

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 IPR2016-01264¹
U.S. Patent No. 6,538,324

PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR REHEARING

¹ GlobalFoundries U.S. Inc.'s motion for joinder in Case IPR2017-00920 was granted.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	The Board Misapprehended Patent Owner’s Arguments That Any Combination Of <i>Zhang</i> And <i>Ding</i> Would Retain A Pure Ta Surface.....	1
II.	The Board Overlooked The Significance Of Having A Surface Of Pure Tantalum Thick Enough To Provide The <002> Crystalline Orientation	6
III.	The Board Overlooked That <i>Zhang</i> ’s And <i>Ding</i> ’s Sputter-Deposition Processes Provide Similar Results.....	8
IV.	<i>Zhang</i> Discloses A Top Film Of “Tantalum-Rich Tantalum Nitride”	12
V.	The Board Ignored Express Recitations In Substitute Claims 11 And 12 in Patent Owner’s Motion To Amend	14
VI.	Conclusion	15

The Final Written Decision (“FWD”)(Paper 46) 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 (1) *Zhang* in view of *Ding*; and, (2) *Zhang* in view of *Ding* in further view of *Sun*.² The Board dismissed Patent Owner’s Motion to Amend as moot. FWD (Paper 46), p. 29.

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

I. The Board Misapprehended Patent Owner’s Arguments That Any Combination Of *Zhang* And *Ding* Would Retain A Pure Ta Surface

The Board summarized Patent Owner’s arguments as follows:

Patent Owner’s arguments, reproduced above, are premised on: (1) *Zhang* **exclusively** teaching an upper surface of pure tantalum and (2) the claims requiring nitrogen throughout the first film. Both premises are erroneous. *Zhang* teaches nitrogen in the tantalum-rich tantalum nitride film, including at its upper surface. *See* Ex. 1004, 3:53–62. And, the claims require nitrogen in the first film, but not throughout the first film. Accordingly, Patent Owner’s arguments fail to rebut Petitioner’s obviousness arguments, which are identified above and which we find persuasive.

FWD (Paper 46), p. 25 (emphasis added).

The Board misapprehended Patent Owner’s arguments. Patent Owner did

² *Sun* is not relevant to any of the matters discussed in this Request for Rehearing.

not argue that *Zhang* **exclusively** taught an upper surface of pure tantalum. Rather, Patent Owner argued that *Zhang* taught the **desirability** of an upper surface of pure tantalum (emphasis added in each quote): “*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**.’” PO Response (Paper 14), p. 24; “A PHOSITA would have understood *Zhang* to teach the **desirability** of forming a film having an upper surface of pure tantalum to provide better adhesion to the copper film.” PO Response, p. 27; “Second, as both *Zhang* and *Ding* teach the **desirability** of having a pure tantalum film on which to form a copper layer...” PO Response, p. 34; “Both *Zhang* and *Ding* disclose the **desirability** of having a pure metal layer on which to form a copper layer.” PO Response, p. 35; “A PHOSITA reading *Zhang* would readily recognize that *Zhang*, like *Ding*, discloses the **desirability** of a layer of pure tantalum over a layer of tantalum nitride.” PO Response, p. 37; “As both *Ding* and *Zhang* teach the **desirability** of a layer of pure tantalum over a layer of tantalum nitride, a PHOSITA would have recognized the nearly identical nature of both films in *Ding* and *Zhang*, and would thus not have been motivated to modify *Ding* in view of *Zhang* to arrive at the claimed subject matter (but for impermissible hindsight).” PO Response, p. 39; *Zhang* and *Ding* individually teach the **desirability** of having a layer of pure tantalum on which to form a layer of copper.” *Id.*; “Both *Zhang* and *Ding* teach the **desirability** of

forming a film having a surface of pure tantalum to contact a copper film.” PO Response, p. 21; “As both *Zhang* and *Ding* disclose the ***desirability*** of layers having an upper surface composed of pure tantalum, *i.e.*, containing no nitrogen, a PHOSITA combining *Zhang* and *Ding* would result with layers having an upper surface composed of pure tantalum.” PO Response, p. 51.

With respect to Patent Owner’s arguments regarding *Zhang* teaching the ***desirability*** of an upper surface of pure tantalum, the Board further overlooked (1) the embodiment in *Zhang* of an entire top film that does not contain nitrogen; and, (2) embodiments in *Zhang* with an upper surface that does not include nitrogen. *See* PO Response, pp. 24-26. Even Petitioner acknowledges that *Zhang* discloses an embodiment that has an upper surface which is “substantially pure tantalum”:

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.” Ex. 1004, 3:54-57, FIG. 4. [footnote omitted].

Petition (Paper 2), p. 16.

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);

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.