

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

INTEL CORPORATION, GLOBALFOUNDRIES U.S., INC.,  
MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC., and  
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS COMPANY, LTD.,  
Petitioners,

v.

DANIEL L. FLAMM,  
Patent Owner.

---

PTAB Case No. IPR2017-00280<sup>1</sup>  
Patent No. RE40,264 E

---

**PETITIONERS' REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

**Claims 27-36, 51-55, 66 & 68-69**

---

<sup>1</sup> Samsung Electronics Company, Ltd. was joined as a party to this proceeding via a Motion for Joinder in IPR2017-01750.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Combinations based on Kadomura and Matsumura rendered claims 27-36, 51-55, 66, and 68-69 obvious.....	2
A.	The prior art taught changing processing temperature within a “preselected time [interval/period]” .....	3
B.	It would have been obvious to combine Kadomura and Matsumura .....	4
1.	A skilled person would have combined Kadomura and Matsumura .....	5
2.	Flamm does not meaningfully address some of Petitioners’ motivations and his arguments on the others fail .....	8
C.	Flamm mischaracterizes Kadomura and Matsumura.....	12
1.	Kadomura.....	13
2.	Matsumura .....	15
III.	Combinations based on Kikuchi and Matsumura also rendered claims 27-36, 51-55, 66, and 68-69 obvious.....	16
A.	Kikuchi and Matsumura disclosed each element of claim 27.....	17
1.	Kikuchi and Matsumura taught claim 27, limitation [a].....	17
2.	Kikuchi and Matsumura disclosed claim 27, limitation [e] .....	19
B.	A skilled person would have been motivated to combine Kikuchi and Matsumura .....	21
IV.	Petitioners are relying on the same theories of unpatentability as in the Petition .....	22
V.	Flamm has waived any arguments unique to the dependent claims .....	23
VI.	Flamm’s supporting declaration is entitled to little, if any, weight.....	23
VII.	Conclusion .....	26

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES

<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	22
<i>In re Mouttet</i> , 686 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	21
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	22
<i>Meiresonne v. Google, Inc.</i> , 849 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	14, 16

### OTHER AUTHORITIES

37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b) .....	22
37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).....	24

### UPDATED EXHIBIT LIST

Petitioner's Exhibits	
Exhibit	Description
Ex. 1001	U.S. Patent No. RE40,264 ("264 patent")
Ex. 1002	U.S. Patent No. 5,605,600 ("Muller")
Ex. 1003	U.S. Patent No. 5,151,871 ("Matsumura")
Ex. 1004	U.S. Patent No. 5,226,056 ("Kikuchi")
Ex. 1005	U.S. Patent No. 6,063,710 ("Kadomura")
Ex. 1006	Declaration of Dr. John Bravman in Support of Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review of U.S. Patent No. RE40,264
Ex. 1007	U.S. Patent Application No. 08/567,224 ("224 application")
Ex. 1008	Wright, D.R. et al., <i>A Closed Loop Temperature Control System for a Low-Temperature Etch Chuck</i> , <i>Advanced Techniques for Integrated Processing II</i> , Vol. 1803 (1992), pp. 321–329 ("Wright")
Ex. 1009	U.S. Patent No. 5,711,849 ("849 patent")
Ex. 1010	U.S. Patent No. 4,331,485 ("Gat")
Ex. 1011	U.S. Patent No. 5,393,374 ("Sato")
Ex. 1012	PTAB Decision Denying Institution of <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, <i>Lam Research Corp. v. Daniel L. Flamm</i> , IPR2016-00470, Paper 6 (July 1, 2016)
Ex. 1013	PTAB Institution of <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, <i>Lam Research Corp. v. Daniel L. Flamm</i> , IPR2015-01768, Paper 7 (February 24, 2016)
Ex. 1014	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review of U.S. Patent No. RE40,264 E Fourth Petition, <i>Lam Research Corp. v. Daniel L. Flamm</i> , IPR2015-01768, Paper 1 (August 18, 2015)

**UPDATED EXHIBIT LIST**  
**(continued)**

Ex. 1015	PTAB Decision Denying Institution of <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, <i>Lam Research Corp. v. Daniel L. Flamm</i> , IPR2016-00469, Paper 6 (July 1, 2016)
Ex. 1016	PTAB Institution of <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, <i>Lam Research Corp. v. Daniel L. Flamm</i> , IPR2015-01764, Paper 7 (February 24, 2016)
Ex. 1017	U.S. Patent No. 5,446,824 (“Moslehi ’824”)
Ex. 1018	U.S. Patent No. 5,628,871 (“Shinagawa”)
Ex. 1019	U.S. Patent No. 5,174,856 (“Hwang”)
Ex. 1020	Declaration of Rachel J. Watters regarding Exhibit 1008
Ex. 1021	Declaration of Jared Bobrow in Support of Motion for Pro Hac Vice Admission
Ex. 1022	Declaration of Chad Campbell in Support of Motion for Pro Hac Vice Admission
Ex. 1023	Reply Declaration of Dr. John Bravman in Support of Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review of U.S. Patent No. RE40,264 and Reply to Patent Owner's Response
Ex. 1024	Final Written Decision, <i>Thorley Indus. LLC v. Kolcraft Enter., Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00352, Paper 25 (June 1, 2017)
Ex. 1025	Final Written Decision, <i>inContact, Inc. v. Microlog Corp.</i> , IPR2015-00560, Paper 21 (July 28, 2016)
Ex. 1026	Patent Owner Preliminary Response, <i>Lam Research Corp. v. Daniel L. Flamm</i> , IPR2016-00470, Paper 5 (April 27, 2016)
Ex. 1027	Final Written Decision, <i>Curt G. Joa, Inc. v. Fameccanica.Data S.p.A.</i> , IPR2016-00906, Paper 79 (October 11, 2017)
Ex. 1028	Decision Denying Institution of <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, <i>Kinetic Techs., Inc. v. Skyworks Sols., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00529, Paper 8 (September 23, 2014)

# 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.