

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SPTS TECHNOLOGIES LTD.  
Petitioner

v.

PLASMA-THERM LLC  
Patent Owner

---

*Inter Partes* Review No.: IPR2017-01314  
U.S. Patent No. 8,980,764

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR  
INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,980,764 UNDER 37  
C.F.R. § 42.107**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iii
LIST OF EXHIBITS .....	v
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. TECHNOLOGY OVERVIEW .....	3
A. Dicing Overview .....	4
B. Plasma Dicing .....	6
III. THE ‘764 PATENT AND PROSECUTION HISTORY.....	9
A. Overview of the ‘764 Patent.....	9
B. Relevant Prosecution History.....	13
IV. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....	14
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	14
VI. OVERVIEW OF ASSERTED REFERENCES.....	18
A. Sekiya ‘901 (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0115901).....	18
B. Todorow (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0000805).....	21
C. Nisany (U.S. Pub. No. 2009/0183583).....	24
D. Ogasawara (U.S. Patent No. 7,411,384).....	26
VII. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE .....	29
A. The Cited References Relate To Completely Different Aspects Of The Fabrication Process Than The Challenged Claims .....	29
1. Sekiya ‘901.....	30
2. Todorow .....	31
3. Nisany And Ogasawara.....	33
B. Person Of Skill In The Art Would Not Combine The Cited References As Proposed By Petitioner .....	34
1. A POSITA Would Not Have Combined The Stabilizer Of Todorow With Sekiya ‘901 .....	35

a.	There Is No Need For The Stabilizer Of Todorow In Sekiya ‘901 .....	36
b.	Petitioner’s Proposed Combination Would Render The Prior Art Unsatisfactory For Its Intended Purpose .....	37
c.	Petitioner Relies On Impermissible Hindsight .....	39
2.	A POSITA Would Not Have Combined The Lift Mechanism Of Todorow With Sekiya ‘901 .....	41
3.	A POSITA Would Not Have Combined The Lift Mechanisms Of Nisany Or Ogasawara With Sekiya ‘901 and Todorow .....	44
4.	Petitioner’s Other Rationales For Combining The Cited References Are Insufficient .....	47
VIII.	THE DECLARATION OF DR. JOHN E. SPENCER SHOULD BE GIVEN LITTLE OR NO WEIGHT .....	50
IX.	CONCLUSION .....	51

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>ACTV, Inc. v. Walt Disney Co.</i> , 346 F.3d 1082 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	16
<i>DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	43
<i>Epos Techs. Ltd. v. Pegasus Techs. Ltd.</i> , 766 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	18
<i>Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Sys., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	14
<i>Gen. Elec. Co. v. Tas Energy, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00163, Paper 11 (PTAB May 13, 2014) .....	50
<i>GPNE Corp. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 830 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	15
<i>In re ICON Health &amp; Fitness, Inc.</i> , 496 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	44
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	29
<i>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	14
<i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGO Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	40, 47
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	29

*Nichia Corp. v. Everlight Americas, Inc.*,  
855 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....41, 46, 47, 48

*Phillips v. AWH Corp.*,  
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....16, 18

*Securus Techs., Inc. v. Global Tel\*link Corp.*,  
2017 WL 2992516 (Fed. Cir. July 14, 2017).....41

*Trivascular, Inc. v. Samuels*,  
812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....49

*Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.*,  
90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....17

*Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. & Eng'g, Inc.*,  
200 F.3d 795 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....15

*Wowza Media Sys., LLC v. Adobe Sys., Inc.*,  
IPR2013-00054, Paper 16 (PTAB July 13, 2013) .....50

**Rules**

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....14

Fed. R. Evid. 702.....51

# 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.