Acta Crystallographica Section E Structure Reports Online

ISSN 1600-5368

# Guo-Ming Wang, Yan-Qiong Sun and Guo-Yu Yang\*

Coordination and Hydrothermal Chemistry Group, State Key Laboratory of Structural Chemistry, Fujian Institute of Research on the Structure of Matter, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Fuzhou, Fujian 350002, People's Republic of China

Correspondence e-mail: ygy@ms.fjirsm.ac.cn

#### Key indicators

Single-crystal X-ray study T = 293 KMean  $\sigma(C-C) = 0.008 \text{ Å}$  R factor = 0.053 wR factor = 0.126 Data-to-parameter ratio = 13.0

For details of how these key indicators were automatically derived from the article, see http://journals.iucr.org/e. (Ethylenediamine- $\kappa^2 N$ )(triethylenetetramine- $\kappa^4 N$ )nickel hexafluorogermanate

The title compound,  $[Ni(en)(TETA)][GeF_6]$  or  $[Ni(C_2H_8N_2)-(C_6H_{18}N_4)][GeF_6]$ , was synthesized under mild solvothermal conditions in the presence of triethylenetetramine (TETA) as a base. It is a new salt composed of  $[GeF_6]^{2-}$  anions and  $[Ni(en)(TETA)]^{2+}$  cations. The ions are linked together by hydrogen bonding between F atoms and N-H groups. The complex cation and anion lie on twofold axes of the space group *Pccn*.

Received 13 April 2004 Accepted 22 April 2004 Online 30 April 2004

## Comment

Currently, many efforts have been dedicated to the design and synthesis of new materials. The field of fluorides, however, remains undeveloped. More recently, different fluorides including fluoroaluminates (Tang et al., 2001a,b), fluorosilicates (Tang et al., 2001c) and fluorotitanates (Tang et al., 2001d,e,f; Dadachov et al., 2001) have been reported. However, less work has been performed on fluorogermanates, with only a few Ge<sup>IV</sup> fluorides (Brauer et al., 1980, 1986; Lukevics et al., 1997; Zhang et al., 2003) structurally characterized. The aim of our work is to synthesize microporous germanates templated by organic amines. Unexpectedly, the title compound, (I), was obtained, a new fluorogermanate templated by the metal complex [Ni(en)(TETA)]<sup>2+</sup>. Since we did not add ethylenediamine (en) to the initial mixture, it must have been derived from the decomposition of TETA under hydrothermal conditions.



The crystal structure of (I) consists of a discrete  $[GeF_6]^{2-}$ anion and an  $[Ni(en)(TETA)]^{2+}$  cation (Fig. 1). In  $[GeF_6]^{2-}$ , the germanium center is coordinated by six F atoms, resulting in an octahedral geometry. The Ge—F bond distances are in the range 1.781 (3)–1.799 (3) Å, which is consistent with  $K_2GeF_6$  (Ge—F = 1.77 Å; Hoard & Vincent, 1939) and other fluorogermanates, *e.g.*  $[(CH_3)_4N][(CF_3)_3GeF_2]$  (Brauer *et al.*, 1986). In the  $[Ni(en)(TETA)]^{2+}$  cation, the Ni<sup>II</sup> atom is bonded to six N atoms of the en and TETA molecules, with Ni—N distances in the range 2.080 (4)–2.135 (5) Å. The complex cation and anion lie on twofold axes. The  $[GeF_6]^{2-}$ anions and  $[Ni(en)(TETA)]^{2+}$  cations interact with each other

 $\bigcirc$  2004 International Union of Crystallography Printed in Great Britain – all rights reserved



### Figure 1

The ionic components of the title compound, with the atom-numbering scheme. Displacement ellipsoids are shown at the 30% probability level. [Symmetry codes: (i)  $\frac{3}{2} - x$ ,  $\frac{3}{2} - y$ , *z*; (ii)  $\frac{1}{2} - x$ ,  $\frac{3}{2} - y$ , *z*].



## Figure 2

Packing diagram of the title compound, viewed down the b axis.

via weak hydrogen bonds, with  $H \cdots F$  distances in the range 2.07–2.40 Å.

# **Experimental**

In a typical synthesis, a mixture of  $\text{GeO}_2$  (0.104 g, 1 mmol), NiCl<sub>2</sub>.6H<sub>2</sub>O (0.238 g, 1 mmol), TETA (1.8 ml), pyridine (2 ml), hydrofluoric acid (40%, 0.1 ml), and H<sub>2</sub>O (1 ml), in a 1:1:12:25:5:56 molar ratio, was sealed in a Teflon-lined steel autoclave, heated at 443 K for 7 d and then cooled to room temperature. The resulting purple crystals were recovered by filtration, washed with distilled water and dried in air.

### Crystal data

$[Ni(C_2H_8N_2)(C_6H_{18}N_4)][GeF_6]$	Mo $K\alpha$ radiation
$M_r = 451.65$	Cell parameters from 2958
Orthorhombic, Pccn	reflections
a = 8.9029 (2) Å	$\theta = 2.2 - 25.0^{\circ}$
b = 9.4731 (3) Å	$\mu = 3.27 \text{ mm}^{-1}$
c = 18.0856 (2) Å	T = 293 (2) K
V = 1525.30 (6) Å <sup>3</sup>	Prism, purple
Z = 4	$0.22 \times 0.12 \times 0.10 \text{ mm}$
$D_{\rm x} = 1.967 {\rm Mg m}^{-3}$	

### Data collection

Bruker SMART CCD area-detector diffractometer	1315 independent reflections 1216 reflections with $I > 2\sigma(I)$
$\varphi$ and $\omega$ scans	$R_{\rm int} = 0.034$
Absorption correction: multi-scan	$\theta_{\rm max} = 25.0^{\circ}$
(SADABS; Sheldrick, 1996)	$h = -8 \rightarrow 10$
$T_{\min} = 0.630, T_{\max} = 0.721$	$k = -11 \rightarrow 10$
7696 measured reflections	$l = -19 \rightarrow 21$
Refinement	
Refinement on $F^2$	$w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_o^2) + (0.0415P)^2]$
$R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.053$	+ 11.3515 <i>P</i> ]
$wR(F^2) = 0.126$	where $P = (\hat{F_o}^2 + 2F_c^2)/3$
S = 1.14	$(\Delta/\sigma)_{\rm max} < 0.001$
1315 reflections	$\Delta \rho_{\rm max} = 1.03 \ {\rm e} \ {\rm \AA}^{-3}$
101 parameters	$\Delta \rho_{\rm min} = -0.56 \ {\rm e} \ {\rm \AA}^{-3}$
H-atom parameters constrained	

## Table 1

Selected geometric parameters (Å, °).

Ge-F1	1.781 (3)	Ni-N3	2.080 (4)
Ge-F3	1.785 (3)	Ni-N2	2.108 (5)
Ge-F2	1.799 (3)	Ni-N1	2.135 (5)
F1–Ge–F3	91.46 (17)	N3-Ni-N2	96.04 (17)
F1-Ge-F2	89.56 (16)	N3-Ni-N1	90.72 (18)
F3-Ge-F2	89.54 (16)	N2-Ni-N1	81.90 (18)

## Table 2

Hydrogen-bonding geometry (Å, °).

$D - H \cdot \cdot \cdot A$	D-H	$H \cdot \cdot \cdot A$	$D \cdots A$	$D - H \cdots A$
N1-H1 $A$ ···F3 <sup>iii</sup>	0.90	2.19	3.005 (6)	151
$N1 - H1A \cdots F2^{iii}$	0.90	2.34	3.064 (6)	138
$N2-H2C\cdots F1^{iv}$	0.91	2.25	3.035 (5)	145
$N2 - H2C \cdot \cdot \cdot F3^{v}$	0.91	2.40	3.176 (6)	143
$N3-H3A\cdots F2^{v}$	0.90	2.21	3.028 (6)	150
$N3-H3A\cdots F1^{iv}$	0.90	2.32	3.046 (5)	138
$N3-H3B\cdots F2^{ii}$	0.90	2.07	2.960 (6)	171
$C4-H4B\cdots F1$	0.97	2.33	3.198 (7)	148

Symmetry codes: (ii)  $\frac{1}{2} - x, \frac{3}{2} - y, z$  (iii)  $x - \frac{1}{2}, 1 - y, \frac{1}{2} - z$ ; (iv)  $x - \frac{1}{2}, 2 - y, \frac{1}{2} - z$ ; (v)  $1 - x, \frac{1}{2} + y, \frac{1}{2} - z$ .

All H atoms were positioned geometrically (C–H = 0.97 Å and N–H = 0.90 Å) and allowed to ride on their parent atoms, with  $U_{\rm iso}({\rm H}) = 1.2U_{\rm eq}$ (parent atom). The highest peak in the difference map is located 1.14 Å from atom F3.

Data collection: *SMART* (Bruker, 1999); cell refinement: *SMART*; data reduction: *SAINT* (Bruker, 1999); program(s) used to solve structure: *SHELXS*97 (Sheldrick, 1990); program(s) used to refine structure: *SHELXL*97 (Sheldrick, 1997); molecular graphics: *SHELXTL* (Bruker, 1997); software used to prepare material for publication: *SHELXTL*.

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation of China (grant Nos. 20271050 and 20171045), the Ministry of Finance of China and the talents program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences.

# References

Brauer, D. J., Burger, H. & Eujen, R. (1980). Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl. 19, 836–837.

- Brauer, D. J., Wilke, J. & Eujen, R. (1986). J. Organomet. Chem. 316, 261-269.
- Bruker (1997). SHELXTL. Version 5.10. Bruker AXS Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, USA.
- Bruker (1999). SMART and SAINT. Versions 5.054. Bruker AXS Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, USA.
- Dadachov, M. S., Tang, L. Q. & Zou, X. D. (2001). Z. Kristallogr. New Cryst. Struct. 216, 141–142.
- Hoard, J. L. & Vincent, W. B. (1939). J. Am. Chem. Soc. 61, 2849-2852.
- Lukevics, E., Belyakov, S., Arsenyan, P. & Popelis, J. (1997). J. Organomet. Chem. 549, 163–165.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (1990). Acta Cryst. A46, 467-473.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (1996). SADABS. University of Göttingen, Germany.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (1997). SHELXL97. University of Göttingen, Germany.

- Tang, L. Q., Dadachov, M. S. & Zou, X. D. (2001a). Z. Kristallogr. New Cryst. Struct. 216, 385–386.
- Tang, L. Q., Dadachov, M. S. & Zou, X. D. (2001b). Z. Kristallogr. New Cryst. Struct. 216, 389–390.
- Tang, L. Q., Dadachov, M. S. & Zou, X. D. (2001c). Z. Kristallogr. New Cryst. Struct. 216, 391–392.
- Tang, L. Q., Dadachov, M. S. & Zou, X. D. (2001d). Z. Kristallogr. New Cryst. Struct. 216, 257–258.
- Tang, L. Q., Dadachov, M. S. & Zou, X. D. (2001e). Z. Kristallogr. New Cryst. Struct. 216, 259–260.
- Tang, L. Q., Dadachov, M. S. & Zou, X. D. (2001f). Z. Kristallogr. New Cryst. Struct. 216, 387–388.
- Zhang, H. X., Yang, G. Y. & Sun, Y. Q. (2003). Acta Cryst. E59, m185-m187.