

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TAIWAN SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING COMPANY, LTD. (TSMC) and
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD (SAMSUNG),
Petitioners,

v.

DSS TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT, INC.
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2014-01030¹
Patent No. 5,652,084

**PATENT OWNER DSS TECHNOLOGY, INC.'S
RESPONSE TO PETITION**

¹ Case IPR2014-01493 has been joined with this proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. | OVERVIEW OF THE INVENTION CLAIMED IN THE ‘084 PATENT AND THE CITED PRIOR ART | 1 |
| | A. Background of the photolithographic process and equipment..... | 2 |
| | B. Summary of the ‘084 Patent | 3 |
| | C. The ‘084 Patent requires two separate patterns | 6 |
| | D. Jinbo Addresses the Same Problem but Describes a Different Technique..... | 7 |
| III. | CLAIM CONSTRUCTION..... | 9 |
| | A. The Claims of the ‘084 Patent are Construed According to the Legal Principles Used by the District Courts..... | 9 |
| | 1. Second pattern..... | 10 |
| | a. The specification of the ‘084 Patent reaffirms that the first and second patterns are two separate individual elements and cannot be one and the same..... | 11 |
| | b. The second pattern cannot be a duplicate of the first pattern..... | 12 |
| IV. | PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO PROVE ANY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIM OF THE ‘084 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE..... | 19 |
| | A. Challenge #1: Jinbo does not anticipate claims 1-8, 12, 15, and 16 of the ‘084 Patent | 19 |
| | a. Jinbo does not explicitly disclose a limitation of patterning the second imaging layer in accordance with a second pattern | 20 |
| | b. Jinbo does not inherently disclose a “second pattern” in accordance with which second resist layer is patterned..... | 23 |
| | B. Challenge #2: Claim 9 cannot be found obvious based on Jinbo in view of McColgin because Jinbo does not disclose several material limitations of claim 1 from which claim 9 depends..... | 25 |

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| C. | Challenge #3: Claims 10 and 11 cannot be rendered obvious by Jinbo in view of Matthews because Jinbo does not disclose several material limitations of claim 1 from which claims 10 and 11 depend..... | 25 |
| V. | CONCLUSION..... | 25 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Federal Cases

3M Innovative Properties Co. v. Avery Dennison Corp.,
350 F.3d 1365, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... 12, 13

Advanced Display Sys., Inc. v. Kent State Univ.,
212 F.3d 1272, 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2000)..... 20

Anchor Wall Sys., Inc. v. Rockwood Retaining Walls, Inc.,
340 F.3d 1298, 1304 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... 11

Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Systems, Inc.,
773 F.3d 1201, 1224 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 20

Free Motion Fitness, Inc. v. Cybex Intern., Inc.,
423 F.3d 1343, 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 11

Glaverbel Societe Anonyme v. Northlake Mktg. & Supply, Inc.,
45 F.3d 1550, 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1995)..... 20

Glaxo Grp. Ltd. v. Apotex, Inc.,
376 F.3d 1339, 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... 22

In re Montgomery,
677 F.3d 1375, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 22

In re Robertson,
169 F.3d 743, 745 (Fed. Cir. 1999)..... 23

Old Reliable Wholesale, Inc. v. Cornell Corp.,
635 F.3d 539, 544-45 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 20

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 9, 10, 11, 19

...

| | |
|--|----|
| <i>Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , 927 F.2d 1565, 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1991)..... | 20 |
| <i>Springs Window Fashions LP v. Novo Indus., L.P.</i> , 323 F.3d 989, 992 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... | 11 |
| <i>Swapalease, Inc. v. Sublease Exchange.com, Inc.</i> , 2009 WL 204408, *11 (S.D. Ohio Jan 27, 2009) | 13 |
| <i>Volterra Semiconductor Corp. v. Primarion, Inc.</i> , 2010 WL 653452, *5 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 22, 2010) | 13 |

Federal Statutes

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| 35 U.S.C. § 102..... | 1 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 103..... | 1 |

Federal Regulations

| | |
|----------------------------|----|
| 37 C.F.R. §1.84(p)(4)..... | 11 |
|----------------------------|----|

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.