

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company, Ltd.

Petitioner

v.

Godo Kaisha IP Bridge 1

Patent Owner

Patent No. 7,126,174

Filing Date: November 24, 2004

Issue Date: October 24, 2006

Title: SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURING
THE SAME

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2016-01246

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *ET SEQ.***

Table of Contents

I.	Preliminary Statement	1
II.	Technological Background.....	1
	A. Integrated Circuits	1
	B. Isolation Structures.....	4
	1. LOCOS.....	4
	2. Shallow Trench Isolation	5
	C. Insulating Sidewalls	7
III.	The '174 Patent	10
	A. Admitted Prior Art.....	10
	B. Challenged Claims	11
	C. Representative Embodiment	12
	D. The '174 Patent Is Not Entitled to the Benefit of Foreign Priority Before December 19, 1995	14
IV.	Statement of Precise Relief Requested for Each Claim Challenged.....	15
	A. Claims for Which Review is Requested.....	15
	B. Statutory Grounds of Challenge.....	16
	C. Level of Ordinary Skill	16
	D. Claim Construction.....	16
V.	Claims 1–3, 5–7, 9–12, and 14–18 of the '174 Patent Are Unpatentable	17
	A. Disclosures of the Prior Art.....	17
	1. <i>Lee</i> (U.S. Patent No. 5,153,145)	17
	2. <i>Noble</i> (U.S. Patent No. 5,539,229)	19

3.	<i>Ogawa</i> (U.S. Patent No. 4,506,434)	20
B.	The <i>Lee-Noble</i> combination renders claims 1–3, 5–7, 9–12, and 14–18 obvious	21
1.	A POSITA would have found it obvious, and even desirable, to have combined the teachings of <i>Lee</i> and <i>Noble</i>	22
2.	Claim 1 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Noble</i> combination.....	30
3.	Claim 2 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Noble</i> combination.....	44
4.	Claim 3 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Noble</i> combination.....	46
5.	Claim 5 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Noble</i> combination.....	47
6.	Claim 6 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Noble</i> combination.....	49
7.	Claim 7 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Noble</i> combination.....	51
8.	Claim 9 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Noble</i> combination.....	52
9.	Claim 10 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Noble</i> combination.....	54
10.	Claim 11 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Noble</i> combination.....	57
11.	Claim 12 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Noble</i> combination.....	58
12.	Claim 14 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Noble</i> combination.....	60
13.	Claim 15 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Noble</i> combination.....	61
14.	Claim 16 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Noble</i> combination.....	63
15.	Claim 17 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Noble</i> combination.....	67
16.	Claim 18 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Noble</i> combination.....	68
C.	The <i>Lee-Ogawa</i> combination renders claims 1–3, 5–7, 9–12, and 14–18 obvious.....	70
1.	A POSITA would have combined the teachings of <i>Lee</i> and <i>Ogawa</i>	70

2.	Claim 1 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Ogawa</i> combination.....	76
3.	Claim 2 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Ogawa</i> combination.....	79
4.	Claim 3 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Ogawa</i> combination.....	79
5.	Claim 5 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Ogawa</i> combination.....	80
6.	Claim 6 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Ogawa</i> combination.....	80
7.	Claim 7 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Ogawa</i> combination.....	80
8.	Claim 9 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Ogawa</i> combination.....	81
9.	Claim 10 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Ogawa</i> combination.....	82
10.	Claim 11 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Ogawa</i> combination.....	83
11.	Claim 12 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Ogawa</i> combination.....	83
12.	Claim 14 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Ogawa</i> combination.....	83
13.	Claim 15 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Ogawa</i> combination.....	84
14.	Claim 16 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Ogawa</i> combination.....	84
15.	Claim 17 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Ogawa</i> combination.....	84
16.	Claim 18 is obvious over the <i>Lee-Ogawa</i> combination.....	85
VI.	Trial Should Be Instituted on Both Grounds.....	85
VII.	Mandatory Notices Under 37 C.F.R. §42.8	85
A.	Real Parties-In-Interest.....	85
B.	Related Matters.....	86
C.	Lead and Back-Up Counsel.....	86
D.	Service Information.....	87
VIII.	Certification Under 37 C.F.R. §42.24(d)	87
IX.	Payment of Fees	87

X. Time for Filing Petition.....88
XI. Grounds for Standing.....88
XII. Conclusion88

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.