

Amkor Technology, Inc.
Justin F. Boyce, lead counsel
Robert W. Ashbrook Jr., back-up counsel
Dechert LLP
2440 W. El Camino Real, Suite 700
Mountain View, CA 94040-1499
telephone 650-813-4853
patents@dechert.com
justin.boyce@dechert.com
robert.ashbrook@dechert.com

January 30, 2017

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SYNAPTICS INCORPORATED,
Petitioner,

v.

AMKOR TECHNOLOGY, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-00085
Patent 7,358,174

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(D).....	1
A.	Timeline.....	2
B.	Petitioner’s Rationale for Filing This Follow-On Petition.....	3
C.	The Petition Should Be Denied under § 325(d).....	5
1.	The Instant IPR Will Tax the Finite Resources of the Board.....	8
2.	The Instant IPR Will Jeopardize the Board’s Ability to Secure the Just Resolution of IPR2016-00863 and -00865 Within One Year.	8
3.	Petitioner Previously Filed <i>Three</i> Petitions Directed to the Same Claims of the ‘174 Patent.....	11
4.	Petitioner Knew of the Fay Patent When It Filed the Petition in IPR2016-00863.	13
5.	Petitioner Knew of and Used Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response and the Board’s Institution Decision in IPR2016-00863 in Preparing the Instant Petition.....	13
6.	Petitioner Waited More Than Six Months After Learning about Fay to File the Instant Petition.	16
7.	Petitioner Provides No Good Reason for Its Delay.....	16
8.	The Instant Petition Presents the Same Art and Arguments as the IPR2016-00863 Petition	20
9.	The Instant Petition Is Harassing to Patent Owner.....	23
III.	THE PETITIONER’S STATED OBVIOUSNESS GROUND IS NOT PERMITTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 311(B).....	24
IV.	TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND AND PROBLEMS SOLVED BY THE ‘174 PATENT.....	25
V.	OVERVIEW OF FAY	26
VI.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART (“POSA”).....	27
VII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	27
A.	“Barrier Layer”	28

B.	“Pad”.....	30
VIII.	THERE IS NOT A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT PETITIONER WILL PREVAIL IN AT LEAST ONE CLAIM.....	32
A.	Claims 1, 18, 23, and 26 (and Their Dependent Claims) Are Patentable Because a POSA Would Understand that Fay Has No Exposed Metal Pad.....	32
1.	Professor Ivey Could Not Tell Where the Pad Was in Fay’s Figure7.	33
2.	Fay’s Figure 21 is Only a “Schematic Drawing” Disclosing a Method.	34
3.	Fay’s Figure 8 Discloses an Actual Structure.....	37
4.	A POSA Would Know that Fay Figure 21 Should Show Layer 207 Extending Up Onto Layer 205.	37
5.	A POSA Would Know that the Pad in Fay Figure 21 Would Be Entirely Covered, and Not Exposed.	39
a.	A POSA Would Know that Pads Were Normally Completely Covered.	40
b.	Fay’s Use of the Term “Encapsulation Layer” Indicates that the Pad Is Not Exposed.	42
c.	Fay’s Mention of a Stress Compensation Layer Would Lead a POSA to Believe the Pads Were Not Exposed.....	42
d.	Fay’s Failure to Discuss Any Benefits of an Exposed Pad Would Tell a POSA that the Pad Was Covered.....	44
6.	Summary: Claims 1, 18, 23, 26, and Their Dependent Claims Patentable Because the Pad in Fay Figure 21 Would Be Entirely Covered, and Not Exposed.	47
B.	All Challenged Claims Are Patentable Because Fay Has No “Barrier” Layer.....	48
C.	Dependent Claim 4 Is Patentable.	49
1.	Only a Plan-View Could Reveal Details of the Type Required in Claim 4, and Fay Shows No Plan Views	52

2.	Fay’s Cross-Sectional Views Do Not Reveal Features As Required by Claim 4	56
D.	Dependent Claims 9–12 and 28–31 Are Patentable.....	58
1.	Petitioner Relied upon Professor Ivey’s Opinions about the Shape of Pads 205.....	59
2.	Professor Ivey Then Changed His Original Opinions about the Shape of Pads 205.....	60
3.	Fay Does Not Disclose Professor Ivey’s L-Shaped Pads.....	64
4.	Instead, a POSA Would Know that Fay Discloses Conventional Pads with a Conventional Centered UBMs.....	66
5.	Summary: Dependent Claims 9–12 and 28–31 Are Patentable.....	70

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	IPR2016-00863 Docket (from PTAB E2E)
2002	IPR2016-00865 Docket (from PTAB E2E)
2003	IPR2016-00866 Docket (from PTAB E2E)
2004	IPR2016-00863 Institution-in-Part Decision (Paper 27)
2005	IPR2016-00865 Institution-in-Part Decision (Paper 28)
2006	IPR2016-00863 Scheduling Order (Paper 28)
2007	IPR2016-00865 Scheduling Order (Paper 29)
2008	Declaration of Leonard W. Schaper, Dr. Engr. Sci., Ex. 2001 in IPR2016-00863
2009	Declaration of Leonard W. Schaper, Dr. Engr. Sci., Ex. 2001 in IPR2016-00865
2010	Supplemental Declaration of Leonard W. Schaper, Dr. Engr. Sci., Ex. 2019 in IPR2016-00865
2011	Curriculum Vitae of Leonard W. Schaper, Dr. Engr. Sci.
2012	M. Datta et al., “Electrochemical Fabrication of Mechanically Robust PbSn C4 Interconnections,” 142 <i>J. Electrochemical Society</i> 11 (Nov. 1995)
2013	US Patent 5,162,257 (“Yung”);
2014	International Publication WO 1996/30933 (by the same inventor, Mis).
2015– 2024	Not used, so that Exhibit Nos. 2025-2033 will correspond to the exhibit numbers in IPR2016-00863

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.