Paper No. ____

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 IPR2017-01843 Patent 7,893,501

> > _____

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

DOCKET

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
|------|--|----|
| | A. Overview of the '501 Patent | 5 |
| | B. The Claims Were Narrowed During Prosecution to Distinguish Prior Art with Gate Electrodes that Do Not Protrude | 9 |
| | C. The Petition's Sole Ground Fails | 10 |
| | 1. Overview of Misra | 11 |
| | 2. The Misra/Tsai Combination Plainly Does Not Have a Protruding Gate Electrode | 12 |
| | a. The Petition Advances an Improper Construction of "Film" that Is Inconsistent with the Specification and Ignores Claim Limitations Imposed on the Parts of the Film from which the Gate Electrode Protrudes | 13 |
| | b. The Petition's Construction Is Inconsistent with the Prosecution History | 17 |
| | 3. Tsai Does Not Remedy Misra's Failure to Teach the Claimed Protruding Gate Electrode | 20 |
| II. | OVERVIEW OF THE '501 PATENT AND CHALLENGED CLAIMS | 20 |
| | A. The Silicon Nitride Film Enhances Performance | 22 |
| | B. The Gate Electrode Protruding Upward From Parts of the Silicon Nitride Film at Both Sides of the Gate Electrode Is Disclosed in the Specification | 27 |
| | C. The Protruding Gate Electrode Reduces Parasitic Capacitance Between the Gate Electrode and the Source/Drain Contacts | 30 |
| | D. The Claims Were Narrowed During Prosecution to Distinguish Prior Art with Gate Electrodes that Do Not Protrude | 37 |
| III. | CHALLENGED CLAIMS | 39 |
| IV. | LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART | 39 |
| V. | CLAIM INTERPRETATION | 40 |
| | A. "the gate electrode protrudes upward from a surface level of parts of the silicon nitride film located at both side surfaces of the gate electrode" | 41 |

| | 1. | The Petition Implicitly Advances an Improperly Narrow Construction of "Silicon Nitride Film" that Is Inconsistent with the Specification | 42 |
|-----|------|--|----|
| | | a. The Claimed Silicon Nitride Film is Not Limited to a Single Layer | 44 |
| | | b. The Claimed Silicon Nitride Film Can Perform More than One Function | 46 |
| | 2. | The Petition Implicitly Advances an Improperly Broad Construction of "Parts of the Silicon Nitride Film Located at Both Side Surfaces of the Gate Electrode" that Ignores Limitations in the Claim. | 47 |
| | | a. The Petition's Improperly Broad Construction Ignores Limitations In the Claim | 48 |
| | | b. The Petition's Overly Broad Construction Is Inconsistent with the Prosecution History | 50 |
| | 3. | Petitioner's Conclusory Expert Testimony Cannot Trump the Intrinsic Evidence | 56 |
| | 4. | Conclusion on BRI of "the Gate Electrode Protrudes Upward From a Surface Level of Parts of the Silicon Nitride Film Located at Both Side Surfaces of the Gate Electrode" | 58 |
| VI. | DEMO | PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT FAILS TO ONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF AILING AS TO ANY CHALLENGED CLAIMS | 58 |
| | | ound 1: Claims 1, 4-5, 7, 9-11, 15-18, and 23-25 Are Not endered Obvious by Misra in view of Tsai | 58 |
| | 1. | Overview of Misra | 59 |
| | 2. | Overview of Tsai | 61 |
| | 3. | Misra in View of Tsai Does Not Teach or Suggest a Protruding Gate Electrode | 61 |
| | | a. Misra's Silicon Nitride Film Comprises Plasma-Enhanced Nitride Layer 20 <u>and</u> Silicon Nitride Spacers 23 | 63 |
| | | (1) Misra is Not "Nearly Identical" to Figure 1 of the '501 Specification | 65 |

| (2) The '501 Patent's Specification is Explicit that the Claimed Silicon Nitride Film Can Be Formed From Different Layers | 68 |
|---|----|
| b. Misra's Gate Electrode Does Not Protrude Upward from the Surface Level of the Parts of the Silicon Nitride Film Located at the Sides of the Gate Electrode | 69 |
| c. Tsai Does Not Remedy Misra's Failure to Teach the Claimed Protruding Gate Electrode | 76 |
| 4. None of Dependent Claims 4, 7, 9-11, 14, 16-18, and 23-25 Are Obvious in View of Misra and Tsai. | 76 |
| VII. CONCLUSION | 77 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

| <i>Aqua Prod., Inc. v. Matal,</i> 872 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2017)19 |
|---|
| Bell Atl. Network Servs. v. Covad Commc 'ns Grp., 262 F.3d 1258 (Fed. Cir. 2001) |
| <i>Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.,</i> 815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016)27 |
| <i>Clickbooth.com, LLC v. Essociate, Inc.,</i> IPR2015-00464, Paper 9 (July 9, 2015) |
| <i>Cultec, Inc. v. Stormtech LLC,</i> IPR2017-00777, Paper No. 7 at 13 (PTAB Aug. 22, 2017) |
| <i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee,</i> 136 S.Ct. 2131 (2016) |
| <i>D'Agostino v. MasterCard International Inc.</i> , 844 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2016) |
| Hospira, Inc. v. Genetech, Inc., IPR2017-00739, Paper No. 16 at 18 (PTAB July 27, 2017) 19, 56 |
| <i>In re Slocombe</i> , 510 F.2d 1398 (C.C.P.A. 1975)29 |
| <i>Jiawei Tech. (HK) Ltd. v. Richmond,</i> IPR2014-00937, Paper 24, (Feb. 6, 2014)41 |
| <i>Jiawei Tech. (HK) Ltd. v. Richmond,</i> IPR2014-00938, Paper 27 (Jan. 13, 2015) |
| <i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015) |
| PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Communs. RF, LLC, 815 F.3d 747 (Fed. Cir. 2016) |

DOCKET A L A R M



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.