



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/900,047 07/24/97 YEN

T

EXAMINER

B2M1/0224

DAVID J. SIMONELLI
BLISS MCGLYNN
2075 WEST BIG BEAVER, SUITE600
TROY MI 48084-3443

WALLACE, V

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER


2503

DATE MAILED:

02/24/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No. 08/900,047	Applicant(s) Yen	
	Examiner Valencia Martin Wallace	Group Art Unit 2503	

Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 9, 1998.

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 2-6 and 8-17 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 2-6 and 8-17 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Art Unit: 2503

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 4-6 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 4-6 and 10-12 recite the limitation "said electrically conducting plug". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 3-6 and 9-14, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chappell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,541,427).

Chappell et al. disclose a semiconductor structure and a method of forming a local interconnect in a semiconductor structure, comprising:

a silicon substrate (10) having a top surface;

Art Unit: 2503

a diffusion region (43) formed in said substrate adjacent to said top surface;

a polysilicon gate (18) formed on the top surface of said substrate juxtaposed to but not contacting said diffusion region;

a sidewall spacer (28) adjacent to said polysilicon gate and disposed above said diffusion region;

an insulator layer (36) substantially covering said polysilicon gate and said diffusion region; and

a conducting plug (44a) at least partially filling a via in said insulation layer that exposes said sidewall spacer in the absence of said conducting plug, said conducting plug providing direct electrical communication between said polysilicon gate and said diffusion region. Note Chappell et al. Figure 8.

In re claims 3 and 9, said insulator layer is formed of a material such as silicon oxide (see Chappell et al. column 4, lines 23 and 24).

In re claims 4-6 and 10-12, said conducting plug is a metal plug formed of a refractory material such as tungsten (see Chappell et al. column 4, lines 66 and 67).

In re claim 16, said polysilicon gate and said diffusion region are exposed in said via in the absence of said conducting plug (see Chappell et al. Figure 5).

Therefore, Chappell et al. meet and anticipate the claims.

Art Unit: 2503

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chappell et al. in view of Jones, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,313,089), of record.

The disclosure of Chappell et al. as discussed above. However, Chappell et al. fail to disclose forming the conductive plug with both a refractory metal layer and a layer of glue.

Therefore, to provide the device of Chappell et al. with a conductive plug comprised of an outer glue layer and a plug of a refractory metal as taught by Jones, Jr. would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art because Jones, Jr. specifically teaches the process of forming a semiconductor device similar in structure and function to that of Chappell et al. having a conductive plug (32) within a dielectric layer (30) wherein said plug has a layer of glue and a plug of tungsten, as well known and commonly used in conductive plug technology (see Jones, Jr. column 3, lines 64-68 and column 4, lines 1-17). Note Jones, Jr. Figure 2.

Also, it is obvious that the diffusion regions of Chappell et al. would be of N or P type conductivity because Chappell et al. specify that the regions are. Further, Jones, Jr. specify that the diffusion regions (16, 18) are heavily doped with an impurity (see Jones, Jr. column 3, lines 23-24).

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.