

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. IPR2026-00061

U.S. Patent No. 8,076,194 B2

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. SEMICONDUCTOR TRANSISTOR TECHNOLOGY PRIMER.....	3
A. Basic Transistor Components.....	4
B. Planar vs. Three-Dimensional Transistors	7
C. Processes For Manufacturing Integrated Circuits And Transistors	9
1. The Four Stages Of Fabricating Integrated Circuits.....	9
2. The Wafer Fabrication Stage	10
III. THE CHALLENGED '194 PATENT	13
IV. THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH THE REQUIRED LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS	21
A. Grounds 1A, 1B, And 1C	21
1. Hoentschel262 Does Not Disclose Or Render Obvious “Wherein The Top Surface Of The [First] Epitaxial Layer Is Above The Surface Of The Semiconductor Substrate” (Elements 1[e]/10[e]) And “Wherein A Contact Surface Of the [First] Epitaxial Layer And The Spacer Is Above The Surface Of The Semiconductor Substrate” (Elements 1[f]/10[f])	22
2. Ground 1C Fails For The Same Reasons As 1A And 1B.....	30
B. Grounds 2A, 2B, And 2C	30
1. Wang753 Does Not Disclose Or Render Obvious “Wherein The Top Surface Of The [First] Epitaxial Layer Is Above The Surface Of The Semiconductor Substrate” (Elements 1[e]/10[e])	30

a.	The Petition’s Attempt To Rely On Non-Scale Drawings Is Wrong As A Matter Of Law	31
b.	The Petition’s Interpretations Of Wang753’s Figures Are Unsupported By And Contradicted By The Reference Itself.....	35
2.	Ground 2C Fails For The Same Reasons As Grounds 2A and 2B	37
V.	CONCLUSION.....	37

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Hockerson-Halberstadt, Inc. v. Avia Group Intern.</i> , 222 F.3d 951 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	32, 33
<i>In re Wright</i> , 569 F.2d 1124 (C.C.P.A. 1977)	33
<i>Nystrom v. Trex Co.</i> , 424 F.3d 1136 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	32, 33
<i>Plantronics, Inc. v. Aliph, Inc.</i> , 724 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	33
<i>Regents of Univ. of Cal. v. Satco Prods., Inc.</i> , 2024 WL 4972639 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 4, 2024).....	34

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description
2001	Declaration of Joseph C. McAlexander III
2002	Peter Van Zant, <i>Microchip Fabrication, A Practical Guide to Semiconductor Processing</i> , (4 th ed. 2000)
2003	<i>Curriculum Vitae</i> of Joseph C. McAlexander III
2101	Website: Foundries to Grow Faster than Integrated Circuits in 2016 (https://marketrealist.com/2015/12/foundries-grow-faster-integrated-circuits-2016/)
2102	Website: Ranked: Semiconductor Foundries by Revenue Share (www.visualcapitalist.com/ranked-semiconductor-foundries-by-revenue-share/)
2103	Website: US Patent No. 8,076,194 B2 – Method of fabricating metal oxide semiconductor transistor – Google Patents https://patents.google.com/patent/US8076194B2/en?q=8%2c076%2c194+
2104	Declaration of Garrett Dempsey Regarding Patent Owner’s Request for Discretionary Denial of Institution

I. INTRODUCTION

The Petition should be denied because none of the Petition grounds establishes a reasonable likelihood that Petitioners will prevail on any challenged claim of U.S. Patent Number 8,076,194 (“the ’194 patent”).

The Petition alleges that Hoentschel262 (Grounds 1A-C) and Wang753 (Grounds 2A-C) anticipate or render obvious independent claims 1 and 10. In fact, neither Hoentschel262 nor Wang753 discloses or renders obvious at least “wherein the top surface of the [first] epitaxial layer is above the surface of the semiconductor substrate” (elements 1[e]/10[e]) and “wherein a contact surface of the [first] epitaxial layer and the spacer is above the surface of the semiconductor substrate” (elements 1[f]/10[f]).

In Grounds 1A-C, the Petition relies solely on Hoentschel262’s statement that epitaxial growth can include “overfilling” to support its allegation that the top surface of the alleged epitaxial layer is above the surface of the semiconductor substrate. The Petition concedes that Hoentschel262 does not illustrate epitaxial layers above the substrate. The single word “overfilling” is insufficient to teach or suggest elements 1[e] and 10[e]. Moreover, even if the word “overfilling” was enough to suggest “the top surface of the epitaxial layer is above the surface of the semiconductor substrate”, the Petition offers no explanation for how the rest of Hoentschel262’s fabrication process could be modified to accommodate such raised

epitaxial layers. A POSITA would have understood that if epitaxial layers were raised above the surface of the substrate rather than flush with the substrate, other fabrication steps would need to be altered in order to accommodate this change. In the '194 patent, the solution to this problem “is to form the epitaxial layer before forming the spacer.” EX1001, 7:15-16. This allows the spacers to be formed on top of raised epitaxial layers. In contrast, in the embodiment of Hoentschel262 that the Petition relies upon, part of the spacer is formed before the alleged recesses are etched and the alleged epitaxial layers are formed. As such, Hoentschel262’s fabrication process is incompatible with raised epitaxial layers. The Petition fails to address this issue at all. As such, the Petition fails to establish that Hoentschel262 discloses or renders obvious “wherein a contact surface of the [first] epitaxial layer and the spacer is above the surface of the semiconductor substrate.”

In Grounds 2A-2C, the Petition relies solely on Wang753’s non-scale drawings to support its allegation that the top surface of the alleged epitaxial layer is above the surface of the semiconductor substrate. The Petition’s attempt to rely on non-scale drawings should be rejected as (1) wrong as a matter of law; and (2) inconsistent with and not supported by the accompanying text and the drawings themselves. The Federal Circuit has rejected as a matter of law an attempt to rely on non-scale drawings to establish and prove “proportions,” “sizes,” or “quantitative relationship” of elements in those drawings. The Federal Circuit has repeatedly

made clear that this prohibition is well-established. Moreover, even if relying on non-scale drawings were not reversible legal error, the Petition's interpretations of Wang753's figures are inconsistent with, and not supported by, Wang753's text and the figures themselves. Wang753 expressly describes that its "SiGe stressors" (the alleged epitaxial layer) are grown "*in* recesses 116," rather than out of the recesses and above the substrate. Wang753's description is in direct contrast to the challenged '194 patent, which describes that its epitaxial layers are not merely grown "in" the recesses, they are further grown "higher than the surface of the semiconductor substrate": "epitaxial layer 220 is grown in the recess 218 *and may be grown higher than the surface of the semiconductor substrate 200, so as to form a raised epitaxial layer 220.*" EX1001 at 3:51-54 (emphasis added).

Accordingly, all Petition grounds fail and institution 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. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶17.

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). EX2002 at 1-2; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶18. 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. EX2002 at 3; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶18.

One type of transistor typically used in an integrated circuit (or "chip") is a "field effect transistor," or FET. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶19. Materials used to build such transistors are divided into three categories based on their ability to conduct electrical current: conductors, dielectrics, and semiconductors. EX2002 at 29-34; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶19. In a conductor (*e.g.*, a metal), electric current can flow freely. EX2002 at 29; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶19. 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. EX2002 at 30; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶19. Semiconductors (*e.g.*, silicon) fall between conductors and dielectrics and have some conducting and some resisting ability. EX2002 at 31-34; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶19.

The simplified FET below illustrates how these materials may be used to create a semiconductor transistor device. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶20. As shown, the transistor is built on a semiconductor substrate and comprises a source, a drain, a gate, and a channel. *See, e.g.*, EX2002 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., EX2002 at 510-511; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶20.

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). EX2002 at 26-28, 427-28; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶21. 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). EX2002 at 510-511; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶21.

The gate is a conductor (or semiconductor) located above the channel. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶22. In this simplified version of a FET, there is a

dielectric between the channel and the gate. EX2002 at 510-511; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶22. 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. EX2002 at 510-511; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶22. This “field effect” either builds up or depletes the charges in the channel (depending on whether it is a p- or n-type channel). EX2002 at 510-511; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶22.

As illustrated below, this field effect allows charge to flow from the source, through the channel, to the drain. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶23. Thus, selectively applying voltage to the gate switches the transistor on and off, starting and stopping drain-to-source or source-to-drain current. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶23.




B. Planar vs. Three-Dimensional Transistors

Integrated circuit chips in modern computer systems are typically composed of millions and even billions of transistors. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶24. 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.” EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶24.

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. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶25. In the early 2010s, however, commercial gates evolved from such two-dimensional (2D) planar transistors to three-dimensional (3D) FinFET transistors. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶25.

In the below image, the figure on the left illustrates a 2D planar transistor built on a flat silicon substrate. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶26. In this traditional 2D planar transistor, the transistor forms a conducting channel in the silicon region under the gate.



Source: Intel

EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶26.

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. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶27. 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. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶28. 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. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶29.

In the first stage, the semiconductor material itself is created. EX2002 at 13. For a silicon semiconductor, the raw starting material is sand, which is converted to pure silicon with a polysilicon structure. EX2002 at 13; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶30.

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.” EX2002 at 13-14; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶31. A wafer acts as a semiconductor substrate on and in which transistors may be formed. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶31.

The third stage is wafer fabrication, during which individual integrated circuits are formed in and on the wafer semiconductor substrate. EX2002 at 14; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶32. Thousands of integrated circuits can be formed on the substrate of a single wafer. EX2002 at 14; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶32.

In the packaging stage, the wafer is separated into individual chips. EX2002 at 14-15; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶33.

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. EX2002 at 14; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶34. 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* EX2002 at 29-31, 71; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶34. For purposes of understanding the Petition and its deficiencies, the two most important basic operations are layering and patterning. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶34.

Layering is the operation used to add thin layers to the semiconductor substrate. EX2002 at 72; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶35. The layers may be conductors, semiconductors, or dielectrics; and they can have a variety of functions and be made in a variety of ways. EX2002 at 72; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶35.

For example, one way of adding a layer of material is to deposit that material onto the semiconductor substrate. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶36. 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. EX2002 at 72; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶36.




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. EX2002 at 72-73; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶37. This creates a pattern on the wafer surface. EX2002 at 72-73; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶37.

The patterning may result in one or more holes in the layered material or one or more remaining islands of material. EX2002 at 72-73; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶38. 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.

EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶38.

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 operation 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.


EX2002 at 73; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶39.

III. THE CHALLENGED '194 PATENT

The '194 patent describes and claims improved FET designs intended to improve the transistor's performance. The patent discloses a number of ways of improving performance, including combining "raised epitaxial layers" with various other transistor features.


An "epitaxial layer" is a high-purity layer of semiconducting material. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶41. As the patent describes, these layers may be formed within recesses in the semiconductor substrate and, in addition, "may be grown higher than the surface of the semiconductor substrate 200," thereby making them "*raised* epitaxial layers." *E.g.*, EX1001 at 3:41-54, 6:19-22; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶41.

The '194 patent describes a method of fabricating a transistor structure with such raised epitaxial layers. For example, as illustrated below in an annotated portion of Figure 1, the method may start with a gate 208 (annotated in blue and comprising dielectric layer 210, conductive layer 212, and cap layer 213) positioned on substrate 200 (annotated in yellow):




EX1001 at Fig. 1 (annotated), 2:56-3:6; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶42. As shown, “[s]ubsequently, a protective layer 214 is formed on the semiconductor substrate 200, and the protective layer 214 covers the surface of [the] gate 208.” EX1001 at 3:28-30.

The substrate is then patterned to form recesses therein. For example, as shown below in an annotated portion of Figure 2, portions of the substrate may be selectively etched away to form recesses 218:




EX1001 at Fig. 2 (annotated), 3:23-28; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶44.

“Raised epitaxial layers” are then formed in these substrate recesses and next to sides of the gate. For example, “an epitaxial growth process is carried out to form epitaxial layers 220 in the recesses 218.” EX1001 at 3:49-50. As the patent describes, these layers may be formed to a height higher than the surface of that substrate, thereby making them “raised epitaxial layers”: “epitaxial layer 220 is grown in the recess 218 and may be grown higher than the surface of the semiconductor substrate 200, so as to form a raised epitaxial layer 220.” EX1001 at 3:51-54. The illustrative raised epitaxial layers are shown in orange in the following annotated excerpt from Figure 3:



EX1001 at Fig. 3 (annotated), 3:35-38; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶45.

Selective doping is then performed to form doped regions 222 (annotated in green) in the substrate:



EX1001 at Fig. 4 (annotated), 3:45-48; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶46.

Spacer 228 (shown below in pink and comprising layers 230 and 232) is subsequently formed on the sidewalls of the gate:

between the gate and the epitaxial layer is no longer limited by the width of the spacer.” EX1001, 7:16-18. Moreover, “the process of etching the recess is carried out before forming the spacer. At this moment, the pattern density on the semiconductor substrate is lower than the time when the spacer is formed, thus the micro-loading effect caused by the pattern density can be reduced, and then the uniformity in etching the recess is increased.” *Id.*, 7:18-24.

Each of the challenged claims includes the foregoing inventive concepts and combinations, including spacers lying over raised epitaxial layers with a contact surface above the substrate. For example, independent claim 1 recites:

1[pre] A method of fabricating a MOS transistor, comprising:

1[a] providing a semiconductor substrate;

1[b] forming at least a gate on the semiconductor substrate;

1[c] forming a protective layer on the semiconductor substrate, and the protective layer covering the surface of the gate;

1[d] forming at least a recess within the semiconductor substrate adjacent to the gate;

1[e] *forming an epitaxial layer in the recess, wherein the top surface of the epitaxial layer is above the surface of the semiconductor substrate;*

and

1[f] *forming a spacer on the sidewall of the gate and on a portion of the epitaxial layer wherein a contact surface of the epitaxial layer and the spacer is above the surface of the semiconductor substrate.*

EX1001, claim 1.

Similarly, independent claim 10 recites:

10[pre] A method of fabricating a CMOS transistor, comprising:

10[a] providing a semiconductor substrate having at least a first conductive transistor area for fabricating first conductive transistors and at least a second conductive transistor area for fabricating second conductive transistors, and an isolation structure between the first conductive transistor area and the second conductive transistor area;

10[b] forming a gate on the first conductive transistor area and on the second conductive transistor area respectively;

10[c] forming a first protective layer on the semiconductor substrate, and the first protective layer covering the surface of each gate;

10[d] forming at least a first recess within the semiconductor substrate adjacent to the gate in the first conductive transistor area;

10[e] *forming a first epitaxial layer in the first recess, wherein the top surface of the first epitaxial layer is above the surface of the semiconductor substrate;* and

10[f] *forming a spacer on the sidewall of each gate and at least on a portion of the first epitaxial layer, wherein a contact surface of the first epitaxial layer and the spacer is above the surface of the semiconductor substrate.*

EX1001, claim 10.

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

The Petition asserts the following grounds challenging claims 1-22 of the '194 patent:

Ground	Claim(s) Challenged	Statutory Basis	Prior Art
1A	1-4, 6-7, 10, 12-13, 15-16, 21-22	102	Hoentschel262
1B	1-22	103	Hoentschel262
1C	5, 7-9, 11, 14, 17-20	103	Hoentschel262, Wang407
2A	1-3, 5-12, 14-16, 21, 22	102	Wang753
2B	1-3, 5-12, 14-16, 21, 22	103	Wang753
2C	4, 13	103	Wang753, Hoentschel262

Pet., 1. Each of the these grounds fails because both of the Petition's primary references (Hoentschel262 and Wang753) fail to disclose or render obvious certain elements of independent claims 1 and 10. Accordingly, institution should be denied.

A. Grounds 1A, 1B, And 1C

In Grounds 1A and 1B, the Petition alleges that Hoentschel262 anticipates (Ground 1A) and renders obvious (Ground 1B) independent claims 1 and 10 and

certain claims depending from claims 1 and 10. Pet., 14. In Ground 1C, the Petition alleges the combination of Hoentschel262 and Wang 407 renders obvious dependent claim 6, which depends from claim 1. Pet., 66. All of these grounds fail because Hoentschel262 does not disclose or render obvious at least elements 1[e], 1[f], 10[e], and 10[f].

1. Hoentschel262 Does Not Disclose Or Render Obvious “Wherein The Top Surface Of The [First] Epitaxial Layer Is Above The Surface Of The Semiconductor Substrate” (Elements 1[e]/10[e]) And “Wherein A Contact Surface Of The [First] Epitaxial Layer And The Spacer Is Above The Surface Of The Semiconductor Substrate” (Elements 1[f]/10[f])

The sole basis for the Petition’s allegation that Hoentschel262 discloses or renders obvious “wherein the top surface of the epitaxial layer is above the surface of the semiconductor substrate” is Hoentschel262’s statement that the epitaxial growth process can include “any desired degree of underfilling or overfilling, or a substantially flush configuration.” Pet., 28 (citing EX1005-Hoentschel262 at 13:21-26, 9:11-20). According to the Petition, the single word “overfilling” in Hoentschel262 is apparently sufficient to disclose or render obvious elements 1[e] and 10[e]. Not so. The Petition’s mapping of this claim limitation is flatly contrary to the embodiments of Hoentschel262 as shown in the drawings and as supported by Hoentschel262’s specification. EX1005-Hoentschel262, Figs. 2a-2i. To overcome this actual disclosure, Petitioner relies on a single word from the specification—

“overfilling”—but that single word cannot erase the structure shown in the drawings and mandated by the deposition sequence (as explained below) disclosed in Hoentschel226. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶53. The Petition concedes that Hoentschel262 does not illustrate epitaxial layers above the substrate. Pet., 29. As such, the mere use of the term “overfilling” in Hoentschel262, without more, is insufficient to disclose or render obvious elements 1[e] and 10[e].

Moreover, even if the word “overfilling” was sufficient to suggest “wherein the top surface of the [first] epitaxial layer is above the surface of the semiconductor substrate”, Hoentschel262 does not disclose or render obvious “wherein a contact surface of the [first] epitaxial layer and the spacer is above the surface of the semiconductor substrate,” as required by all challenged claims. The Petition alleges that “FIG. 2i shows that Hoentschel262’s spacers extend onto the epitaxial layers”:




FIG. 2i

Hoentschel262, FIG. 2i

Pet., 33 (showing annotated EX1005-Hoentschel262, Fig. 2i). However, as shown above, the contact surface between the alleged spacers (in blue in the above figure) and the alleged epitaxial layers (in yellow in the above figure) is not above the alleged surface of the substrate (in pink in the above figure). EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶55. Despite this, the Petition argues that hypothetically, if the epitaxial layers were above the substrate (which they are not, as illustrated), the contact surface between the spacers and the epitaxial layer would be above the surface of the substrate, as required by elements 1[f] and 10[f]. Pet., 33-34. Not so.

First, this is inadequate to disclose or render obvious “wherein a contact surface of the epitaxial layer and the spacer is above the surface of the semiconductor substrate,” as required by all challenged claims. Moreover, the Petition’s argument fails because Hoentschel262’s spacers, as depicted in Figure 2i, are incompatible with raised epitaxial layers that are above the substrate. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶56. A POSITA would have understood that if epitaxial layers were raised above the surface of the substrate rather than flush with the substrate, other fabrication steps would need to be altered in order to accommodate this change. *Id.* As explained above in Section III, a key characteristic of the ’194 patent’s improved fabrication process “is to form the epitaxial layer before forming the spacer.” EX1001, 7:15-16; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶56. This allows the spacers to be formed on top of raised epitaxial layers. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶56. In contrast, as explained below, in the embodiment of Hoentschel262 that the Petition relies upon, part of the spacer is formed before the alleged recesses are etched and the alleged epitaxial layers are formed. As such, Hoentschel262’s fabrication process is incompatible with raised epitaxial layers. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶56.

Hoentschel262’s Figure 2a through 2i embodiment is the only embodiment relied upon by the Petition. *See* Pet., 14-85. In this embodiment, the fabrication




FIG. 2c

EX1005-Hoentschel262, Fig. 2c (annotated); EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶58. This portion of the liner 207a persists throughout the fabrication process (*see, e.g., id.*, Figs. 2c-2i) and eventually forms part of sidewall spacer structure 216, as shown in Fig. 2i:




FIG. 2i

EX1005-Hoentschel262, Fig. 2i (annotated); EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶59. Sidewall spacer structure 216 is the spacer that the Petition identifies as allegedly satisfying elements 1[f] and 10[f]. Pet., 33.

Beyond the drawings, the sequence of deposition specified in Hoentschel262 mandates that bottom of the liner 207a is never above the substrate. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶61. As discussed above, the liner 207a is deposited on the substrate 201 prior to formation of the recesses 211p and therefore prior to the epitaxially grown material 214p. *Id.* The epitaxial growth, therefore, cannot raise

the contact surface of the liner 207a above the top of the substrate, since the liner 207a is in place before the epitaxial growth begins. *Id.*

Petitioner's reliance on Hoentschel262's reference to "overflowing" cannot change the geometry mandated by the deposition sequence. Pet., 33. Even if the epitaxial material were to somehow grow laterally to a position underneath the liner 207a, such growth would not change the vertical position of the liner 207a. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶62. Again, the liner 207a is already in position before the epitaxial growth, and lateral "overflowing" cannot change its position vertically. *Id.* Since the bottom of the vertical position of the bottom of the liner 207a is fixed at the top of the substrate, the contact surface between the liner 207a and the epitaxially-grown material 214p cannot be above the top of the substrate. *Id.*

As can be appreciated from Fig. 2i above, because the liner 207a is formed along the surface of the substrate and extends onto the epitaxial layer, and because the liner 207a is part of the sidewall spacer 216, Hoentschel262's sidewall spacer 216 is simply incompatible with a raised epitaxial layer with a top surface above the substrate. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶63. The Petition fails to address this incompatibility. Pet., 33-34. Nor does the Petition explain how or why a POSITA would have modified Hoentschel262's fabrication process to form its spacers on a raised epitaxial layer. *Id.*

Accordingly, Hoentschel262 fails to disclose or render obvious elements 1[f] and 1[f]. Thus, Grounds 1A and 1B fail.

2. Ground 1C Fails For The Same Reasons As 1A And 1B

Ground 1C adds the Wang407 reference to address additional limitations of certain dependent claims, each of which depends from either independent claim 1 or independent claim 10. Pet., 66. Ground 1C does not provide any further analysis regarding claims 1 or 10. Pet., 66-84. Thus, Ground 1C fails for the same reasons as Grounds 1A and 1B.

B. Grounds 2A, 2B, And 2C

In Grounds 2A and 2B, the Petition alleges that Wang753 anticipates (Ground 2A) and renders obvious (Ground 2B) independent claims 1 and 10 and certain claims depending from claims 1 and 10. Pet., 84. In Ground 1C, the Petition alleges the combination of Wang753 and Hoentschel262 renders obvious dependent claim 6, which depends from claim 1. Pet., 111. All of these grounds fail because Wang753 does not disclose or render obvious elements 1[e] and 10[e].

1. Wang753 Does Not Disclose Or Render Obvious “Wherein The Top Surface Of The [First] Epitaxial Layer Is Above The Surface Of The Semiconductor Substrate” (Elements 1[e]/10[e])

Wang753 does not disclose or render obvious “wherein the top surface of the epitaxial layer is above the surface of the semiconductor substrate,” as required by claims 1 and 10. Indeed, Wang753 never mentions, describes, or suggests anything

regarding the top surface of an epitaxial layer. The Petition does not assert otherwise or even attempt to identify a single mention or description of such epitaxial layers in Wang753. Pet., 92-93.

The Petition points to Wang753's "SiGe stressors" as the alleged epitaxial layer. *Id.* But Wang753 simply describes that its stressors 118 are "grown in [substrate] recesses 116," rather than grown out of and above those recesses. *E.g.*, EX1007-Wang753 at 4:10-11, 4:14-17; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶68. The Petition admits that Wang753 describes that "[t]he SiGe stressors [are] epitaxially grown *in* the recesses 116," and identifies no description of the stressors being further grown out of the recesses and above the substrate. Pet., 92 (emphasis added).

In light of the Wang753's complete failure to describe or identify any epitaxial layer with a top surface above the substrate, the Petition resorts to interpreting select figures from Wang753 in an effort to find this missing limitation. Pet., 92-93 (citing EX1007-Wang753, Figs. 5 and 6). But the Petition's attempt to rely on non-scale drawings should be rejected as (1) wrong as a matter of law; and (2) inconsistent with and not supported by the accompanying text and the drawings themselves.

a. The Petition's Attempt To Rely On Non-Scale Drawings Is Wrong As A Matter Of Law

The Petition's attempt to use patent drawings to provide claim limitations that are not described in Wang753 is improper as a matter of law, directly contrary to the

Federal Circuit’s repeated admonishment that it is reversible legal error to assess prior art and “not properly apply[] . . . our prior precedents that arguments [such as Petitioners’] based on drawings not explicitly made to scale are unavailing.” *Nystrom v. Trex Co.*, 424 F.3d 1136, 1149 (Fed. Cir. 2005).

Wang753 never states or suggests that its drawings or any elements depicted therein are to scale, and the Petition does not assert otherwise. Nor would anyone expect these simplistic drawings to be to scale, because a transistor in 2006 (when Wang753 was filed) was roughly 45 nanometers (where a human hair diameter is 50,000-100,000 nanometers), with a single chip containing hundreds of millions of transistors. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶71. Thus, no POSITA would understand Wang753’s drawings to be drawn to scale or to represent the actual shapes and proportions of their elements. *Id.*

And because the drawings and their elements are not explicitly to scale, Petitioners cannot, as they attempt to do here, properly rely on those drawings to establish and prove the “proportions,” “sizes,” or “quantitative relationship” of any elements in those drawings. *E.g., Hockerson-Halberstadt, Inc. v. Avia Group Intern.*, 222 F.3d 951, 956 (Fed. Cir. 2000). For example, in *Hockerson*, the Federal Circuit rejected as a matter of law an attempt to rely on patent drawings to establish the “quantitative relationship” between different elements in the drawings. *Id.* In doing so, the Federal Circuit stated, “it is well established that patent drawings do

not define the precise proportions of the elements and may not be relied on to show particular sizes if the specification is completely silent on the issue.” *Id.* But what the Federal Circuit forbids is exactly what Petitioners are attempting to do here.

And as the Federal Circuit has repeatedly made clear, this prohibition on relying on drawings in the manner Petitioners attempt here is well established. For example:

- “[A]rguments based on drawings not explicitly made to scale in issued patents are unavailing.” *Nystrom*, 424 F.3d at 1149.
- A POSITA “would be aware that figures in a patent are not drawn to scale unless otherwise indicated.” *Hockerson*, 222 F.3d at 956.
- “Absent any written description in the specification of quantitative values, arguments based on measurement of a drawing are of little value.” *In re Wright*, 569 F.2d 1124 (C.C.P.A. 1977).
- Absent a written description, patent drawings may not be used to evidence the shape or proportions of an element because the figures “in a drawing are not evidence of actual proportions when the drawings are not to scale.” *Plantronics, Inc. v. Aliph, Inc.*, 724 F.3d 1343, 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2013) (holding that the patent’s figures cannot be used to establish that an element of the figures has an elongated shape).

Petitioners provide no basis for their attempt to contravene this “well established” precedent. They cite—without any explanation or discussion—only a single non-precedential decision as supposedly supporting their attempt to rely on patent drawings that are not scale. Pet., 92 (citing *Regents of Univ. of Cal. v. Satco Prods., Inc.*, 2024 WL 4972639 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 4, 2024)). Petitioners’ failure to discuss or explain how this *Regents* decision supposedly supports this Petition is telling because in *Regents* the Federal Circuit (again) expressly *rejects* Petitioners’ approach.

In *Regents*, the Federal Circuit found the Board committed legal error by relying on patent drawings to establish the relative size of elements because “nothing in the [reference] indicates that its figures are drawn to scale.” *Regents*, 2024 WL 4972639, at *8-12. The Federal Circuit again warned that, contrary to the Petitioners’ grounds here, “it is well established, however, that patent drawings do not define the precise proportions of elements and may not be relied on to show particular sizes if the specification is completely silent on the issue. In other words, figures in a patent are not drawn to scale unless otherwise indicated. ***Arguments based on drawings not explicitly made to scale in issued patents’ are thus unavailing.***” *Regents*, 2024 WL 4972639, at *3 (emphasis added) (internal quotations omitted).

The patent drawings relied on in the Petition are not explicitly made to scale and Petitioners' arguments based on those drawing are "thus unavailing." For this reason alone, the Petition fails.

b. The Petition's Interpretations Of Wang753's Figures Are Unsupported By And Contradicted By The Reference Itself

Even if relying on non-scale drawings were not reversible legal error, Grounds 2A and 2B would still fail because the Petition's interpretations of Wang753's figures are inconsistent with, and not supported by, Wang753's text and the figures themselves, and thus cannot provide the required reasonable likelihood of success. Wang753 expressly describes that its "SiGe stressors" are grown "*in* recesses 116," rather than out of the recesses and above the substrate. EX1007-Wang753 at 4:10-11, 4:14-17; EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶73. Wang753's description is in direct contrast to the challenged '194 patent, which describes that its epitaxial layers are not merely grown "in" the recesses, they are further grown "higher than the surface of the semiconductor substrate": "epitaxial layer 220 is grown in the recess 218 *and may be grown higher than the surface of the semiconductor substrate 200, so as to form a raised epitaxial layer 220.*" EX1001 at 3:51-54 (emphasis added); EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶73.

Indeed, the Petition does not dispute that Wang753 fails to describe the claimed epitaxial layer "wherein the top surface of the epitaxial layer is above the

surface of the semiconductor substrate”. Instead, the Petition merely asserts that “Wang753 discloses an epitaxial growth process that takes place in the PMS source/drain recesses: ‘FIG. 5 illustrates the formation of SiGe stressors 118 and 318 in recesses 116 and 316, respectively. It is preferred that the SiGe stressors be epitaxially grown in the recesses 116 and 316.’” Pet., 92 (quoting EX1007-Wang753, 4:14-17). The Petition does not assert—and could not reasonably assert—that this passage somehow describes epitaxial layers wherein the top surface is above the substrate or otherwise describes that that Wang753’s “SiGe stressors” are further grown out from the recess and above the surface of the substrate. EX2001-McAlexander-Decl, ¶74.

Thus, because the Petition’s interpretations of Wang753’s figures find no support in, and are in fact inconsistent with, Wang753 itself, those interpretations could not provide the required reasonable likelihood of success, even absent the Federal Circuit’s clear directive that reliance on such non-scale drawings is wrong as a matter of law.

Accordingly, Wang753 fails to disclose or render obvious elements 1[e] and 10[e]. Thus, Grounds 2A and 2B fail.

2. Ground 2C Fails For The Same Reasons As Grounds 2A and 2B

Ground 2C adds Hoentschel262 to address additional limitations of dependent claims 4 and 13, which depend from independent claims 1 and 10, respectively. Pet., 111. Ground 2C does not provide any further analysis regarding claims 1 or 10. Pet., 111-114. Thus, Ground 2C fails for the same reasons as Grounds 2A and 2B.

V. CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, the Petition should be denied.

Dated: March 12, 2026

/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 6,674. This word count excludes the tables of contents, tables of authorities, certificate of word count, certificate of service, and table of exhibits.

Dated: March 12, 2026

/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:

J. Preston Long
Reg. No. 65,125
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,
FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER,
LLP
901 New York Ave. N.W.
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 408-4347
jp.long@finnegan.com
TSMC-MSL-IPR@finnegan.com

Forrest A. Jones
Reg. No. 74,123
Carlos E. Duarte-Guevara
Reg No. 80,559
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE
AND DORR LLP
901 New York Ave. N.W.
Washington, DC 20001
Phone: (202) 408-6013
forrest.jones@finnegan.com
carlos.duarte-guevara@finnegan.com

Dated: March 12, 2026

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