

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company Limited

Petitioner

v.

Godo Kaisha IP Bridge 1

Patent Owner

**DECLARATION OF DR. SANJAY K. BANERJEE
IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF UNITED
STATES PATENT NO. 6,538,324**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	3
II.	SUMMARY OF OPINIONS	3
III.	BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS	4
	A. Background	4
	B. Previous Expert Witness Experience	7
	C. Compensation	7
IV.	MATERIALS REVIEWED	8
V.	LEGAL STANDARDS	9
	A. Anticipation	10
	B. Obviousness	11
VI.	TECHNOLOGICAL BACKGROUND	16
	A. Diffusion Barrier Basics	22
VII.	THE '324 PATENT	25
	A. Claims of the '324 Patent	25
	B. Prosecution History	27
VIII.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL	31
IX.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	32
X.	ANALYSIS	32
	A. Overview of the Prior Art	32
	1. <i>Zhang</i>	34

2.	<i>Ding</i>	36
3.	<i>Sun</i>	39
B.	I believe that the combined teachings of <i>Zhang</i> and <i>Ding</i> render claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9 obvious	40
1.	Claim 1 is obvious.....	40
2.	Claim 2 is obvious.....	60
3.	Claim 3 is obvious.....	64
4.	Claim 5 is obvious.....	65
5.	Claim 6 is obvious.....	67
6.	Claim 7 is obvious.....	68
7.	Claim 9 is obvious.....	68
C.	I believe that the combined teachings of <i>Zhang</i> , <i>Ding</i> , and <i>Sun</i> render claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9 obvious	70
D.	I believe that the combined teachings of <i>Ding</i> in view of <i>Zhang</i> render claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9 obvious	73
4.	Claim 1 is obvious.....	73
5.	Claim 2 is obvious.....	90
6.	Claim 3 is obvious.....	94
7.	Claim 5 is obvious.....	95
8.	Claim 6 is obvious.....	97
9.	Claim 7 is obvious.....	98
10.	Claim 9 is obvious.....	98
	Conclusion	99

I, Sanjay Kumar Banerjee, declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Dr. Sanjay Kumar Banerjee. I have been asked to submit this declaration on behalf of Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company Limited (“TSMC” or “Petitioner”) for a petition for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 6,538,324 (“the ’324 patent”), which I understand is being submitted to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board of the United States Patent and Trademark Office by TSMC. I have been told that the ’324 patent is owned by Godo Kaisha IP Bridge 1.

2. I have been retained as a technical expert by TSMC to study and provide my opinions on the technology claimed in, and the patentability or non-patentability of, claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9 in the ’324 patent (“Challenged Claims”). I have also been asked to provide my opinions regarding the level of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Japanese priority application of the U.S. application leading to the ’324 patent was filed, which I have been told was June 24, 1999.

II. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS

3. Based on my experience, knowledge of the art at the relevant time, analysis of prior art references, and the understanding a person of ordinary skill in the art would give to the claim terms in light of the specification, it is my opinion

that all of the Challenged Claims of the '324 patent are unpatentable as being obvious over the prior art references I discuss below.

III. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS

A. Background

4. I am currently the Cockrell Family Chair Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering at the University of Texas at Austin. At UT Austin, I am also the director of the Microelectronics Research Center. I have been a faculty member at UT Austin since 1987.

5. I have also been active in industries related to the relevant field of semiconductor processing for integrated circuits. As a Member of the Technical Staff, Corporate Research, Development and Engineering of Texas Instruments Incorporated from 1983–1987, I worked on polysilicon transistors and dynamic random access trench memory cells used by Texas Instruments in the world's first 4-Megabit DRAM, for which I was co-recipient of the Best Paper Award, IEEE International Solid State Circuits Conference, 1986.

6. I received a B.Tech from the Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur, an M.S. and Ph.D. from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, all in Electrical Engineering.

7. I am a leading researcher and educator in various areas of transistor device fabrication technology, including the fabrication, characterization and

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.