

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LAM RESEARCH CORP.,

Petitioner

v.

DANIEL L. FLAMM,

Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. RE40,264 E

Issued: April 29, 2008

Named Inventor: Daniel L. Flamm

Title: MULTI-TEMPERATURE PROCESSING

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW

OF U.S. PATENT NO. RE40,264 E

FIFTH PETITION

Mail Stop: PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. MANDATORY NOTICES PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.8	2
A. Notice of Real Party-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))	2
B. Notice of Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	2
C. Designation of Lead and Back-up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3))	2
D. Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4))	2
E. Payment of Fees (37 C.F.R. § 42.103).....	2
F. Certification of Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a))	3
III. PRIORITY DATE OF THE '264 PATENT	3
A. Independent Claim 13	5
B. The Continuation-In-Part Provisional Application No. 60/058,650 Disclosure Filed September 11, 1997	6
1. Selecting A Thermal Mass of The Substrate Holder	6
2. With a Heat Transfer Device, Changing The Substrate Holder Temperature Within a Specific Time Interval.....	6
3. On the Substrate Holder, Etching the Film at the Selected First Temperature, Changing to a Selected Second Temperature, and Etching at a Second Portion of the Film at the Selected Second Temperature.	7
C. Disclosure of Parent Application No. 09/151,163 Filed December 4, 1995.....	8

Page

D. Claims 13-26, 64 and 65 Are Only Entitled to a Priority Date of September 11, 1997 11

IV. CHALLENGE AND RELIEF REQUESTED..... 11

A. Specific Art and Statutory Ground(s) on Which the Challenges Are Based 12

V. PERSON HAVING ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART 13

VI. THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE '264 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE..... 14

A. Ground 1: Claims 13- 21, 23, 64, and 65 Are Rendered Obvious by Kadomura in View of Moslehi Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)..... 14

1. Kadomura in View of Moslehi Teaches All the Limitations of Independent Claim 13 14

2. Chart for Claim 13 22

3. Kadomura in View of Moslehi Teaches All the Limitations of Dependent Claims 14- 21, 23, 64, and 65 27

4. Chart for Claims 14-21, 23, 64, and 65 36

5. Reasons for Combinability for Claims 13-21, 23, 64, and 65 40

B. Ground 2: Claim 22 is Rendered Obvious by Kadomura in view of Moslehi Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) 42

1. Kadomura in View of Moslehi Teaches All the Limitations of Independent Claim 13 43

2. Chart for Claim 13 45

Page

3.	Kadomura in View of Moslehi Teaches All the Limitations of Independent Claim 22	48
4.	Chart for Claim 22	50
5.	Reasons for Combinability for Claim 22.....	50
C.	Ground 3: Claim 24 is Rendered Obvious by Kadomura in View of Moslehi and Collins Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).....	52
1.	Kadomura in View of Moslehi and Collins Teaches All the Limitations of Dependent Claim 24.....	52
2.	Chart for Claim 24	54
3.	Reasons for Combinability for Claim 24.....	54
D.	Ground 4: Claims 25 and 26 are Rendered Obvious by Kadomura in View of Moslehi and Mahawili Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).....	56
1.	Kadomura in View of Moslehi and Mahawili Teaches All the Limitations of Dependent Claims 25 and 26	56
2.	Chart for Claims 25 and 26.....	57
3.	Reasons for Combinability for Claims 25 and 26	58

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<u>Cases</u>	
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics v. Isis Innovation Ltd. Patent Owner,</i> IPR2012-00022 (MPT), 2013 WL 2181162 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 12, 2013)	3
<i>Augustine Med., Inc. v. Gaymar Indus., Inc.,</i> 181 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	4
<i>Baldwin Graphic Systems, Inc. v. Siebert, Inc.,</i> 512 F. 3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	17
<i>Daniel L. Flamm v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., et al.,</i> Case 1:15-cv-00613-LY (W.D. Tex.).....	2
<i>Hollmer v. Harari,</i> 681 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	4
<i>KSR Int'l. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,</i> 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	1
<i>Lam Research Corp. v. Daniel L. Flamm,</i> Case 5:15-cv-01277-BLF (N.D. Cal.)	2, 3
<u>Statutes</u>	
35 U.S.C § 103	14, 42
35 U.S.C. § 103	52, 56
35 U.S.C. § 112	3, 4
35 U.S.C. § 120	3
35 U.S.C. § 314	13
35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319	1
M.P.E.P. § 201.11 I.B	4

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.