Received 7 April 2006 Accepted 7 April 2006

Acta Crystallographica Section E Structure Reports Online

ISSN 1600-5368

# Sonja Pavlik,<sup>a</sup> Karl Kirchner<sup>a</sup> and Kurt Mereiter<sup>b</sup>\*

<sup>a</sup>Institute of Applied Synthetic Chemistry, Vienna University of Technology, Getreidemarkt 9/163, A-1060 Vienna, Austria, and <sup>b</sup>Institute of Chemical Technologies and Analytics, Vienna University of Technology, Getreidemarkt 9/164, A-1060 Vienna, Austria

Correspondence e-mail: kurt.mereiter@tuwien.ac.at

#### Key indicators

Single-crystal X-ray study T = 123 K Mean  $\sigma$ (C–C) = 0.003 Å R factor = 0.023 wR factor = 0.056 Data-to-parameter ratio = 21.8

For details of how these key indicators were automatically derived from the article, see http://journals.iucr.org/e.  $(\eta^3$ -Allyl)bromo $(\eta^5$ -cyclopentadienyl)-(phenylaminodiphenylphosphine- $\kappa P$ )ruthenium(IV) hexafluorophosphate

The title compound,  $[RuBr(\eta^5-C_5H_5)(\eta^3-C_3H_5)(C_{18}H_{16}NP)]$ -PF<sub>6</sub>, contains a half-sandwich cyclopentadienylruthenium(IV) complex with a three-legged piano-stool structure and an intramolecular N-H···Br hydrogen bond.

# Comment

Ruthenium complexes with cyclopentadienyl (Cp), pentamethylcylopentadienyl (Cp\*) or hydridotrispyrazolylborate (Tp) as ancillary ligand and phenylaminodiphenylphosphine (Ph<sub>2</sub>PNHPh) as coligand have recently attracted attention because of a rich chemistry in stoichiometric or catalytic transformations of alkenes and alkynes (Pavlik et al., 2003, 2006; Pavlik, Mereiter et al., 2005; Pavlik, Jantscher et al., 2005; Priya et al., 2003; Jimenez-Tenorio et al., 2005). For Cp, such compounds are accessible from the cationic complex  $[RuCp(Ph_2PNHPh)(CH_3CN)_2]^+$  (Pavlik et al., 2003), which behaves as a masked electron-deficient entity and reacts under mild conditions with unsaturated hydrocarbons. In order to evaluate further chemistry, the bis(acetonitrile) complex was reacted with allyl bromide. As indicated by NMR spectroscopy (see Experimental) and colour change, oxidative addition at the metal centre with replacement of both acetonitrile ligands took place. The resulting crystals contained the title cationic complex of tetravalent Ru, (I), shown in Fig. 1.



Complex (I) has a three-legged pseudo piano-stool structure with Cp as the seat and bromide, aminophosphine and the four-electron electron-donor allyl as the legs. The complex agrees in stereochemistry and orientation of the allyl group with several related compounds [RuCp(allyl)(Br)(*E*Ph<sub>3</sub>)]PF<sub>6</sub>, where E = P, As and Sb but not Bi, and Ph = phenyl (Becker *et al.*, 2002). This is demonstrated in Fig. 2, which presents a superposition plot of (I) with [RuCp(allyl)(Br)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)]PF<sub>6</sub> (Becker *et al.*, 2002). The bond lengths around Ru in this latter complex compare well with those in (I), except that the Ru-P bond to PPh<sub>3</sub> is longer by ~0.04 Å because it is weaker  $\pi$ -

© 2006 International Union of Crystallography All rights reserved



#### Figure 1

The molecular structure of (I), shown with 40% probability displacement ellipsoids. The broken line represents the intramolecular  $N-H\cdots$ Br hydrogen bond.



### Figure 2

Superposition plot of the Ru complexes in (I) (full lines) and  $[RuCp(allyl)(Br)(PPh_3)]PF_6$  (broken lines; Becker *et al.*, 2002). Weighted r.m.s. deviation of the fitted atoms Ru, Br, P1, C6, C7, and C8 is 0.040 Å.

acceptor than Ph<sub>2</sub>PNHPh. A typical behaviour of the aminophosphine complexes is the formation of a distinctly bent intramolecular hydrogen bond to Br (Fig. 1 and Table 2).

## **Experimental**

The synthesis of (I) was carried out as follows. To a solution of [RuCp(PPh<sub>2</sub>NHPh)(CH<sub>3</sub>CN)<sub>2</sub>]PF<sub>6</sub> (100 mg, 0.15 mmol) in CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> (10 ml), allyl bromide was added (26 µl, 0.30 mmol) and the mixture was stirred for 2 h at room temperature. After evaporation of the solvent, (I) was obtained as a yellow solid, which was washed with diethyl ether  $(3 \times 5 \text{ ml})$  and dried *in vacuo* (yield 87 mg, 82%). Spectroscopic analysis: <sup>1</sup>H NMR (acetone- $d_6$ , 293 K,  $\delta$ , p.p.m.): 7.84– 7.30 [m, 10H, Ph(P)], 7.06-6.87 [m, 2H, Ph(NH)], 6.84-6.66 [m, 1H, Ph(NH)], 6.63–6.48 [m, 2H, Ph(NH)], 5.92 (5H, Cp), 4.80 (dd,  ${}^{3}J_{HH} =$ 10.7 Hz,  ${}^{2}J_{\text{HH}} = 2.7$  Hz, 1H, CH<sub>2</sub>CHCH<sub>2</sub>), 4.52–4.38 (m, 1H, CH<sub>2</sub>CHCH<sub>2</sub>), 4.10-3.90 (m, 1H, CH<sub>2</sub>CHCH<sub>2</sub>), 3.86-3.69 (m, 1H, CH<sub>2</sub>CHCH<sub>2</sub>), 3.61 (d, <sup>3</sup>J<sub>HHtrans</sub> = 10.6 Hz, CH<sub>2</sub>CHCH<sub>2</sub>). The NH proton could not be detected. <sup>13</sup>C{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR (acetone- $d_6$ , 273 K,  $\delta$ , p.p.m.): 141.8-119.0 [Ph(P), Ph(NH)], 97.0 (CH<sub>2</sub>CHCH<sub>2</sub>), 95.2 (Cp), 62.1 (CH<sub>2</sub>CHCH<sub>2</sub>), 54.7 (CH<sub>2</sub>CHCH<sub>2</sub>). <sup>31</sup>P{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR (acetone-d<sub>6</sub>, 273 K,  $\delta$ , p.p.m.): 49.8 (PPh<sub>2</sub>), -144.2 (<sup>1</sup> $J_{FP}$  = 706.5 Hz, PF<sub>6</sub>). Crystals of (I) for X-ray structure analysis were obtained by crystallization using vapour diffusion of diethyl ether into a solution of the compound in CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> at room temperature.

Z = 8

 $D_r = 1.787 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$ 

 $0.38 \times 0.31 \times 0.25 \text{ mm}$ 

59992 measured reflections

7663 independent reflections

 $w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_0^2) + (0.0224P)^2]$ 

where  $P = (F_0^2 + 2F_c^2)/3$ 

+ 3.5883P]

 $\Delta \rho_{\rm min} = -0.28 \text{ e } \text{\AA}^{-3}$ 

 $(\Delta/\sigma)_{\rm max} = 0.002$  $\Delta\rho_{\rm max} = 0.50 \text{ e} \text{ Å}^{-3}$ 

6108 reflections with  $I > 2\sigma(I)$ 

Mo  $K\alpha$  radiation

 $\mu = 2.29 \text{ mm}^{-1}$ 

T = 123 (2) K

Block, orange

 $R_{\rm int} = 0.037$ 

 $\theta_{\rm max} = 30.0^{\circ}$ 

#### Crystal data

 $[RuBr(C_{5}H_{5})(C_{3}H_{5})(C_{18}H_{16}NP)]-PF_{6}$   $M_{r} = 709.40$ Orthorhombic, *Pbca*  a = 15.384 (2) Å b = 17.603 (2) Å c = 19.469 (2) Å V = 5272.4 (11) Å<sup>3</sup>

#### Data collection

- Bruker SMART CCD area-detector diffractometer  $\omega$  scans Absorption correction: multi-scan
- (SADABS; Sheldrick, 1996) $T_{min} = 0.458, T_{max} = 0.564$

## Refinement

Refinement on  $F^2$   $R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.023$   $wR(F^2) = 0.056$  S = 1.047663 reflections 352 parameters H atoms treated by a mixture of independent and constrained refinement

# Table 1

Selected geometric parameters (Å,  $^\circ).$ 

Ru-C1	2.243 (2)	Ru-P1	2.3754 (5)
Ru-C2	2.218 (2)	Ru-Br	2.5298 (3)
Ru-C3	2.189 (2)	C6-C7	1.402 (3)
Ru-C4	2.196 (2)	C7-C8	1.400 (3)
Ru-C5	2.233 (2)	P1-C9	1.815 (2)
Ru-C6	2.220 (2)	P1-C15	1.814 (2)
Ru–C7	2.175 (2)	P1-N	1.6714 (15)
Ru-C8	2.243 (2)	N-C21	1.419 (2)
C7-Ru-P1	94.68 (6)	C6-C7-C8	116.6 (2)
C7-Ru-Br	87.06 (6)	P1-N-C21	127.17 (13)
P1-Ru-Br	85.053 (15)		

Table 2Hydrogen-bond geometry (Å,  $^{\circ}$ ).

$D - H \cdot \cdot \cdot A$	D-H	$H \cdot \cdot \cdot A$	$D \cdots A$	$D - \mathbf{H} \cdot \cdot \cdot A$
$N - H \cdots Br$	0.77 (2)	2.65 (2)	3.2206 (16)	132 (2)

H atoms attached to cyclopentadienyl and phenyl groups were placed in calculated positions and constrained to ride on their parent atoms with C—H distances of 0.95 Å. The positions of allyl and N-bound H atoms were refined freely. The isotropic displacement parameters of all H atoms were set at  $U_{iso}(H) = 1.2U_{eq}(C,N)$  of their carrier atoms.

Data collection: *SMART* (Bruker, 1999); cell refinement: *SAINT* (Bruker, 1999); data reduction: *SHELXTL* (Bruker, 1999); program(s) used to solve structure: *SHELXS97* (Sheldrick, 1997); program(s) used to refine structure: *SHELXL97* (Sheldrick, 1997); molecular graphics: *SHELXTL*; software used to prepare material for publication: *SHELXTL*.

Financial support by the FWF Austrian Science Fund is gratefully acknowledged (project No. P16600-N11).

## References

- Becker, E., Slugovc, C., Rüba, E., Standfest-Hauser, C., Mereiter, K., Schmid, R. & Kirchner, K. (2002). J. Organomet. Chem. 649, 55–63.
- Bruker (1999). SAINT (Version 6.01), SMART (Version 5.054) and SHELXTL (Version 5.10). Bruker AXS Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, USA.
- Jimenez-Tenorio, M., Puerta, M. C. & Valerga, P. (2005). Eur. J. Inorg. Chem. pp. 2631–2640.
- Pavlik, S., Jantscher, F., Dazinger, G., Mereiter, K. & Kirchner, K. (2006). Eur. J. Inorg. Chem. pp. 1006–1021.
- Pavlik, S., Jantscher, F., Mereiter, K. & Kirchner, K. (2005). Organometallics, 24, 4899–4901.
- Pavlik, S., Mereiter, K., Puchberger, M. & Kirchner, K. (2005). Organometallics, 24, 3561–3575.
- Pavlik, S., Mereiter, K., Schmid, R. & Kirchner, K. (2003). Organometallics, 22, 1771–1774.
- Priya, S., Balakrishna, M. S., Mobin, S. M. & McDonald, R. (2003). J. Organomet. Chem. 688, 227–235.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (1996). SADABS. University of Göttingen, Germany.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (1997). SHELXS97 and SHELXL97. University of Göttingen, Germany.