

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

TAIWAN SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING COMPANY LTD.,

Petitioner,

v.

MARLIN SEMICONDUCTOR LIMITED,

Patent Owner.

---

Case No. IPR2025-01484

U.S. Patent No. 9,786,510 B2

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE  
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|   | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| I. INTRODUCTION .....   | 1           |
| II. SEMICONDUCTOR TRANSISTOR TECHNOLOGY PRIMER.....   | 2           |
| A. Basic Transistor Components.....   | 2           |
| B. Planar vs. Three-Dimensional Transistors .....   | 5           |
| C. Processes For Manufacturing Integrated Circuits And<br>Transistors .....   | 7           |
| 1. The Four Stages Of Fabricating Integrated Circuits.....  | 7           |
| 2. The Wafer Fabrication Stage .....  | 8           |
| III. THE CHALLENGED '510 PATENT .....   | 10          |
| IV. THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH THE REQUIRED<br>LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS .....   | 15          |
| A. Grounds 1 and 2 .....  | 15          |
| 1. Ground 1 Fails Because Oh Does Not Disclose Or<br>Render Obvious “A Third Distance Between Adjacent<br>Lower Parts Of The First Fin And The Second Fin Is The<br>Same As A Fourth Distance Between Adjacent Lower<br>Parts Of The Third Fin And The Fourth Fin” .....  | 16          |
| 2. Ground 2 Fails For The Same Reasons As Ground 1 .....  | 21          |
| B. Ground 3.....  | 21          |
| 1. The Petition Offers No Motivation Or Basis For The<br>Concocted “Wann-Lin five-fin FinFET structure” .....   | 21          |
| 2. The Petition Offers No Motivation To Combine Wann<br>and Lin In A Manner That Discloses Or Renders Obvious<br>“A Third Distance Between Adjacent Lower Parts Of<br>The First Fin And The Second Fin Is The Same As A<br>Fourth Distance Between Adjacent Lower Parts Of The<br>Third Fin And The Fourth Fin” ..... | 24          |

V. CONCLUSION.....25

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**Federal Cases**

*ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Comm’ns, Inc.*,  
694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....24, 25

**TABLE OF EXHIBITS**


| <b>Exhibit</b> | <b>Description</b>  |
|----------------|---|
| 2001           | Declaration of Joseph C. McAlexander III  |
| 2002           | Peter Van Zant, <i>Microchip Fabrication, A Practical Guide to Semiconductor Processing</i> , (4th ed. 2000)  |
| 2003           | <i>Curriculum Vitae</i> of Joseph C. McAlexander III  |
| 2101           | Website: Foundries to Grow Faster than Integrated Circuits in 2016 ( <a href="https://marketrealist.com/2015/12/foundries-grow-faster-integrated-circuits-2016/">https://marketrealist.com/2015/12/foundries-grow-faster-integrated-circuits-2016/</a> )        |
| 2102           | Website: Ranked: Semiconductor Foundries by Revenue Share ( <a href="http://www.visualcapitalist.com/ranked-semiconductor-foundries-by-revenue-share/">www.visualcapitalist.com/ranked-semiconductor-foundries-by-revenue-share/</a> )                          |
| 2103           | Website: US Patent No. 9,786,510 B2 – Fin-shaped structure and manufacturing method thereof – Google Patents<br><a href="https://patents.google.com/patent/US9786510B2/en?q=9%2c786%2c510">https://patents.google.com/patent/US9786510B2/en?q=9%2c786%2c510</a> |
| 2104           | Declaration of Paul Ahern Regarding Patent Owner’s Request for Discretionary Denial of Institution  |

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Petition should be denied because each of the three asserted grounds fails to disclose each limitation of the challenged claims of U.S. Patent Number 9,786,510 (“the ’510 patent”).

With respect to Grounds 1 and 2, the Oh reference does not disclose or render obvious “a third distance between adjacent lower parts of the first fin and the second fin is the same as a fourth distance between adjacent lower parts of the third fin and the fourth fin,” as required by all challenged claims. The Petition argues that Oh renders obvious that the spacing between adjacent fins is uniform, but this interpretation is conclusory and unsupported by Oh’s disclosure.

With respect to Ground 3, the Petition fails to set forth any motivation to combine the Wann and Lin references in the manner suggested by the Petition. The Petition proposes a very specific combination that allegedly meets all of the challenged claim elements:



EX 1003, Illustration 8.

However, this illustration is provided in Petitioner’s expert declaration rather than Wann or Lin, and is based on Wann’s brief mention of a five-fin FinFET

embodiment having “2 regular fins, 2 fins shaped a particular way, and 1 fin shaped a different way.” As such, the proposed combination is wholly speculative and the Petition fails to set forth any rationale for why a POSA would combine the Wann and Lin references in this specific manner.

Accordingly, the Petition should be denied.

## **II. SEMICONDUCTOR TRANSISTOR TECHNOLOGY PRIMER**


The following is a brief primer of semiconductor transistors to establish a foundation of common terms and concepts that can be used in addressing the defects in the Petition. These terms and concepts focus on: (1) the basic components of transistors; (2) the difference between planar and three-dimensional (*e.g.*, fin) transistors; and (3) common process steps for creating transistors. Ex. 2001, ¶18.

### **A. Basic Transistor Components**

Today’s semiconductor devices trace their lineage back to the first computers of the 1940s, which used vacuum tubes to perform two key electrical functions: switching (*i.e.*, turning access to electrical current on and off) and amplification (*i.e.*, increasing the amplitude of a signal while retaining its electrical characteristics). Ex. 2002 at 1-2; Ex. 2001, ¶19. Where earlier tube devices used a vacuum tube to control the flow of electrons (turning electrical current on and off), today’s semiconductor devices use transistors. Ex. 2002 at 3; Ex. 2001, ¶19.

One type of transistor typically used in an integrated circuit (or “chip”) is a “field effect transistor,” or FET. Ex. 2001, ¶20. Materials used to build such transistors are divided into three categories based on their ability to conduct electrical current: conductors, dielectrics, and semiconductors. Ex. 2002 at 29-34; Ex. 2001, ¶20. In a conductor (*e.g.*, a metal), electric current can flow freely. Ex. 2002 at 29; Ex. 2001, ¶20. A dielectric (*e.g.*, silicon dioxide) is an insulative material at the opposite end of the conductivity spectrum and has a high resistance to the flow of current. Ex. 2002 at 30; Ex. 2001, ¶20. Semiconductors (*e.g.*, silicon) fall between conductors and dielectrics and have some conducting and some resisting ability. Ex. 2002 at 31-34; Ex. 2001, ¶20.

The simplified FET below illustrates how these materials may be used to create a semiconductor transistor device. Ex. 2001, ¶21. As shown, the transistor is built on a semiconductor substrate and comprises a source, a drain, a gate, and a channel. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 2002 at 510-511. The source, drain and channel comprise semiconductor material, the gate comprises a conductor, and the gate and channel are separated by a thin dielectric layer.




*See, e.g.*, Ex. 2002 at 510-511; Ex. 2001, ¶21.

The source and drain are regions in the semiconductor substrate that are either rich in electrons (a negative, or n-type, region) or rich in holes (a positive, or p-type, region). Ex. 2002 at 26-28, 427-28; Ex. 2001, ¶22. The channel is a region under the gate and between the source and drain, and is of the opposite type to that of the source and drain. In other words, if the source and drain are n-type regions, then the channel will be a p-type region (and vice versa). Ex. 2002 at 510-511; Ex. 2001, ¶22.

The gate is a conductor (or semiconductor) located above the channel. Ex. 2001, ¶23. In this simplified version of a FET, there is a dielectric between the channel and the gate. Ex. 2002 at 510-511; Ex. 2001, ¶23. When a voltage is applied to the gate, the dielectric prevents the “flow of charge” (current) between the gate and the channel, but the applied voltage results in the creation of a “field effect” in the channel. Ex. 2002 at 510-511; Ex. 2001, ¶23. This “field effect” either builds up or depletes the charges in the channel (depending on whether it is a p- or n-type channel). Ex. 2002 at 510-511; Ex. 2001, ¶23.

As illustrated below, this field effect allows charge to flow from the source, through the channel, to the drain. Ex. 2001, ¶24. Thus, selectively applying voltage to the gate switches the transistor on and off, starting and stopping drain-to-source or source-to-drain current. Ex. 2001, ¶24.




## B. Planar vs. Three-Dimensional Transistors

Integrated circuit chips in modern computer systems are typically composed of millions and even billions of transistors. Ex. 2001, ¶25. The first transistor prototypes in 1947 were several inches in size, and implementing even the simplest early computers required tens of thousands of gates or transistors. *Id.* Given those numbers, and the correlation between an increased number of transistors and increased computing power, the desire to shrink transistor sizes to fit more transistors on a chip has been consistent and widespread in industry. *Id.* This desire led to the development of a new type of transistor, a “FinFET.” Ex. 2001, ¶25.

The simplified illustrative FET transistors illustrated in the previous section all feature a gate structure built on a flat semiconductor substrate; in other words, a “planar” FET. Ex. 2001, ¶26. In the early 2010s, however, commercial gates evolved from such two-dimensional (2D) planar transistors to three-dimensional (3D) FinFET transistors. Ex. 2001, ¶26.

In the below image, the figure on the left illustrates a 2D planar transistor built on a flat silicon substrate. Ex. 2001, ¶27. In this traditional 2D planar transistor, the transistor forms a conducting channel in the silicon region under the gate.



Ex. 2001, ¶27.

In contrast, as illustrated above in the right figure, an exemplary 3D fin transistor design features a vertical semiconductor fin structure above the substrate that acts as a channel between the source and drain regions. Ex. 2001, ¶28. In the resulting fin field effect transistor (“FinFET”), the source and drain regions are formed at opposing regions of the fin, and the gate is wrapped over the fin surrounding the fin on the top and two sides. *Id.*

Thus, where a planar gate has only a horizontal dimension, the FinFET gate has both horizontal and vertical dimensions, thereby allowing a FinFET transistor to take up less surface area than a planar transistor. Ex. 2001, ¶29. This alone means that more FinFET transistors may fit on an integrated circuit chip compared to that of the planar transistor. *Id.* In addition, because FinFETs typically leak less current than planar FET transistors, FinFETs may be more tightly packed on an integrated circuit chip. *Id.* This, too, increases the number of FinFET transistors that may fit onto a single chip. *Id.*

### **C. Processes For Manufacturing Integrated Circuits And Transistors**

#### **1. The Four Stages Of Fabricating Integrated Circuits**

The intricate, complex manufacturing process developed over the years for achieving such highly-dense integrated circuits can be divided into four distinct stages: (1) material preparation; (2) wafer preparation; (3) wafer fabrication; and (4) packaging. Ex. 2001, ¶30.

In the first stage, the semiconductor material itself is created. Ex. 2002 at 13. For a silicon semiconductor, the raw starting material is sand, which is converted to pure silicon with a polysilicon structure. Ex. 2002 at 13; Ex. 2001, ¶31.

In the second stage, the semiconductor material is first formed into a silicon crystal with specific electrical and structural parameters, and it is then sliced into

thin disks called “wafers.” Ex. 2002 at 13-14; Ex. 2001, ¶32. A wafer acts as a semiconductor substrate on and in which transistors may be formed. Ex. 2001, ¶32.

The third stage is wafer fabrication, during which individual integrated circuits are formed in and on the wafer semiconductor substrate. Ex. 2002 at 14; Ex. 2001, ¶33. Thousands of integrated circuits can be formed on the substrate of a single wafer. Ex. 2002 at 14; Ex. 2001, ¶33.

In the packaging stage, the wafer is separated into individual chips. Ex. 2002 at 14-15; Ex. 2001, ¶34.

## **2. The Wafer Fabrication Stage**

The third manufacturing stage, wafer fabrication, is the one most relevant here, and it can take several thousand steps, during which transistors and other devices are formed in and on the wafer’s substrate. Ex. 2002 at 14; Ex. 2001, ¶35. These steps are generally performed using three categories of materials (conductors, semiconductors, and dielectrics) in four basic operations (layering, patterning, doping, and heat treatments). *See* Ex. 2002 at 29-31, 71; Ex. 2001, ¶35. For purposes of understanding the Petition and its deficiencies, the two most important basic operations are layering and patterning. Ex. 2001, ¶35.

**Layering** is the operation used to add thin layers to the semiconductor substrate. Ex. 2002 at 72; Ex. 2001, ¶36. The layers may be conductors,

semiconductors, or dielectrics; and they can have a variety of functions and be made in a variety of ways. Ex. 2002 at 72; Ex. 2001, ¶36.

For example, one way of adding a layer of material is to deposit that material onto the semiconductor substrate. Ex. 2001, ¶37. Another way of adding a layer of material is to grow the material on the semiconductor substrate. *Id.* After an initial layer is added to the semiconductor substrate, additional layers may be added to the earlier layers using similar growth or deposition processes. *Id.* To illustrate, the transistor structure shown below shows a number of layers that have been added to the wafer's semiconductor substrate, some deposited, some grown. Ex. 2002 at 72; Ex. 2001, ¶37.




Figure 4.4 Cross section of completed metal gate MOS transistor with grown and deposited layers.

**Patterning** is the series of steps to remove (etch away) selected portions of the semiconductor substrate or one or more layers of materials that were added during one or more prior layering operations. Ex. 2002 at 72-73; Ex. 2001, ¶38. This creates a pattern on the wafer surface. Ex. 2002 at 72-73; Ex. 2001, ¶38.

The patterning may result in one or more holes in the layered material or one or more remaining islands of material. Ex. 2002 at 72-73; Ex. 2001, ¶39. For example, the following figures illustrate the use of patterning to make (1) a hole in a previously formed layer: and (2) an island from a previously formed layer:




Figure 4.7 Patterning.

Ex. 2001, ¶39.

The repeated combination of layering and patterning in different sequences and variations is critical to the formation of transistors in and on the semiconductor wafer:

These parts are created one layer at a time by the combination of putting a layer on the surface and removing a portion, with a patterning process, to leave a specific shape. The goal of the patterning operations is to create the desired shapes in the exact dimensions (feature size) required by the circuit design, and to locate them in their proper location on the wafer surface and in relation to the other parts.

Ex. 2002 at 73; Ex. 2001, ¶40.

### III. THE CHALLENGED '510 PATENT

The '510 patent “relates generally to a fin-shaped structure and method thereof, and more specifically to a fin-shaped structure which has a ladder-shaped

cross-sectional profile, and a method thereof.” Ex. 1001, 1:7-10. Specifically, the patent states that the invention involves “cover[ing] a mask in a first area, and then remov[ing] an external surface of a top part of a second fin-shaped structure of a second area, so that the second fin-shaped structure is formed.” *Id.*, 2:18-23. “Hence, fin-shaped structures of different heights and critical dimensions can be formed, and thus transistors for each area can achieve required electrical requirements.” *Id.*, 2:24-26.

The patent describes an embodiment in which “two first fin-shaped structures 112a are formed in the first area A and two second fin-shaped structures 112b are formed in the second area B.” *Id.*, 3:1-4. The above-described structure is illustrated in Figure 1:




FIG. 1

*Id.*, Fig. 1. In this embodiment:

[T]he first fin-shaped structures 112a and the second fin-shaped structures 112b have the same structure. A height  $h_1$  of each of the first fin-shaped structures 112a is common to a height  $h_2$  of each of the second fin-shaped structures 112b; a width  $w_1$  of a top part of each of the first fin-shaped structures 112a is the same as a width  $w_2$  of a top part of each of second fin-shaped structures 112b; and a first distance  $p_1$  between a top part of each of the first fin-shaped structures 112a is the same as a distance  $p_2$  between a top part of each of the second fin-shaped structures 112b. Therefore, when a selective treatment process is performed on one single area or on a plurality

of areas, symmetric structures in these areas will receive the same influence and uniform structures can be formed.

*Id.*, 3:6-20. Subsequently, “[a]s shown in FIG. 4, a treatment process Q2 is performed to modify an external surface R1 of a first top part 112b1 of each of the second fin-shaped structures 112b, thereby a modified part 120 covering the first top part 112b1 of each of the second fin-shaped structures 112b is formed.” *Id.*, 4:53-57.




FIG. 4

*Id.*, Fig. 4. Then, “[a]fter the modified parts 120 are formed, the patterned mask 20a is removed, as shown in FIG. 5.”




FIG. 5

*Id.*, Fig. 5. As shown above in Figure 5, in the resulting structure, “[t]he first distance p1 between adjacent top corners of the first fin and the second fin of the first fin-shaped structures 112a is less than a second distance p3 between adjacent top corners of the third fin and the fourth fin of the second fin-shaped structures 112b while a third distance p5 between adjacent lower parts of the first fin and the second fin is the same as a fourth distance p6 between adjacent lower parts of the third fin and the fourth fin.” *Id.*, 5:24-32.

The above-described innovative aspects of the invention are embodied in all challenged claims via independent claim 1, which recites:

1. A fin-shaped structure, comprising:

a substrate having a plurality of first fin-shaped structures and a plurality second fin-shaped structures, and the first fin-shaped structures comprising a first fin and a second fin, the second fin-shaped structures comprising a third fin and a fourth fin,

*wherein a first distance between adjacent top corners of the first fin and the second fin of the first fin-shaped structures is less than a second distance between adjacent top corners of the third fin and the fourth fin of the second fin-shaped structures*

*while a third distance between adjacent lower parts of the first fin and the second fin is the same as a fourth distance between adjacent lower parts of the third fin and the fourth fin, and*

wherein the adjacent top corners are directly opposite each other.

Ex. 1001, claim 1.

#### **IV. THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH THE REQUIRED LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS**

##### **A. Grounds 1 and 2**

In Ground 1, the Petition alleges that Oh (Ex. 1005) renders obvious independent claim 1 and dependent claim 2 and 6. Pet., 14. In Ground 2, the Petition alleges that Oh in view of Rachmady (Ex. 1006) renders obvious dependent claims 3-5, which depend from claim 1. Pet., 37. Both of these grounds fail because Oh does not disclose or render obvious elements [1.b] and [1.c].


**1. Ground 1 Fails Because Oh Does Not Disclose Or Render Obvious “A Third Distance Between Adjacent Lower Parts Of The First Fin And The Second Fin Is The Same As A Fourth Distance Between Adjacent Lower Parts Of The Third Fin And The Fourth Fin”**

Element [1.c] recites: “while a third distance between adjacent lower parts of the first fin and the second fin is the same as a fourth distance between adjacent lower parts of the third fin and the fourth fin.” Oh does not disclose or render obvious this claim element.

The Petition alleges that Oh discloses or renders obvious [1.c] because “Oh discloses or renders obvious uniform spacing between fins when forming its fin-shaped structure.” Pet., 19. But Oh never mentions the distances between adjacent fins, much less any comparison of distances between two sets of fins, nor such distances measured from the “adjacent lower parts” of the fin. *See generally* Ex. 1005.


The Petition alleges that Oh’s Figures 2, 4, 6, and 14 show that Oh’s initial fin formation process for both regions RG1 and RG2 are the same, so the distance between the two sets of fins are allegedly also the same. Pet., 19-21. But this is unsupported by Oh, which never states that the two sets of fins are formed using identical processes. Ex. 2001, ¶48. For example, with respect to Oh’s Figure 2, the Petition alleges that “first mask patterns 201 and a conformal second mask layer 205 are formed on a substrate 100.” Pet., 19.

Fig. 2




Ex. 1005, Fig. 2. Similarly, with respect to Oh's Figure 4, the Petition alleges that "second mask patterns 206 are spaced apart from one another in the first region RG1 and second region RG2 by first trenches 101." Pet., 19.

Fig. 4



Ex. 1005, Fig. 4. With respect to Oh's Figure 6, the Petition alleges that "an etching process using mask patterns 206 results in the formation of first fin portions F1 separated by second trenches 102." Pet., 20.

Fig. 6



Ex. 1005, Fig. 6.


Based on the above-described figures, the Petition alleges that “[a]ccordingly, a POSA would have understood that Oh teaches that the distance between the first fin portions F1 in the first region RG1 and second region RG2 are identical, because it teaches that the two first mask patterns 201 in Figure 2 are identical, as was first trenches 101 in Figure 4 and second trenches 102 in Figure 6.” Pet., 21. But this, too, is unsupported by Oh, which does not state that the mask pattern and mask layer on both regions in Figure 2, or the trenches in Figures 4 and 6, are the same. *See* Ex. 1005, ¶¶ [0047]-[0050]; Ex. 2001, ¶49. The Petition argues that because Oh states that “use of similar or identical reference numbers in the various drawings is intended to indicate the presence of a similar or identical element or feature,” the trenches between adjacent fins must have the same distance. Pet., 21 (citing Ex. 1005 ¶ [0038]). This is an overstatement; just because both trenches are labeled 102

does not mean that the *width* of the trenches are identical, but rather simply that they are both trenches.

Next, the Petition alleges that “when the same etching process is performed on exposed trenches having the same properties and size, then the resulting trenches will be the same.” Pet., 21. But Oh never discloses that the same etching process is performed on both regions, nor that the trenches have the same properties and size. Thus, the Petition’s logic rests on facts that are not supported by Oh. Ex. 2001, ¶50.

Finally, the Petition alleges that “if Oh does not expressly disclose that the spacing/distance between the fins in Figure 14 is the same, a POSA would have found it obvious to apply the teachings from Figure 30 to render such a property obvious.” Pet., 23. But Oh’s Figure 30 fares no better than any of the other figures because Figure 30 also does not disclose that each of the trenches between fins has the same width. Ex. 2001, ¶51.

Fig. 30



Ex. 1005, Fig. 30. In its description of Fig. 30, Oh only states that “[t]he fourth width T4 of the second mask pattern 206 may be different from the lower width T5 of the first trench 101.” Ex. 1005, ¶ [0073]. That is, Oh only discloses that T4 is different than T5, not that each of the trenches all have the same width T5. Ex. 2001, ¶51. Thus, Oh’s Figure 30 also fails to disclose “a third distance between adjacent lower parts of the first fin and the second fin is the same as a fourth distance between adjacent lower parts of the third fin and the fourth fin.”

In short, the Petition fails to identify any disclosure in Oh from which a POSA could determine relative distances between adjacent fins in both regions. As such, Oh does not disclose or render obvious element [1.c]. Ex. 2001, ¶52.

Accordingly, Ground 1 fails.

**2. Ground 2 Fails For The Same Reasons As Ground 1**


Ground 2 adds the Rachmady reference to address additional limitations of dependent claims 3-5, which all depend from independent claim 1. Pet., 28. Ground 2 does not provide any further analysis regarding claim 1. Pet., 28-46. Thus, Ground 2 fails for the same reasons as Ground 1.

**B. Ground 3**

In Ground 3, the Petition alleges that the combination of Wann (Ex. 1007) and Lin (Ex. 1008) renders obvious claims 1-6. Pet., 46. Ground 3 fails because it is based on a wholly speculative combination of Wann and Lin, and the Petition fails to offer any rationale for why a POSA would combine Wann and Lin in the manner proposed by the Petition.

**1. The Petition Offers No Motivation Or Basis For The Concocted “Wann-Lin five-fin FinFET structure”**

The Petition alleges that because Wann briefly mentions a five-fin FinFET embodiment having “2 regular fins, 2 fins shaped a particular way, and 1 fin shaped a different way,” a POSA would have been motivated to implement such an embodiment according to the illustration below. To be clear, this illustration does not appear in Wann or any other asserted reference. Rather, it is an illustration provided in Petitioner’s expert declaration (Ex. 1003, ¶170), presumably created by Petitioner’s counsel.



EX 1003, Illustration 8.

Pet., 51-52 (citing Ex. 1003, Illustration 8). This combination is wholly speculative, because Wann provides no details on this embodiment other than that it “may have 2 regular fins, 2 fins shaped a particular way, and 1 fin shaped in a different way.” Ex. 1007, ¶ [0042]; Ex. 2001, ¶54. Wann does not disclose any particular shapes or arrangements of the fins in this embodiment. *See id.*

The Petition argues that “[a] POSA would have understood that this fin permutation is obvious to try since it is merely one fin arrangement from a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, with a reasonable expectation of success.” Pet., 51. This is plainly incorrect—the number of fin arrangements and shapes is not finite, because fins can be shaped in an infinite number of ways. Ex. 2001, ¶55. For example, Wann discloses numerous fin shapes, including diamond-shaped and oval-shaped fins:




Figure 9A

Figure 9B

Ex. 1008, Figs. 9A and 9B. The Petition offers no rationale for choosing the particular fin shape shown in “Illustration 8” over any other fin shape. *See* Pet., 51-56. Moreover, the Petition identifies no disclosure in Wann or Lin, or any other rationale, for why a POSA would have been motivated to arrange the fins in the order illustrated in Illustration 8—that is, the “2 regular fins adjacent to one another” and the “2 fins shaped a particular way adjacent to one another.” Pet., 56. Indeed, *every* embodiment disclosed by Wann that includes fins of different shapes orients the fins such that the particularly-shaped fin is between two regular fins, rather than having two fins of the same shape adjacent to one another. *See* Ex. 1007, Figs. 4-10.

Accordingly, the Petition “fails to explain why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have combined elements from specific references *in the way the*

*claimed invention does.” ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Comm’ns, Inc.*, 694 F.3d 1312, 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (emphasis in original). Accordingly, Ground 3 fails.

**2. The Petition Offers No Motivation To Combine Wann and Lin In A Manner That Discloses Or Renders Obvious “A Third Distance Between Adjacent Lower Parts Of The First Fin And The Second Fin Is The Same As A Fourth Distance Between Adjacent Lower Parts Of The Third Fin And The Fourth Fin”**

Similarly, the Petition fails to establish any motivation to combine Wann and Lin such that “a third distance between adjacent lower parts of the first fin and the second fin is the same as a fourth distance between adjacent lower parts of the third fin and the fourth fin,” as required by element [1.c].

The Petition alleges that “a POSA would have reasonably expected to succeed in forming Wann’s fin-shaped structures, where a distance between lower parts of adjacent regular fins is the same as a distance between lower parts of adjacent shaped fins” “because Lin’s mandrel/spacer process can be used to form Wann’s regular fins, in which one or more of the regular fins can be further shaped by Wann’s fin-shaping process.” Pet., 50. But even if this were true, it does not explain *why* a POSA would want to use Lin’s mandrel/spacer process (which results in “substantially equal” spacing between fins) over any other process. Ex. 2001, ¶57. The Petition alleges that “[a]dvantageously, Lin’s mandrel/spacer process provides

substantially uniform fins, in which ‘the spacing and depth between the fins 50 are better controlled and may be substantially equal between all of the fins 50.’” Pet., 49 (citing Ex. 1008, ¶ [0062]). But this logic is circular—the Petition essentially argues that a POSA would be motivated to use Lin’s process to implement substantially uniform fins because Lin’s process provides substantially uniform fins. This does not provide a motivation for why a POSA would want uniform spacing in the first place. Ex. 2001, ¶57. The Petition also alleges that “[a]n additional benefit of Lin’s mandrel/spacer process is its mandrel removal process, which includes a ‘wet etch process [that] is a lower cost and allows a higher throughput (Wafers per hour) than a dry etch process.’” Pet., 49 (citing Ex. 1008, ¶ [0063]). But this, too, fails to provide a motivation to implement uniform spacing between fins, because such a mandrel removal process including a wet etch process could be performed regardless of whether the fins are uniformly spaced. Ex. 2001, ¶57.

Thus, the Petition “fails to explain why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have combined elements from specific references *in the way the claimed invention does.*” *ActiveVideo*, 694 F.3d at 1328 (emphasis in original). Accordingly, Ground 3 fails.

## V. CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, the Petition should be denied.

Dated: December 10, 2025

/s/ William A. Meunier

William A. Meunier (Reg. No. 41,193)

Adam S. Rizk (Reg. No. 66,867)

Michael T. Renaud (Reg. No. 44,299)

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS,

GLOVSKY AND POPEO, P.C.

One Financial Center

Boston, MA 02111

Telephone: 617-348-1793

Facsimile: 617-542-2241

E-mail: WAMeunier@mintz.com

ARizk@mintz.com

MTRenaud@mintz.com

Mintz-Marlin-IPRs@mintz.com

Reza Dokhanchy (Reg. No. 62,795)

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS,

GLOVSKY AND POPEO, P.C.

3580 Carmel Mountain Road, Suite 300

San Diego, CA 92130

Telephone: 858-314-1500

RDokhanchy@mintz.com

Tawfik Goma (Reg. No. 67,416)

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS,

GLOVSKY AND POPEO, P.C.

777 Brickell Avenue, Suite 500

Miami, FL 33131

Tel: (786) 949-6600

TAGoma@mintz.com

*Counsel to Patent Owner Marlin  
Semiconductor Ltd.*

**CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §42.24(d), Patent Owner hereby certifies, in reliance on the word count of the word-processing system (Microsoft Office Word 2010) used to prepare this preliminary response, that the number of words in this paper is 4,452. This word count excludes the tables of contents, tables of authorities, certificate of word count, certificate of service, and table of exhibits.

Dated: December 10, 2025

/s/ William A. Meunier

William A. Meunier (Reg. No. 41,193)

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that a copy of Patent Owner's Preliminary Response was served by electronic mail on the following counsel of record:

Christian A. Camarce  
Reg. No. 65,021  
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN &  
FOX PLLC  
1101 K Street, NW, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 371-2600  
ccamarce-PTAB@sternekessler.com

Donald R. Banowit  
Reg. No. 42,289  
Richard Bemben  
Reg No. 68,658  
Zhichun Zhang  
Reg No. 77,776  
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN &  
FOX PLLC  
1101 K Street, NW, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 371-2600  
dbanowit-PTAB@sternekessler.com  
rbemben-PTAB@sternekessler.com  
zzhang-PTAB@sternekessler.com  
PTAB@sternekessler.com

Dated: December 10, 2025

/s/ William A. Meunier  
William A. Meunier (Reg. No. 41,193)