

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

LAM RESEARCH CORP.,

Petitioner

v.

DANIEL L. FLAMM,

Patent Owner

---

U.S. Patent No. RE40,264 E

Issued: April 29, 2008

Named Inventor: Daniel L. Flamm

Title: MULTI-TEMPERATURE PROCESSING

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW**

**OF U.S. PATENT NO. RE40,264 E**

**SECOND PETITION**

Mail Stop: PATENT BOARD  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. MANDATORY NOTICES PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.8.....	3
A. Notice of Real Party-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)) .....	3
B. Notice of Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	3
C. Designation of Lead and Back-up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)) .....	3
D. Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)).....	3
E. Payment of Fees (37 C.F.R. § 42.103).....	3
F. Certification of Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)) .....	4
III. CHALLENGE AND RELIEF REQUESTED .....	4
A. Specific Art and Statutory Ground(s) on which the Challenges are Based .....	4
IV. THE '264 PATENT .....	6
A. Representative Claim 37 .....	6
B. The '264 Patent Disclosure.....	8
1. Multi-Temperature Etching .....	8
2. Substrate Holder and Heat Transfer Device.....	8
3. Temperature Sensor .....	8
4. Control System .....	9
V. PERSON HAVING ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	9

	<u>Page</u>
VI. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	9
A. "portion of the film," "film portion," and "film portions" .....	10
B. "preselected time interval" and "preselected time period" .....	12
C. "etching ... the portions of the film comprises radiation" .....	12
VII. THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE '264 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE .....	14
A. Ground 1: Claims 27, 28, 30, 33, 35-39, 42, 43, 45, 46, 49, 51-54, 66, 67, and 69 are Rendered Obvious by Tegal in View of Matsumura and Narita under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) .....	14
1. Tegal in View of Matsumura and Narita, Teaches All the Limitations of Independent Claim 27 .....	14
2. Chart for Claim 27 .....	21
3. Tegal in View of Matsumura and Narita Teaches All the Limitations of Dependent Claims 28, 30, 33, 35, 36, and 66.....	24
4. Chart for Claims 28, 30, 33, 35, 36, and 66 .....	27
5. Tegal in View of Matsumura and Narita Teaches All the Limitations of Independent Claim 37 .....	28
6. Chart for Claim 37 .....	36
7. Tegal in View of Matsumura and Narita Teaches All the Limitations of Dependent Claims 38, 39, 42, 43, 45, 46, 49, and 67.....	40
8. Chart for Claims 38, 39, 42, 43, 45, 46, 49, and 67 .....	46
9. Tegal in View of Matsumura and Narita Teaches All the Limitations of Independent Claim 51 .....	48

**Page**

10.	Chart for Claim 51 .....	51
11.	Tegal in View of Matsumura and Narita Teaches All the Limitations of Dependent Claims 52-54 and 69.....	52
12.	Chart for Claims 52-54 and 69 .....	53
13.	Reasons for Combinability for Claims 27, 28, 30, 33, 36-39, 42, 43, 45, 46, 49, 51-54, 66, 67, and 69.....	54
14.	Reasons for Combinability for Claim 35.....	56
B.	Ground 2: Claim 29 is Rendered Obvious by Tegal in View of Matsumura, Narita, and Ooshio under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) .....	57
1.	Chart for Claim 29 .....	58
2.	Reasons for Combinability for Claim 29.....	59

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES****Page(s)****Cases**

<i>Agilent Techs. Inc. v. Affymetrix, Inc.</i> , No. C 06-05958 JW, 2008 WL 7348188 (N.D. Cal. June 13, 2008).....	10
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics v. Isis Innovation Ltd. Patent Owner</i> , IPR2012-00022 (MPT), 2013 WL 2181162 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 12, 2013) .....	4
<i>Curtiss-Wright Flow Control Corp. v. Velan, Inc.</i> , 438 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	11
<i>Gardner v. TEC Sys., Inc.</i> , 725 F.2d 1338 (Fed. Cir.), <i>cert. denied</i> , 469 U.S. 830 (1984).....	21
<i>In re Alappat</i> , 33 F.3d 1526 (Fed. Cir. 1994) .....	41
<i>In re Freeman</i> , 573 F.2d 1237 (CCPA 1978).....	41
<i>In re Keller</i> , 642 F.2d 413 (C.C.P.A. 1981).....	3
<i>In re Mouttet</i> , 686 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	3
<i>In re Noll</i> , 545 F.2d 141 (CCPA 1976).....	41
<i>In re Prater</i> , 415 F.2d at 1403 (CCPA 1969).....	41
<i>In re Woodruff</i> , 919 F. 2d 1575 (Fed. Cir. 1990) .....	21

# 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.