

Filed on behalf of Godo Kaisha IP Bridge 1

By: Michael J. Fink (mfink@gbpatent.com)
Greenblum & Bernstein, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, Virginia 20191
Tel: (703) 716-1191
Fax: (703) 716-1180

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TAIWAN SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING COMPANY, LTD.
and GLOBALFOUNDRIES U.S. INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

GODO KAISHA IP BRIDGE 1,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01249¹
U.S. Patent No. 6,538,324

PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR REHEARING

¹ GlobalFoundries U.S. Inc.'s motion for joinder in Case IPR2017-00919 was granted.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. The Board Overlooked Patent Owner’s Arguments That <i>Zhang</i> Teaches The Desirability Of An Upper Surface Of Pure Tantalum	1
II. The Board Overlooked And Misapprehended The Importance Of Maintaining A Layer Of Pure Crystalline Tantalum With An Upper Surface Having A <002> Crystalline Orientation	5
III. The Board Overlooked And Misapprehended The Significance That <i>Zhang</i> And <i>Ding</i> Teach Similar Sputter-Deposition Processes	7
IV. The Board Overlooked And Misapprehended The Evidence And Arguments Regarding Allegedly Predictable Results	10
A. Chemical Mechanical Polishing (“CMP”)	11
B. Inhibit Diffusion	12
C. Resistivity	13
V. Substitute Claims 11 And 12 Are Patentable	14
VI. Conclusion	15

The Final Written Decision (“FWD”)(Paper 47) finds claims 1–3, 5–7, and 9 (“Challenged Claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 6,538,324 (the “324 patent”) unpatentable as obvious over *Ding* in view *Zhang*; finds proposed Substitute Claims 11 and 12 unpatentable; and finds proposed Substitute Claim 13 patentable.

Patent Owner asserts the Board overlooked and misapprehended pertinent disclosure in *Ding* and *Zhang*, and Patent Owner’s arguments regarding the proposed combination of *Ding* and *Zhang*, and respectfully requests rehearing.

I. The Board Overlooked Patent Owner’s Arguments That *Zhang* Teaches The Desirability Of An Upper Surface Of Pure Tantalum

The Board stated:

The Patent Owner Response contains numerous arguments that are premised on *Zhang* **requiring** pure tantalum and prohibiting nitrogen at the upper surface of the first conductive film. *See, e.g., All of these arguments are inapposite in light of our determination that Zhang teaches nitrogen in the tantalum-rich tantalum nitride film, including at its upper surface.* See Ex. 1004, 3:53–62. **Accordingly, such arguments are not further addressed in this Decision.**

FWD (Paper 47), pp. 20-22 (emphasis added).

The Board misapprehended Patent Owner’s arguments. Patent Owner did not argue that *Zhang* requires an upper surface of pure tantalum. Rather, Patent Owner argued that *Zhang* taught the desirability of an upper surface of pure tantalum. Arguments pertaining to the “desirability” of forming a film having a

surface of pure tantalum are present throughout Patent Owner's remarks, such as, "Both *Ding* and *Zhang* teach the desirability of forming a film having a surface of pure tantalum to contact a copper film." PO Response (Paper 14), p. 21 (emphasis added); "A PHOSITA would not have modified *Ding* in view of *Zhang* to add nitrogen to *Ding*'s pure tantalum layer as it is contrary to both *Ding*'s and *Zhang*'s teaching of the desirability of forming a film with a surface that is pure tantalum for contacting a copper layer." *Id.* (emphasis added); "Both *Ding* and *Zhang* teach the desirability of forming a film having a surface of pure tantalum, *i.e.*, with no nitrogen." PO Response, p. 22 (emphasis added); *see also* PO Response, stating "desirability" on pp. 28, 30, 31, 32, 34 and 35.

The Board further overlooked embodiments in *Zhang* having (1) an entire top film that does not contain nitrogen, and (2) an upper surface that does not contain nitrogen. PO Response, pp. 28-29. Even Petitioner acknowledges that "*Zhang* discloses an embodiment in which the top film of the two-layer diffusion barrier (the copper side) is a 'tantalum-rich tantalum nitride film' that has an upper surface which is 'substantially pure tantalum.'" Petition (Paper 2), p. 14. Patent Owner specifically argued *Zhang*'s embodiments with substantially pure tantalum:

Zhang also teaches the desirability that "the upper surface of the tantalum rich tantalum nitride film is substantially pure tantalum and has essentially no nitrogen atoms." *Id.*, 3:54-57 (emphasis added);

see also Petition, p.16 (“*Zhang* discloses an embodiment in which the top film of the two-layer diffusion barrier is a ‘tantalum-rich tantalum nitride film’ that has an upper surface which is ‘substantially pure tantalum.’”). *Zhang* further discloses an embodiment where the second portion of the first conductive film consists of pure tantalum. *Id.*, 3:62-64 (“the nitrogen-containing and inert gases can be terminated and the chamber evacuated before flowing just the inert gas.”). Evacuating the nitrogen from the chamber after the tantalum nitride film has been formed, and then flowing just the inert gas would result in a film of pure tantalum that has essentially no nitrogen atoms. Exhibit 2011, ¶¶114-115.

PO Response (Paper 14), pp. 28-29.

Zhang discloses two processes when forming film 32 during the sputtering process. In one process, after the tantalum nitride film 22 is formed, the nitrogen flow is terminated while the inert gas continues to flow. *Id.*, 3:44-46; *see also* Fig. 4. This process forms a film with a surface of pure tantalum. In the other process, after the tantalum nitride film 22 is formed, the nitrogen and argon gas flows are terminated, the chamber is evacuated (*i.e.*, remove all gases, including the nitrogen gas), and the process continues with only the inert gas. This process forms a film of pure tantalum. *Id.*, 3:62-64. Exhibit 2011, ¶119. Thus, a PHOSITA reading *Zhang* would understand the *desirability* of forming film 32 with a surface of pure tantalum. Exhibit 2011, ¶¶118-120.

PO Response (Paper 14), pp. 29-30 (emphasis added).

By overlooking these *Zhang* embodiments with pure tantalum in the top film

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.