



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/540,610	03/31/2000	James E. Nulty	16820.P097	2171

7590 01/09/2002
 Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman
 12400 Wilshire Boulevard
 Seventh Floor
 Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

CHU, CHRIS C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2815	7

DATE MAILED: 01/09/2002

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

INTEL 1113

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/540,610	NULTY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chris C. Chu	2815	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on October 4, 2001.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 25 - 39 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 25 - 39 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 - 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 - * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on October 4, 2001 has been received and entered in this office action.

Amend claims: 25, 26, and 34.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 25 and 27 ~ 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dennison et al.

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

Regarding claim 27, note Fig. 2 of Dennison et al., where the reference shows 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; 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), the etch stop material being distinct from the insulating spacer (see Fig. 2 and column 3, lines 32 ~ 38).

Regarding claim 28, Fig. 2 of Dennison et al., where the reference shows the insulating spacer (18) has a substantially rectangular profile in the contact region (see Fig. 2).

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

Regarding claims 30 and 37, Fig. 2 of Dennison et al., where the reference shows the insulating spacer (18) surface portion without overlying etch stop material comprises an insulating spacer surface portion most distant from the substrate (see Fig. 2).

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

Regarding claims 32 and 38, Fig. 2 of Dennison et al., where the reference shows 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, Fig. 2A of Dennison et al., where the reference shows a structure (10), further comprising a second conductive material (40) in the contact region (see Fig. 2A).

Regarding claim 34, Fig. 2 of Dennison et al., where the reference shows 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), the etch stop material being distinct from the insulative spacer (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).

Regarding claim 35, Fig. 2 of Dennison et al., where the reference shows the electrically insulative spacer (18) has a substantially rectangular cross-sectional shape in a plane that is substantially perpendicular to the substrate surface (see Fig. 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. 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 negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dennison et al. in view of Gonzalez.

Dennison et al. discloses the claimed invention except the etch stop layer is silicon dioxide. However, Gonzalez discloses the etch stop layer is silicon dioxide (31 in Fig. 1B). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

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.