

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

Case IPR2016-01264
Patent No. 6,538,324

PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBITS 2008-2042

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), Petitioner objects to the following

Patent Owner exhibits:

2014	JP H08-139092A.
2015	English translation of JP H08-139092A.
2016	JP H08-250596A.
2017	English translation of JP H08-250596A.
2018	JP H08-274098A.
2019	English translation of JP H08-274098A.
2020	JP H09-64044A.
2021	English translation of JP H09-64044A.
2022	JP H09-293690A.
2023	English translation of JP H09-293690A.
2024	JP H10-125627A.
2025	English translation of JP H10-125627A.
2026	JP H10-256256A.
2027	English translation of JP H10-256256A.
2028	JP H10-330938A.
2029	English translation of JP H10-330938A.
2030	JP H11-67686A.

2031	English translation of JP H11-67686A.
2032	D. Denning, et al., “An Inlaid CVD Cu Based Integration for Sub 0.25 μ m Technology.” 1998 Symposium on VLSI Technology Digest of Technical Papers, 1998, pp. 22-23.
2033	K. Kwon et al., “Characteristics of Ta as an Underlayer for Cu Interconnects.” Advanced Metallization and Interconnect Systems for ULSI Applications in 1997, 1998, pp. 711-716.
2034	N. Awaya, “Semiconductor World.” Feb. 1998, pp. 91-96 (“Awaya”).
2035	English translation of Awaya.
2037	Declaration of Harlan Rusty Harris, Ph.D. in Support of Patent Owner’s Motion to Amend.
2039	U.S. Patent No. 6,346,745 to Nogami et al.
2040	U.S. Patent No. 6,156,647 to Hogan.
2041	U.S. Patent No. 6,139,699 to Chiang et al.
2042	Min, K. H. et al., “Comparative study of tantalum and tantalum nitrides (Ta ₂ N and TaN) as a diffusion barrier for Cu metallization.” <i>Journal of Vacuum Science & Technology B: Microelectronics and Nanometer Structures Processing, Measurement, and Phenomena</i> , 14(5), pp. 3263-3269 (1996).

I. Exhibit 2037

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2037 under FRE 702 because the opinions do not disclose the underlying facts or data on which the opinions are based. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.65. For example, Dr. Harris opines that Exhibits 2014-2027, 2030-2035, 2039, and 2040 do not anticipate or render obvious substitute claims, but he provides no citations to any of the those exhibits.

II. Exhibits 2014-2035 and 2039-2042

Petitioner objects to Exhibits 2015, 2017, 2019, 2021, 2023, 2025, 2027, 2029, 2031, and 2035 for lack of authentication under FRE 901 and for unverified English translations under FRE 604 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(b) because these exhibits are alleged translations of Exhibits 2014, 2016, 2018, 2020, 2022, 2024, 2026, 2028, 2030, and 2034, but there is insufficient evidence to support a finding that these exhibits are true and accurate translations by qualified translators.

Exhibits 2017, 2023, 2025, 2027, and 2035 were certified by a sales/marketing representative rather than a person who performed the alleged English-language translation. The manner in which these documents were prepared is unknown and these translations are unreliable.

Exhibits 2015, 2019, 2021, 2029, and 2031 include verifications by different translators, who only attest to accurate translations “to the best of my knowledge and ability” without further specifying their credentials. One alleged translator is a paralegal of Patent Owner’s counsel, Ex. 2038, ¶ 1, and no other credentials have been provided for these translators. Patent Owner does not contend these exhibits are “certified” translations of their corresponding Japanese patents.

Petitioner objects to Exhibits 2014, 2016, 2018, 2020, 2022, 2024, 2026, 2028, 2030, and 2034, and 2039-2042 under FRE 403 because they are irrelevant.

Any relevance of these exhibits depend on the accuracy of the English translations

in Exhibits 2015, 2017, 2019, 2021, 2023, 2025, 2027, 2029, 2031, and 2035. As explained above, because sufficient proof has not been introduced to support a finding that the English translations are accurate, Exhibits 2014, 2016, 2018, 2020, 2022, 2024, 2026, 2028, 2030, and 2034 are irrelevant. Additionally, Patent Owner's Response or Contingent Motion to Amend does not cite these exhibits.

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2039-2041 under FRE 403 as irrelevant because Dr. Harris does not state that he has reviewed Exhibits 2039-2041.

To the extent Patent Owner relies on the bibliographic information on page 1 of Exhibit 2042 for the truth of the information provided in this exhibit, Petitioner objects to it as inadmissible hearsay. FRE 802.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 14, 2017

By: /Stephen E. Kabakoff/
Stephen E. Kabakoff
Reg. No. 51,276

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.