

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

GlobalFoundries U.S. Inc.  
Petitioner

v.

Godo Kaisha IP Bridge 1  
Patent Owner

Patent No. 7,126,174

---

**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 .....2**

    A. Integrated Circuits .....2

    B. Isolation Structures.....4

        1. LOCOS..... 4

        2. Shallow Trench Isolation ..... 5

    C. Insulating Sidewalls .....7

**III. The '174 Patent .....10**

    A. Admitted Prior Art.....10

    B. Challenged Claims .....11

    C. Representative Embodiment .....12

    D. The '174 Patent Is Not Entitled to the Benefit of Foreign Priority  
        Before December 19, 1995.....13

**IV. Statement of Precise Relief Requested for Each Claim Challenged.....15**

    A. Claims for Which Review is Requested.....15

    B. Statutory Grounds of Challenge.....15

    C. Level of Ordinary Skill .....15

    D. Claim Construction.....16

**V. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8–12, 14, and 16 of the '174 Patent Are Unpatentable....16**

    A. Disclosures of the Prior Art.....17

        1. *Lowrey* (U.S. Patent No. 5,021,353)..... 17

        2. *Noble* (U.S. Patent No. 5,539,229) ..... 18

        3. *Ogawa* (U.S. Patent No. 4,506,434) ..... 19

    B. The *Lowrey-Noble* combination renders claims 1, 4, 5, 8–12, 14,  
        and 16 obvious.....21

        1. A POSITA would have found it obvious and even desirable  
            to have combined the teachings of *Lowrey* and *Noble* ..... 21

2.	Claim 1 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Noble</i> .....	29
3.	Claim 4 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Noble</i> .....	43
4.	Claim 5 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Noble</i> .....	45
5.	Claim 8 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Noble</i> .....	47
6.	Claim 9 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Noble</i> .....	49
7.	Claim 10 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Noble</i> .....	51
8.	Claim 11 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Noble</i> .....	54
9.	Claim 12 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Noble</i> .....	55
10.	Claim 14 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Noble</i> .....	57
11.	Claim 16 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Noble</i> .....	58
C.	The <i>Lowrey-Ogawa</i> combination renders claims 1, 4, 5, 8–12, 14, and 16 obvious.....	61
1.	A POSITA would have combined the teachings of <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Ogawa</i> .....	62
2.	Claim 1 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Ogawa</i> .....	67
3.	Claim 4 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Ogawa</i> .....	70
4.	Claim 5 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Ogawa</i> .....	71
5.	Claim 8 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Ogawa</i> .....	71
6.	Claim 9 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Ogawa</i> .....	71
7.	Claim 10 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Ogawa</i> .....	72
8.	Claim 11 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Ogawa</i> .....	73
9.	Claim 12 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Ogawa</i> .....	74
10.	Claim 14 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Ogawa</i> .....	74
11.	Claim 16 is obvious over <i>Lowrey</i> and <i>Ogawa</i> .....	74
<b>VI.</b>	<b>Trial Should Be Instituted on Both Grounds.....</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>Mandatory Notices Under 37 C.F.R. §42.8 .....</b>	<b>75</b>
A.	Real Parties-In-Interest.....	75
B.	Related Matters.....	75

C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel.....77

D. Service Information.....78

**VIII. Certification Under 37 C.F.R. §42.24(d) .....78**

**IX. Payment of Fees .....78**

**X. Time for Filing Petition.....78**

**XI. Grounds for Standing.....78**

**XII. Conclusion .....79**

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

**Page(s)**

### CASES

<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc) .....	16
<i>Liberty Mutual Inc. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.</i> , ..... CMB2012-00003, Paper 7, at 2 (Oct. 25, 2012)	75

### STATUTES AND RULES

35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	15
35 U.S.C. § 311 .....	15
35 U.S.C. §§ 311–319.....	1, 80

### MISCELLANEOUS

37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b) .....	75
37 C.F.R. § 42.8 .....	75, 78
37C.F.R. § 42.15(a).....	78
37 C.F.R. § 42.24 .....	78
37 C.F.R. § 42.24(d) .....	78
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....	78
37 C.F.R. § 42.100 <i>et seq.</i> .....	1, 80
37 C.F.R. §§ 42.103(a).....	78
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a).....	78
37C.F.R. § 42.122(b) .....	78

# 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.