

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TAIWAN SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING COMPANY, LTD.
AND GLOBALFOUNDRIES U.S. INC.,
PETITIONER,

v.

GODO KAISHA IP BRIDGE 1,
PATENT OWNER.

Case IPR2016-01376, Case IPR2016-01377,
Case IPR2016-01378, Case IPR2016-01379¹
U.S. Patent No. 6,197,696 B1

Record of Oral Hearing
Held: September 12, 2017

Before JUSTIN T. ARBES, MICHAEL J. FITZPATRICK, and JENNIFER
MEYER CHAGNON, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

¹ GlobalFoundries U.S. Inc.'s motions for joinder in Cases IPR2017-00921, IPR2017-00922, IPR2017-00923, and IPR2017-00924 were granted.

Case No. IPR2016-01376, Case No. IPR2016-01377,
Case No. IPR2016-01378, Case No. IPR2016-01379
Patent No. 6,197,696 B1

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS:

ROBERT YOCHES, ESQUIRE
J.P. LONG, ESQUIRE
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett &
Dunner, LLP
901 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20001
202.408.4000

ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:

J. STEVEN BAUGHMAN, ESQUIRE
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, LLP
2001 K Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20006
202.223.7340

JAMES L. DAVIS, ESQUIRE
Ropes & Gray, LLP
1900 University Avenue
6th Floor
East Palo Alto, California 94303
650.617.4000

ALSO PRESENT:

HAN XU
HIRMU IKEGAMI

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday, September 12, 2017, commencing at 2:00 p.m. at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia in Courtroom A.

Case No. IPR2016-01376, Case No. IPR2016-01377,
Case No. IPR2016-01378, Case No. IPR2016-01379
Patent No. 6,197,696 B1

1 more clearly. And also please remember to speak into the
2 microphone at the podium so that he can hear you.

3 As we're doing the presentations today, if either
4 party believes that the other party is presenting improper
5 arguments, I would ask that you please just raise that issue
6 during your own presentation and not interrupt the other side
7 during their presentation.

8 And, finally, we received the parties' objections
9 to the demonstratives and we've noted those. We will
10 overrule the objections. The parties can present their
11 presentations today using the demonstratives as filed. And
12 we just want to remind everybody that they're just visual
13 aids to assist the presentation and they're not briefs or
14 evidence. So we will be able to take that into account in
15 rendering our final decision.

16 Are there any questions before we begin today?

17 MR. BAUGHMAN: Your Honor, if I may, I don't expect
18 it will come up, but if there's an objection in the last
19 portion of the presentations, should we save those to raise
20 after the Petitioner's concluded or --

21 JUDGE CHAGNON: If it happens to come up, please
22 just let us know. We can address that at that time.

23 MR. BAUGHMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

24 JUDGE CHAGNON: All right. If there's no further
25 questions, Petitioner, you can go ahead whenever you're
26 ready.

Case No. IPR2016-01376, Case No. IPR2016-01377,
Case No. IPR2016-01378, Case No. IPR2016-01379
Patent No. 6,197,696 B1

1 Would you like to reserve any time today for
2 rebuttal?

3 MR. YOCHES: Yes, I would like to reserve 30
4 minutes.

5 JUDGE CHAGNON: Okay. Whenever you're ready, you
6 can begin.

7 MR. YOCHES: The technology that we're going to
8 talk about -- if you can turn to Slide 3 to begin with -- has
9 two components. One, is the wiring levels, the wiring
10 patterns or trenches, and the other are the via layers, they
11 go between the levels, contact holes.

12 And if you turn to Slide 4, what the patent and the
13 prior art is about is forming the vias and the trenches at
14 the same time, that's why it's Dual Damascene. So that's --
15 unless there's some additional questions, that's about the
16 extent of the background I was going to go into from the
17 technology standpoint.

18 The issues in all four IPRs are essentially the
19 same. If we go to Slide 9, it summarizes -- there's two, one
20 is an issue of priority and the other is the issue of
21 motivation to combine.

22 The question of the priority, the question is
23 whether the principal reference, Grill, is prior art which
24 devolves into two questions; is the '696 patent -- can it
25 antedate Grill because Grill has an earlier filing date. And
26 if so, is Grill entitled to the benefit of its filing date

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.