

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.  
Petitioner

v.

DANIEL L. FLAMM  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2016-01512  
Patent No. RE 40,264 E

---

**REBUTTAL DECLARATION OF DR. STANLEY SHANFIELD**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Response to Dr. Flamm’s Opinion Regarding the Lack of a Benefit from Combining the Teachings of <i>Kadomura</i> and <i>Matsumura</i> .....	2
III.	Response to Dr. Flamm’s Opinion that the Teachings of <i>Narita</i> Cannot Be Combined with <i>Kadomura</i> and <i>Matsumura</i> .....	5
IV.	Response to Dr. Flamm’s Opinion Regarding the Combination of <i>Kadomura</i> , <i>Matsumura</i> , <i>Wang I</i> , and <i>Wang II</i> .....	6
V.	Conclusion .....	10

I, Stanley Shanfield, declare as follows:

**I. Introduction**

1. As I testified in my declaration signed July 29, 2016, which I understand has been labeled as Exhibit 1002 in this proceeding, I have been retained by Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. (“Petitioner”) as an independent expert consultant in this proceeding before the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“PTO”). I previously provided testimony in this proceeding in my July 29, 2016 declaration. (*See* Ex. 1002.) As with my previous work relating to this proceeding, no part of my compensation is contingent on the nature of my findings, the presentation of my findings in testimony, or the outcome of this or any other proceeding. I have no other interest in this proceeding. Relevant aspects of my educational background, career history, and other qualifications were provided in my July 29, 2016 declaration. (*See id.* at ¶¶ 7-13.)

2. I have been asked to review and consider the testimony provided by Dr. Daniel Flamm in his declaration (Ex. 2001) and his cross-examination testimony (which I understand is being submitted in this proceeding as Exhibit 1011) and provide my opinions regarding his positions. My rebuttal opinions are

set forth below, which reply to certain opinions offered by Dr. Flamm.<sup>1</sup> My opinions in this rebuttal declaration are based on the documents I reviewed and my knowledge and professional judgment. In forming my opinions in this rebuttal declaration, I considered the Declaration of Dr. Flamm (Ex. 2001), his deposition testimony (Exhibit 1011), and any other materials I refer to in this declaration in support of my opinions. In forming these opinions, I have also drawn on my knowledge and experience in designing, developing, and researching plasma processing systems, and rely on my opinions and discussions set forth in my July 29, 2016 declaration, including my opinions regarding the level of skill of one of ordinary skill in the art. In providing my rebuttal to Dr. Flamm's positions, I do not change my opinions that I provided in my July 29, 2016 Declaration. Instead, I provide my opinions below to explain why I believe Dr. Flamm's positions regarding my opinions in my July 29, 2016 Declaration are incorrect.

**II. Response to Dr. Flamm's Opinion Regarding the Lack of a Benefit from Combining the Teachings of *Kadomura* and *Matsumura***

3. It is my understanding that Dr. Flamm contends that there would have been no benefit to combining the teachings of *Kadomura* and *Matsumura*. (Ex.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although I respond to selected opinions offered by Dr. Flamm, doing so does not mean that I agree with any of Dr. Flamm's testimony that I do not respond to in this rebuttal declaration.

2001 at ¶¶ 16-19, 22-24.) For instance, Dr. Flamm states that “incorporating Matsumura’s control recipes in Kadomura would have no meaningful effect, and certainly no beneficial effect, on Kadomura.” (*Id.* at ¶ 19.) I understand from reviewing his declaration that Dr. Flamm bases his conclusion on his understanding that the “time period for changing the temperature ‘does not constitute a factor’ in the process” described in *Kadomura* because “it matters not how long it takes to change the temperature” in *Kadomura*. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 16-17.) I disagree with Dr. Flamm’s conclusion because the disclosure of *Kadomura* suggests and supports the understanding that the time required to change the substrate temperature is an important factor in *Kadomura*’s process and must be controlled accurately to achieve *Kadomura*’s goal of not lowering throughput.

4. *Kadomura* explains that two steps occur between etches. The first step involves changing the gases in the processing chamber, and the second step involves changing the temperature of the substrate while the gases are being changed. (*See e.g.*, Ex. 1006 at 6:36-62, 8:24-50, 10:4-16.)

5. *Kadomura*’s process takes into account the amount of time to control the temperature of the specimen (e.g., a substrate) between etching steps so that it can provide an etching treatment comprising multiple steps that can be applied rapidly without lowering the throughput. In particular, *Kadomura* states:

# 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.