

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TAIWAN SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING CO., LTD,
Petitioner,

v.

GODO KAISHA IP BRIDGE 1,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-01843¹
Patent 7,893,501

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

¹ Case IPR2017-01844 has been consolidated with this proceeding. *See* Paper 10 at 3.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| A. | The Claims Were Narrowed During Prosecution to Distinguish a Transistor With The Side Surfaces of Its Gate Electrode Fully Covered By Silicon Nitride | 2 |
| B. | The Side Surfaces of the Misra/Tsai Gate Electrode Are Fully Covered By Silicon Nitride, Just Like The Distinguished Prior Art | 3 |
| C. | The Board’s Preliminary Finding That The Claims Read On Misra/Tsai Cannot Be Maintained | 4 |
| 1. | Petitioner Fails To Give “Film” Its BRI | 5 |
| 2. | Even If Silicon Nitride Layers 20 and 23 Are Considered to be Distinct Films, Misra/Tsai Fails To Meet The Protruding Gate Electrode Limitation..... | 9 |
| 3. | It Would Be Legal Error To Adopt Petitioner’s Unreasonably Broad Interpretation That Is Inconsistent With the Specification and Prosecution History | 11 |
| II. | THE RECORD IS MORE FULLY DEVELOPED THAN AT INSTITUTION | 17 |
| III. | OVERVIEW OF THE ’501-PATENT AND CHALLENGED CLAIMS | 17 |
| A. | The Protruding Gate Electrode Is Disclosed | 21 |
| B. | The Protruding Gate Electrode Reduces Parasitic Capacitance Between the Gate Electrode and the Source/Drain Contacts | 23 |
| C. | The Claims Were Narrowed to Distinguish Gate Electrodes that Do Not Protrude | 25 |
| IV. | CHALLENGED CLAIMS | 27 |
| V. | LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART | 27 |
| VI. | CLAIM INTERPRETATION | 27 |
| A. | “silicon nitride film” | 28 |
| 1. | The Plain Meaning of “Film” is a Thin Coating/Covering | 28 |
| 2. | The ’501-Patent Describes a Silicon Nitride Film As a Thin Coating of One Or More Layers Of Silicon Nitride | 29 |
| 3. | Petitioner’s Narrow Interpretation Of “Silicon Nitride Film” Must Be Rejected | 30 |

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| a. | The Claimed Silicon Nitride Film is Not Limited to a Single Structure Formed Via the Same Process | 31 |
| b. | Silicon Nitride Films Disclosed In the Specification Can Perform More than One Function | 34 |
| 4. | Under BRI, Nothing Precludes A Film From Serving As A Sidewall | 35 |
| VII. | THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER MISRA IN VIEW OF TSAI | 38 |
| A. | Overview of The Grounds | 39 |
| 1. | Misra..... | 39 |
| 2. | Misra/Tsai Combination..... | 41 |
| 3. | The Petitions’ Assertion About How The Protruding Gate Electrode is Met..... | 41 |
| B. | All Grounds Fail Because the Petitions Fail to Give “Film” Its BRI In Ignoring The Parts Of Misra/Tsai’s Silicon Nitride Film That Fully Cover The Gate Electrode Side Surfaces..... | 42 |
| 1. | When Properly Interpreted Under BRI, the Claimed Silicon Nitride “Film” Includes Contiguous Silicon Nitride Layers That Together Coat Surfaces Of The Device | 42 |
| 2. | When “Film” Is Given Its BRI, the Silicon Nitride Film of Misra/Tsai Includes Silicon Nitride Spacers 23 and Layer 20 | 44 |
| a. | Misra’s Layers 20 and 23 Are Contiguous And Form A Film Of Silicon Nitride | 45 |
| b. | Shanfield’s Deposition Testimony That Misra’s Silicon Nitride Layers 20, 23 Are Not Contiguous Fails | 48 |
| c. | When the Entire Silicon Nitride Film in Misra/Tsai Is Considered, The Combination Does Not Meet the Protruding Gate Limitation Required By All Challenged Claims | 52 |
| 3. | Misra is Not “Nearly Identical” to Figure 1 of the ’501-Patent..... | 54 |
| 4. | Petitioner’s Proposed Interpretation of the Protruding Gate Limitation is Inconsistent With the Claims, Specification and Prosecution History | 56 |

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| a. | Petitioner’s Overly Broad Interpretation Reads On Embodiments In The Specification The Claims Are Clearly Not Directed To..... | 57 |
| b. | Petitioner’s Interpretation Is Inconsistent With the Prosecution History..... | 63 |
| C. | Even If Misra/Tsai’s Silicon Nitride Layers 20, 23 Are Considered to be Distinct Films, Misra/Tsai Still Does Not Satisfy the Limitations Claim 1 | 71 |
| 1. | Ignoring The Silicon Nitride Film Closest To The Gate Electrode In Determining Whether The Protruding Gate Electrode Is Met Ignores The Plain Language Of The Claims And Is Not Consistent With The Specification..... | 71 |
| 2. | Ignoring The Silicon Nitride Film Closest To The Gate Electrode In Determining Whether The Protruding Gate Electrode Is Met Ignores The Plain Language Of The Claims And Is Inconsistent With The Prosecution History | 77 |
| 3. | The Gate Electrode in Misra/Tsai Does Not Protrude from Silicon Nitride Spacers 23..... | 79 |
| D. | Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Any Of Dependent Claims 4-5,7,9-11,15-19, and 23-25 Would Have Been Obvious Over Misra and Tsai..... | 80 |
| E. | Claims 6 and 21 are not Rendered Obvious by Misra, Tsai, and Oda..... | 80 |
| F. | Claims 12-13 are not Rendered Obvious by Misra, Tsai, and Hokazono..... | 81 |
| VIII. | CONCLUSION..... | 81 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <i>Aqua Prod., Inc. v. Matal</i> , 872 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2017) | 15 |
| <i>Bell Atl. Network Servs. v. Covad Commc'ns Grp.</i> , 262 F.3d 1258 (Fed. Cir. 2001) | 8, 31 |
| <i>Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016) | 21 |
| <i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S.Ct. 2131 (2016) | 27 |
| <i>D'Agostino v. MasterCard International Inc.</i> , 844 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2016) | 14, 57 |
| <i>Hospira, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-00731, Paper No. 29 (Oct. 26, 2017) | 15 |
| <i>In re Power Integrations, Inc.</i> , 884 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2018) | 13, 28 |
| <i>In re Slocombe</i> , 510 F.2d 1398 (C.C.P.A. 1975) | 23 |
| <i>In re Smith Int'l, Inc.</i> , 871 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2017) | passim |
| <i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015) | 14, 57, 66, 67 |
| <i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) | 75 |
| <i>SAS Inst. Inc. v. Lee</i> , 137 S. Ct. 2160 (2017) | 13 |
| <i>SAS Inst., Inc. v. ComplementSoft, LLC.</i> , 825 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016) | 13, 27, 75 |

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.