

trials@uspto.gov

571-272-7822

IPR2015-01764, Paper No. 25

IPR2015-01768, Paper No. 23

December 1, 2016

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LAM RESEARCH CORP.,
Petitioner,

v.

DANIEL L. FLAMM,
Patent Owner.

Cases IPR2015-01764, IPR2015-01768
Patent RE40,264 E

Held: October 4, 2016

BEFORE: CHRISTOPHER L. CRUMBLY, JO-ANNE M.
KOKOSKI, and KIMBERLY McGRAW, Administrative Patent
Judges.

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday,
October 11, 2016, commencing at 1:00 p.m., at the U.S. Patent
and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia.

Cases IPR2015-01764, IPR2015-01768
Patent RE40,264 E

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

MORGAN CHU, ESQUIRE
SAMUEL K. LU, ESQUIRE
MICHAEL R. FLEMING, ESQUIRE
Irell & Manella, LLP
1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900
Los Angeles, California 90067-4276

ON BEHALF OF PATENT OWNER:

GEORGE C. SUMMERFIELD, ESQUIRE
Stadheim & Gear
400 North Michigan Avenue
Suite 2200
Chicago, Illinois 60611

and

CHRISTOPHER FRERKING
University of New Hampshire School of Law
Two White Street
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

1 two cases. So we'll just the submit is same transcript in both
2 cases and it will be part of the record of both. The petitioner, of
3 course, has the burden of proving unpatentability, so will argue
4 first. You may reserve however much time you wish for your
5 rebuttal, followed by patent owner's argument. And then the
6 petitioner's argument on the 1764 and 1767 cases. And then --
7 did I say is it wrong? 1768. I think we know. I'm sorry if I
8 screwed up. Sorry, 1764 and 1768 will be argued together.
9 That's my fault. And then we'll take a short recess, let everybody
10 stretch their legs, come back in and we'll undertake the 1767
11 argument. We allocated 30 minutes to both sides in that case. So
12 we'll follow the same procedure with petitioner arguing first
13 followed by the patent owner.

14 I note that the petitioner submitted demonstrative slides.
15 I don't have anything for the patent owner; is that correct?

16 MR. SUMMERFIELD: We'll be using theirs, Your
17 Honor.

18 JUDGE CRUMBLEY: That's fine. Just wanted to
19 make sure we have everything we need up here. I also didn't
20 receive any objections to the petitioner's demonstratives. So I
21 assume there were none. Any questions before we begin? So we
22 will get underway, starting with petitioners. Do you wish to
23 reserve any time?

24 MR. CHU: Yes. I'm going to try and reserve at least
25 15 minutes. And with Your Honor's permission, may I distribute

1 to you and the court reporter a copy of the slides in case you want
2 a hard copy?

3 JUDGE CRUMBLEY: Please.

4 MR. CHU: Good afternoon. Again, it's Morgan Chu
5 on behalf of the petitioner, Lam Research. We are going to
6 address the '264 patent. What is the invention? The invention is
7 doing etching in a single chamber with two important
8 qualifications that are directly at issue today. First, that it be done
9 at two temperatures and second that the change between the two
10 temperatures be at a preselected time. The key pieces of prior art
11 are Tegal and Matsumura. Tegal discloses etching in a single
12 chamber at two temperatures. No question about that.
13 Matsumura is a patent directed to controlling the temperature in
14 connection with semiconductor processes, and it teaches using a
15 single chamber, having two temperatures and having a
16 preselected time in changing from temperature 1 to temperature
17 2.

18 And here is the central question before us this afternoon
19 that is hotly disputed: Is there, as a factual matter, a motivation to
20 combine? It is a factual question. Not a legal question. The case
21 law demonstrates that.

22 And here is what the factual record is. Dean Joseph
23 Cecchi, dean of the University of New Mexico School of
24 Engineering submitted declarations. These declarations stated
25 plainly that a person of skill in the art would combine and would

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.