

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Facout and Tradomark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/540,610	03/31/2000	James E. Nulty	16820.P097	2171
75	90 09/11/2002			
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman 12400 Wilshire Boulevard Seventh Floor			EXAMINER	
			CHU, CHRIS C	
Los Angeles, CA 90025		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2815	17
			DATE MAILED: 09/11/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



		Application No.	plicant(s) ہے۔
Office Action Summary		09/540,610	NULTY ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Chris C. Chu	2815
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a r Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address
A SHO THE M - Exten after: - If the - If NO - Failur - Any n	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE- MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO usions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the malling date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum attutory per to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by ste ply received by the Office later than three months after the mid d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N: 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of the lod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC tutle, cause the application to become.	a reply be timely filed inty (30) days will be considered timely. NOTES from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S. C. § 133).
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2	20 May 2002 .	
2a)□		This action is non-final.	
3)□	Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice und	owance except for formal m	
Dispositi	on of Claims		•
	Claim(s) 25 - 39 is/are pending in the appli		
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	drawn from consideration.	
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠	Claim(s) 25 - 39 is/are rejected.		
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	d/or election requirement.	
·· —	ion Papers		
,	The specification is objected to by the Exam		other Economics
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) _ a		
111	Applicant may not request that any objection t The proposed drawing correction filed on	-,,	
لساراا	If approved, corrected drawings are required in		disapproved by the Examiner.
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the		
	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	eign priority under 35 U.S.C	c. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		3
•	1. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received.	
	2. Certified copies of the priority docum	nents have been received in	Application No
* :	Copies of the certified copies of the application from the Internationa See the attached detailed Office action for a	l Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
14) 🔲 /	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dom	estic priority under 35 U.S.	C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
	a)		
Attachmer	nt(s)		
1) 🔯 Noti	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Intervie	w Summary (PTO-413) Paner No(s)



Application/Control Number: 09/540,610

Art Unit: 2815

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment filed on May 20, 2002 has been received and entered in this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 25 and 27 ~ 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dennison et al. in view of Figura et al.

Regarding claim 25, Dennison et al. discloses in column 3, line 35 the etch stop material (20) being silicon nitride.

Regarding claim 27, Dennison et al. discloses in Fig. 2 a structure (10), comprising:

- a conductive layer (12 and column 3, lines 29 ~ 33) disposed over a substrate;
- a first insulating layer (18) on the conductive layer;
- a contact region (the area of 34) in the first insulating layer;



Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Application/Control Number: 09/540,610

Page 3

Art Unit: 2815

- at least one insulating spacer (18) in the contact region adjacent to the first insulating layer (see Fig. 2); and
- an etch stop material (20 and column 3, line 35) over the first insulating layer and adjacent to the insulating spacer (see Fig. 2).

Dennison et al. does not disclose the etch stop material being a different material from the insulating spacer. However, Figura et al. discloses in Fig. 1 an etch stop material (column 4, lines 51 and 52) being a different material from the insulating spacer (column 4, lines 11 and 12). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time when the invention was made to modify Dennison et al. by using different materials for the etch stop material and the insulating spacer as taught by Figura et al. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify Dennison et al. in the manner described above for at least the purpose of minimizing current leakage and short circuits (column 2, lines 36 ~ 38).

Regarding claim 28, Dennison et al. discloses in Fig. 2 the insulating spacer (18) having a substantially rectangular profile in the contact region (see Fig. 2).

Regarding claims 29 and 36, Dennison et al. discloses in Fig. 2 the insulating spacer (18) having a surface portion in the contact region without overlying etch stop material (see Fig. 2).

Regarding claims 30 and 37, Dennison et al. discloses in Fig. 2 the insulating spacer (18) surface portion without overlying etch stop material comprising an insulating spacer surface portion most distant from the substrate (see Fig. 2).

Regarding claim 31, Dennison et al. discloses in Fig. 2 the insulating spacer (18) having a surface portion in the contact region without overlying etch stop material (see Fig. 2).



Application/Control Number: 09/540,610

Page 4

Art Unit: 2815

Regarding claims 32 and 38, Dennison et al. discloses in Fig. 2 a structure (10), further comprising a second insulating layer (28) on the etch stop layer and over the conductive layer (see Fig. 2).

Regarding claims 33 and 39, Dennison et al. discloses in Fig. 2A a structure (10), further comprising a second conductive material (40) in the contact region (see Fig. 2A).

Regarding claim 34, Dennison et al. discloses in Fig. 2 a structure, comprising the step of:

- a first electrically conductive material (24) formed in and/or on a surface of a substrate:
- a contact opening (the area of 34) in a region adjacent to a second electrically conductive material (the area of 40 in Fig. 2A) formed on the substrate;
- an electrically insulative spacer (18) in the contact opening adjacent to the second electrically conductive material (see Fig. 2);
- an etch stop material (20) over the electrically insulative spacer and the first and second electrically conductive materials (see Fig. 2);
- a blanket layer (28) over the etch stop material; and
- an opening through a first part of the etch stop material to the first electrically conductive material (see Fig. 2).

Dennison et al. does not disclose the etch stop material being a different material from the insulating spacer. However, Figura et al. discloses in Fig. 1 an etch stop material (column 4, lines 51 and 52) being a different material from the insulating spacer (column 4, lines 11 and 12).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time when the



DOCKET

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.

