

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

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.120

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE CLAIMED INVENTION AND STATE OF THE ART	4
A. Energetiq’s Laser Driven Light Source, and the ’841 Patent	5
B. Energetiq’s Patented Laser-Driven Light Sources Prove To Be A Success, and Take Over the Market	10
C. Petitioners Copy Energetiq’s Laser Driven Light Source.....	11
III. CLAIM INTERPRETATION	12
A. “Light Source” and “Laser Driven Light Source”	13
B. “Sustain”	13
IV. THE DEFINITION OF AN ORDINARY ARTISAN IN THE FIELD.....	16
A. Active Workers In The Field And The Inventor.....	17
B. Problems In The Art, Prior Art Solutions, Rapidity with Which Innovations are Made, and Sophistication of the Technology.....	17
C. Petitioners Provide <i>No</i> Factual Support For Their Definition And Do Not Rely On Any Of The Relevant Factors	18
V. OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE SHOWS THAT THE CLAIMS WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS.....	19
A. Summary Of Nexus	20
B. Long-Felt Need.....	21
C. Industry Skepticism And Failure Of Others.....	23
D. Commercial Success.....	25
E. Industry Praise	28
F. Copying	30
G. Licensing	32
H. Investment In R&D	34
VI. THE CLAIMS WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER THE COMBINATION OF GÄRTNER IN VIEW OF MOUROU OR KENSUKE AND SILFVAST	34

A.	Overview Of Gärtner.....	37
B.	Overview Of Mourou.....	38
C.	Overview Of Kensuke.....	39
D.	Overview Of Silfvast.....	40
E.	An Ordinary Artisan Would Not Have Redesigned Gärtner By Replacing Its Continuous Long Wavelength Laser With Mourou’s Or Kensuke’s Pulsed Short Wavelength Lasers.....	40
	i. At the time of the invention, it was believed that a short wavelength laser would have led to energy being absorbed less efficiently, resulting in lower brightness light	41
	ii. At the time of the invention, it was believed that a short wavelength laser would have led to larger plasma, resulting in lower brightness light	45
	iii. Energetiq’s recognition of an unexpected physical result led to the claimed invention.....	47
F.	Petitioners Fail To Demonstrate <i>Why</i> An Ordinary Artisan Would Have Combined Gärtner With Mourou Or Kensuke and Silfvast.....	49
	i. Petitioners’ argument that suitable short wavelength lasers had only become available at the time of the invention is demonstrably false	50
	1. Suitable short wavelength lasers existed long before the ’841 priority date	50
	2. The years-long commercial availability of suitable short wavelength lasers before the invention, coupled with the teachings away from the use of such, shows that the invention was not obvious when made	52
	ii. Petitioners have failed to demonstrate that an ordinary artisan would have been motivated to replace Gärtner’s long wavelength laser with a short wavelength laser	53

iii.	Petitioners are wrong that replacing Gärtner’s long wavelength laser with a short wavelength laser would have been a “simple substitution”	55
1.	There would have been no expectation of success	55
2.	The resulting device would have been inoperative for its intended purpose	56
3.	An ordinary artisan would not have known to increase the pressure in the plasma chamber to increase the brightness of the light	57
iv.	Combining Gärtner With Either Mourou or Kensuke and Silfvast Would Not Have “Sustained” A Plasma As Required By The Claims.....	58
VII.	PETITIONERS INCORRECTLY ASSERT THAT THE ’841 PATENT IS NOT ENTITLED TO A PRIORITY CLAIM TO THE ’455 PATENT.....	60
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	60

I. INTRODUCTION

This case is about an invention for a high brightness light source that was so much better than what preceded it, that it has essentially replaced the arc lamps previously used in semiconductor wafer inspection, lithography, and metrology tools.

Energetiq's invention solved a fundamental problem – how to generate a light brighter than arc lamps. Energetiq accomplished this after recognizing that – against the weight of scientific literature – using a *short* wavelength laser to generate, *and sustain* a plasma in a pressurized chamber worked better than a long wavelength laser. Petitioners concede that Energetiq was the first to do this – they cite no Section 102 art. Instead, they institute this proceeding based on an unusable device described in a 1985 patent application, and then say that the invention was nothing more than substituting – more than 20 years later – a short wavelength laser. But, what Energetiq did here was a classic invention – it took components that had been available for years, ignored the teachings away from a combination of those components, and discovered that using a short wavelength laser, when pressure is properly adjusted, will work better than anyone would have expected for sustaining a plasma.

The challenged claims cover this invention. There is no contention here that the claims do not recite a novel laser driven light source that uses a sealed

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.