO Communications, Inc., 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014) ......60 In re Kahn, KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007)......27, 30, 44, 46 Monarch Knitting Mach. Corp. v. Sulzer Morat GmbH, 



	<u>Page(s)</u>
Polaris Indus., Inc. v. Arctic Cat, Inc., 882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	30
Securus Techs., Inc. v. Global Tel*Link Corp., 701 F. App'x 971 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	23, 32
Star Sci., Inc. v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., 655 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	30
<i>In re Van Os</i> , 844 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	45
VLSI Tech. LLC v. Intel Corp., Case No. 1:19-cv-00977-ADA	5
William Wesley Carnes, SR., Inc. v. Seaboard Int'l Inc., IPR2019-00133, Paper 10 (PTAB May 8, 2019)	24
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	4
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	2, 62



# DOCKET

# 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.

