

Paper No. \_\_\_\_\_

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

INTELLECTUAL VENTURES MANAGEMENT, LLC  
Petitioner

v.

Patent of XILINX, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2012-00018  
Patent 7,566,960  
Title: INTERPOSING STRUCTURE

---

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Table of Authorities ..... iii

Introduction ..... 1

I. Overview of U.S. 7,566,960 ..... 1

II. The initial construction of “inside” should be refined to clarify that  
“inside” means “within” ..... 2

    A. No construction is necessary for “an array of landing pads disposed  
    on an inside surface of the integrated circuit package” ..... 2

    B. The initial claim interpretation is unduly broad and effectively  
    removes the “inside” limitation from the claims ..... 3

    C. The Board’s final claim interpretation, if any, should clarify that  
    “inside” means “within” ..... 6

III. Ground 6: Neither Chakravorty ’362 nor Siniaguine teach “an interposing  
structure disposed inside the integrated circuit package” ..... 9

IV. Ground 7: Patel does not rehabilitate Chakravorty ’362 ..... 12

V. Ground 8: Siniaguine, Ma, and Chakravorty ’362 fail to teach all of the  
limitations and are not combinable ..... 12

    A. Siniaguine does not teach “an array of landing pads disposed on an  
    inside surface of the integrated circuit package” ..... 13

    B. Ma does not teach first and second “substantially identical patterns” .... 13

    C. The proposed modification would render Siniaguine inoperable ..... 16

VI. Ground 9: Patel does not rehabilitate Siniaguine, Chakravorty ’362 and  
Ma ..... 18

VII. Conclusion ..... 19

---

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

*Chamberlain v. Lear Corp.*, 516 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....6  
*In re Buszard*, 504 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....5  
*Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (*en banc*).....3

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 316.....1

**Rules**

37 C.F.R. § 42.220.....1

**Other Authorities**

MPEP 2143.01 .....16

## **INTRODUCTION**

Patent Owner Xilinx, Inc. (“Xilinx”) provides this response under 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(8) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.220. Xilinx respectfully submits that the prior art in Grounds 6-9 fails to teach each and every limitation of the claims and fails to teach all of the elements arranged as in the claim. Accordingly, the claims are patentable over the prior art and should be confirmed.

Concurrently with this filing, Xilinx files a separate Motion to Amend that presents reasons why the proposed substitute claims are still further distinguished from the prior art of record. Since the proposed substitute claims recite all of the limitations of the original independent claims, the arguments presented in this Response apply equally to the proposed substitute claims. Nevertheless, Xilinx requests that the Board accept the proposed substitute claims only to the extent that the Board determines that the original claims are invalid under Grounds 6-9.

### **I. Overview of U.S. 7,566,960**

U.S. Patent No. 7566960 to Robert O. Conn, assigned to Xilinx, Inc., describes various innovative structures for capacitive interposers (caposers) for use with integrated circuits. The novel caposers described in the '960 patent are useful in addressing the problem of excessive noise in the power leads of integrated circuitry operating at high frequencies. Placing a caposer with an integrated circuit die *inside* an encapsulating package, as described and claimed, minimizes the

length of wiring between the capacitive element and the integrated circuit. This, in turn, minimizes the parasitic inductance due to the wiring and allows the capacitor to more effectively provide transient power.

**II. The initial construction of “inside” should be refined to clarify that “inside” means “within”**

Xilinx objects to and asks for reconsideration of the Board's proposed interpretation of an “array of landing pads disposed on an inside surface of the integrated circuit package.” The Board's initial analysis interprets this phrase “to mean that the integrated circuit package has at least two surfaces (one facing in and once facing out) and that the array of landing pads is located on the surface facing in.” (Paper 13 at 11.)

The initial claim interpretation is overly broad and fails to capture the essential point that the “inside surface” is *inside* the integrated circuit package. For the reasons outlined more specifically below, further analysis of the claim interpretation is appropriate and leads to a conclusion that either no formal interpretation is necessary, or alternatively that “inside” means “within.”

**A. No construction is necessary for “an array of landing pads disposed on an inside surface of the integrated circuit package”**

The Board's order stated that there is a “‘heavy presumption’ that a claim term carries its ordinary and customary meaning” (Paper 13 at 7). Xilinx submits that the evidence in this case does not overcome that presumption, and accordingly

# 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.