

EXHIBIT

*DSS-2008*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION

DSS TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT, INC.	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:14-cv-00199-RSP
	§	
v.	§	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
	§	
TAIWAN SEMICONDUCTOR	§	
MANUFACTURING COMPANY,	§	
LIMITED; et al.,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

**DEFENDANTS' RESPONSIVE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. OVERVIEW OF THE 084 PATENT ..... 1

III. THE DISPUTED TERMS OF THE 084 PATENT ..... 3

IV. DEFENDANTS’ PROPOSED CONSTRUCTIONS SHOULD BE ADOPTED ..... 4

A. The First and Second Patterned Layers Are Formed by Patterning the First and Second Imaging Layers and Include the Remaining Portions of the Imaging Layer and the Intervening Spaces. .... 4

1. The Claim Language Requires That “Patterning” the First/Second Imaging Layers Forms the First/Second Patterned Layers. .... 6

2. DSS Now Seeks a Broader Construction Inconsistent with its Position in the IPR Proceeding. .... 7

3. The Specification Describes Patterning the First/Second Imaging Layers to Form Patterned Layers Consisting of the Remaining Portions of the First/Second Imaging Layers and the Intervening Spaces. .... 8

**B. The First Patterned Layer Remains With the Second Patterned Layer, Thereby Forming a Single Patterned Layer.** ..... 9

1. Claim 1 Requires that the Single Patterned Layer is Formed from the Patterned Imaging Layers, Not Underlying Layers. .... 10

**C. The First and Second Patterns May be Any Suitable Pattern.** ..... 11

D. Distinct Features are Separate, Non-Overlapping Features. .... 17

1. In the Context of the Claims and Specification as a Whole, “Distinct” Features Are Separated or Not in Contact with Each Other. .... 17

1. During prosecution, the patentee further narrowed the claims by disclaiming overlapping features. .... 20

E. Stabilizing the First Patterned Layer Allows the First Patterned Layer to Withstand Subsequent Lithographic Processing Steps. .... 23

1. The Context of the Specification and the Claim Itself Require that a First Patterned Layer Be Formed and Then Stabilized. .... 24

2. The Specification Does Not Require that the Stabilized First Patterned Layer Be Able to Withstand All Lithographic Processing. .... 25

F. The Relatively Closer Limitation is Indefinite Because There is No Fixed Basis to Determine Whether Two Features are Closer than Otherwise Possible. .... 27

V. CONCLUSION..... 30

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Beneficial Innovations, Inc. v. Blockdot, Inc.</i> , No. 2:07-cv-263-TJW-CE and 2:07-cv-555-TJW-CE, 2010 WL 1441779 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 12, 2010).....	14
<i>Biogen Idec, Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline LLC</i> , 713 F.3d 1090 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	22
<i>Free Motion Fitness, Inc. v. Cybex Int'l, Inc.</i> , 423 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	14, 18
<i>Halliburton Energy Servs., Inc. v. M-I LLC</i> , 514 F.3d 1244 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	27, 28
<i>Harcot Research, LLC v. Europea Sports Prods., Inc.</i> , No. 2:13-cv-228 .....	7
<i>Hill-Rom Servs., Inc. v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	9
<i>Honeywell, Int'l, Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 341 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	29
<i>Interactive Gift Express, Inc. v. Compuserve, Inc.</i> , 256 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	6, 29
<i>Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	16, 25
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Multi-Tech Sys.</i> , 357 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	15
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2120 (2014), _ U.S. _ (2014).....	26
<i>Performance Pricing, Inc. v. Google, Inc.</i> , No. 2:07-cv-432, 2009 WL 2497102 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 13, 2009).....	14
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) ( <i>en banc</i> ) .....	17, 19
<i>Regents of Univ. of Cal. v. Dakocytomation Cal., Inc.</i> , 517 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	22

*Silicon Graphics, Inc. v. ATI Techs., Inc.*,  
607 F.3d 784 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....25

*St. Clair Intellectual Prop. Consultants, Inc. v. Canon Inc.*,  
412 F. App'x 270 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....7

*TecSec, Inc. v. IBM Corp.*,  
731 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....23

*Trading Techs. Int'l, Inc. v. eSpeed, Inc.*,  
595 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....23

# 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.