

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was **not** written for and is **not** binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 36

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte JING S. GOH

Appeal No. 2003-0249
Application 08/863,848

HEARD: June 11, 2003

Before FLEMING, DIXON, and SAADAT, **Administrative Patent Judges**.
FLEMING, **Administrative Patent Judge**.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is a decision on appeal from the final rejection of claims 1 through 8, all the claims pending in the instant application.

Invention

The invention relates to packaging semiconductor devices, and more particularly to packaging board on chip devices. Figure 1 illustrates that solder balls 100 are connected to the

semiconductor die 114 by wires 118. The wires 118 extend from semiconductor die 114 through a hole 120 of the printed circuit board. The hole through the printed circuit board 122 may be positioned at the central longitudinal axis of the printed circuit board.

The independent claim 1 present in the application is reproduced as follows:

1. A package for an integrated circuit having wires for electrical connection, comprising:

a circuit board for mounting the integrated circuit having a first surface and a second surface;

a connector device positioned on the first surface of the circuit board for electrically connecting the integrated circuit by said wires;

said integrated circuit being positioned on the second surface of said circuit board; and

said wires being centrally positioned on said integrated circuit to abut said first surface of the circuit board.

References

The references relied on by the Examiner are as follows:

King et al. (King)	5,677,566	Oct. 14, 1997 (filed May 8, 1995)
Kata et al. (Kata)	5,683,942	Nov. 4, 1997 (filed May 25, 1995)
Nakamura et al. (Nakamura)	5,777,391	Jul. 7, 1998 (filed Dec. 11, 1995)

Appeal No. 2003-0249
Application 08/863,848

Rejections at Issue

Claims 1, 2 and 5 through 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Nakamura. Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nakamura and Kata. Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nakamura and King.

OPINION

With full consideration being given to the subject matter on appeal, the Examiner's rejections and the arguments of Appellant and Examiner, for the reasons stated **infra**, we reverse the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 2 and 5 through 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102, and we reverse the Examiner's rejection of claims 3, 4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

We first will address the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 5 through 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Anticipation can be found only if the prior art reference discloses every element of the claim. **See In re King**, 801 F.2d 1324, 1326, 231 USPQ 136, 138 (Fed. Cir. 1986) and **Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. America Hoist & Derrick Co.**, 730 F.2d 1452, 1458, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Appeal No. 2003-0249
Application 08/863,848

Appellant argues that the claimed invention requires a wire centrally positioned on the integrated surface. Appellant argues that this limitation is not disclosed or suggested by Nakamura. See page 4 of Appellant's brief.

As pointed out by our reviewing court, we must first determine the scope of the claim. "[T]he name of the game is the claim." **In re Hiniker Co.**, 150 F.3d 1362, 1369, 47 USPQ2d 1523, 1529 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

We note that Appellant's only independent claim 1 recites "said wires being centrally positioned on said integrated circuit to abut said first surface of the circuit board." We further note that on page 5 of the Appellant's specification, Appellant states that the hole through the printed circuit board 122 may be positioned at the central longitudinal axis of the printed circuit board. Appellant also shows and discloses that wires 118 are placed through hole 120. See figures 1 and 2 as well as page 5 of Appellant's specification. We fail to find that the Appellant has provided a special definition for the claimed term "centrally".

As our reviewing court states, "[T]he terms used in the claims bear a 'heavy presumption' that they mean what they say and have the ordinary meaning that would be attributed to those

Appeal No. 2003-0249
Application 08/863,848

words by persons skilled in the relevant art.” **Tex. Digital Sys., Inc. v. Telegenix, Inc**, 308 F.3 1193, 1201-02, 64 USPQ2d 1812, 1817 (Fed. Cir. 2002) **cert. denied**, 155 L. Ed. 2d 1108, 2003 U.S. Lexis 3734 (2003).

Turning to **Webster’s New World Dictionary**¹, we find that the ordinary meaning of the term “centrally” is “in, at, or near the center.”

Turning to the specification, we note that Appellant discloses wires 118 extending along the longitudinal axis of the printed circuit board. We note that the wires toward the ends of the axis certainly could not be considered centrally positioned as claimed. However, we note that the Appellant’s independent claim 1 uses the term “comprising” so that the claim is only directed to those wires shown in figure 2 that could be considered centrally positioned and not necessarily all the wires along the central longitudinal axis.

Turning to Nakamura, we find that Nakamura discloses wires 6 attaching to the edge of the integrated circuit 2. See figure 2 and figure 4. Nakamura does not teach “wires being centrally

¹**Webster’s New World Dictionary**, Third Edition, copyright 1998. A copy of the appropriate page is provided.

Appeal No. 2003-0249
Application 08/863,848

positioned on said integrated circuit" as recited in Appellant's claim 1. We note that claims 2 and 5 through 7 depend on claim 1 and thereby also recite this limitation through their dependency. Therefore, we will not sustain the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 2 and 5 through 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Now we turn to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103. We note that the Examiner relies on Nakamura for the teaching of the limitation of having "wires being centrally positioned on said integrated circuit" for both of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Therefore, we will not sustain these rejections for the same reasons as stated above.

Appeal No. 2003-0249
Application 08/863,848

In view of the foregoing, we have not sustained the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 2 and 5 through 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Furthermore, we have not sustained the Examiner's rejection of claims 3, 4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

REVERSED

MICHAEL R. FLEMING)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	
)	
)	
)	BOARD OF PATENT
JOSEPH L. DIXON)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	APPEALS AND
)	
)	INTERFERENCES
)	
MAHSHID SAADAT)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	

MRF:pgg

Appeal No. 2003-0249
Application 08/863,848

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 95266