

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GlobalFoundries, Inc.

Petitioner

v.

Godo Kaisha IP Bridge 1

Patent Owner

Patent No. 7,126,174
Filing Date: November 24, 2004
Issue Date: October 24, 2006

Title: SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURING
THE SAME

Inter Partes Review No.: *To be assigned*

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 ET SEQ.**

Table of Contents

I.	Preliminary Statement.....	1
II.	Technological Background.....	1
A.	Integrated Circuits.....	1
B.	Isolation Structures	3
1.	LOCOS	3
2.	Shallow Trench Isolation	4
C.	Insulating Sidewalls	6
III.	The '174 Patent	8
A.	Admitted Prior Art	8
B.	Challenged Claims	10
C.	Representative Embodiment	10
D.	The '174 Patent Is Not Entitled to the Benefit of Foreign Priority Before December 19, 1995	11
IV.	Statement of Precise Relief Requested for Each Claim Challenged	13
A.	Claims for Which Review is Requested	13
B.	Statutory Grounds of Challenge.....	13
C.	Level of Ordinary Skill	13
D.	Claim Construction	13
V.	Claims 1, 4, 5, 8–12, 14, and 16 of the '174 Patent Are Unpatentable	14
A.	Disclosures of the Prior Art	14
1.	<i>Lowrey</i> (U.S. Patent No. 5,021,353).....	14
2.	<i>Noble</i> (U.S. Patent No. 5,539,229)	15
3.	<i>Ogawa</i> (U.S. Patent No. 4,506,434)	16
B.	The <i>Lowrey-Noble</i> combination renders claims 1, 4, 5, 8–12, 14, and 16 obvious.....	17
1.	A POSITA would have found it obvious and even desirable to have combined the teachings of <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Noble</i>	18

2.	Claim 1 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Noble</i>	24
3.	Claim 4 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Noble</i>	36
4.	Claim 5 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Noble</i>	37
5.	Claim 8 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Noble</i>	39
6.	Claim 9 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Noble</i>	40
7.	Claim 10 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Noble</i>	42
8.	Claim 11 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Noble</i>	45
9.	Claim 12 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Noble</i>	46
10.	Claim 14 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Noble</i>	47
11.	Claim 16 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Noble</i>	49
C.	The <i>Lowrey-Ogawa</i> combination renders claims 1, 4, 5, 8–12, 14, and 16 obvious.....	51
1.	A POSITA would have combined the teachings of <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Ogawa</i> ..	52
2.	Claim 1 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Ogawa</i>	56
3.	Claim 4 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Ogawa</i>	59
4.	Claim 5 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Ogawa</i>	59
5.	Claim 8 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Ogawa</i>	59
6.	Claim 9 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Ogawa</i>	59
7.	Claim 10 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Ogawa</i>	60
8.	Claim 11 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Ogawa</i>	61
9.	Claim 12 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Ogawa</i>	61
10.	Claim 14 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Ogawa</i>	62
11.	Claim 16 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Ogawa</i>	62
VI.	Trial Should Be Instituted on Both Grounds	62
VII.	Mandatory Notices Under 37 C.F.R. §42.8.....	62
A.	Real Parties-In-Interest	62
B.	Related Matters	63

C.	Lead and Back-Up Counsel	64
D.	Service Information	64
VIII.	Certification Under 37 C.F.R. §42.24(d).....	64
IX.	Payment of Fees.....	64
X.	Time for Filing Petition	65
XI.	Grounds for Standing.....	65
XII.	Conclusion	65

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
CASES	
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)	13
STATUTES AND RULES	
35 U.S.C.....	12
35 U.S.C. § 103.....	12
35 U.S.C. §§ 311–319.....	1
35 U.S.C. § 311(c)	60
MISCELLANEOUS	
37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b)	58
37 C.F.R. § 42.8	59, 60
37 C.F.R. § 42.24	60
37 C.F.R. § 42.24(D)	60
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	13
37 C.F.R. § 42.100 <i>et seq.</i>	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.101(b)	60
37 C.F.R. § 42.102(a).....	60
37 C.F.R. §§ 42.103(a) and 42.15(a)	60
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a).....	60
V.B.3, <i>Lowrey</i>	55
V.B.5, <i>Lowrey</i>	56
V.B.6, <i>Lowrey</i>	56
V.B.7, <i>Lowrey</i>	57
V.B.8, <i>Lowrey</i>	58

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.