

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company, Ltd.

Petitioner

v.

Godo Kaisha IP Bridge 1

Patent Owner

Patent No. 6,197,696
Filing Date: March 23, 1999
Issue Date: March 6, 2001

Title: METHOD FOR FORMING INTERCONNECTION STRUCTURE

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2016-01376

**DECLARATION OF DR. BRUCE W. SMITH, PH.D.
IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF UNITED
STATES PATENT NO. 6,197,696**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Summary of Opinions	1
III.	Background and Qualifications	2
	A. Background.....	2
	B. Previous Expert Witness Experience.....	3
	C. Compensation	3
IV.	Materials Reviewed	4
V.	Legal Standards	6
	A. Anticipation	7
	B. Obviousness.....	8
VI.	Technological Background.....	12
	A. Integrated Circuits and Interconnections	12
	B. Semiconductor Etching and Photolithography	16
VII.	The '696 Patent.....	19
	A. Description of the Challenged Claims.....	19
	1. Claim 13	19
	2. Claim 15	43
	B. Japanese Patent Application No. 10-079371 does not disclose many elements of claims 13 and 15	46
VIII.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	53
IX.	Claim Construction	54
X.	Analysis	54

A.	<i>Grill</i> (U.S. Patent No. 6,140,226).....	55
B.	<i>Aoyama</i> (U.S. Patent No. 5,592,024)	61
C.	The combination of <i>Grill</i> and <i>Aoyama</i>	63
D.	<i>Grill</i> and Claim 13	67
E.	The combination of <i>Grill</i> and <i>Aoyama</i> and Claim 13	87
F.	The combination of <i>Grill</i> and <i>Aoyama</i> and Claim 15	103

I, Dr. Bruce W. Smith, Ph.D., declare as follows:

I. Introduction

1. My name is Dr. Bruce W. Smith. I have been asked to submit this declaration on behalf of Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company, Ltd. (“TSMC” or “Petitioner”) in connection with a petition for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 6,197,696 (“the ’696 patent”).

2. I have been retained as a technical expert by TSMC to study and provide my opinions on the technology in and the validity of claims 13 and 15 in the ’696 patent (“the Challenged Claims”). I have also been asked to provide my opinions as to whether certain related applications provide support for the Challenged Claims and whether a certain prior art reference is supported by the disclosures of its provisional application.

II. Summary of Opinions

3. Based on my experience, knowledge of the art at the relevant time, analysis of prior art references, and the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims in light of the specification, it is my opinion that the Challenged Claims of the ’696 patent are obvious over the prior art references discussed below.

4. Based on my experience, knowledge of the art at the relevant time, and the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims in light of the specification,

it is further my opinion that the Challenged Claims do not have support in Japanese application JP 10-079371, to which the '696 patent claims the benefit of priority.

5. Based on my experience, knowledge of the art at the relevant time, and the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims in light of the specification, it is further my opinion that at least claim 28 of the *Grill* reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,140,226) is supported by U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60-071,628, to which the *Grill* reference claims the benefit of priority.

III. Background and Qualifications

A. Background

6. I have over 30 years of research, academic, industry, and consulting engineering experience in IC (integrated circuit) processing, semiconductor device materials, microelectronics, and microlithography. I have expertise in semiconductor IC processes and fabrication, microlithography, and deposition and etch processes.

7. I am a professor of Microelectronic Engineering and the Director of the Ph.D. program in Microsystems Engineering at the Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT).

8. I am a Fellow of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), a Fellow of the International Society for Optical Engineering (SPIE), and a Fellow of the Optical Society of America (OSA). I have received numerous

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.