

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was not written for publication in a law journal and is not binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 21

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte NADIM HADDAD, CHARLES N. ALCORN,
JONATHAN MAIMON, LEONARD R. ROCKETT
and SCOTT DOYLE

Appeal No. 2003-2013
Application No. 09/491,230

ON BRIEF

Before KIMLIN, JEFFREY T. SMITH and PAWLIKOWSKI, Administrative Patent Judges.

KIMLIN, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is an appeal from the final rejection of claims 6-19.

Claim 6 is illustrative:

6. A resistor, comprising:

a first passivation layer overlying a semiconductor substrate having a plurality of transistors;

Appeal No. 2003-2013
Application No. 09/491,230

renders it obvious within the meaning of § 103. Accordingly, we will not sustain the examiner's rejections.

The basis of the examiner's rejections over Matthews is finding that the gate and source regions of Matthews meet the requirements for the claimed first and second bottom contacts, respectively. In other words, it is the examiner's position that the gate and source of Matthews are contacts which meet the requirements of the presently claimed first and second bottom contacts. Appellants, on the other hand, contend that when one of ordinary skill in the art interprets the claim language in light of the specification, such a skilled artisan would not read the first and second bottom contacts as including the gate and source regions of Matthews.

We must acknowledge that there is a certain appeal in the examiner's position. Manifestly, the source and gate of Matthews are made of a conductive material and serve to pass current from one body to another, as urged by the examiner. However, it is well settled that claim language is given its broadest reasonable meaning during prosecution as it would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, taking into consideration the description of the applicant's specification. In re Morris,

Appeal No. 2003-2013
Application No. 09/491,230

127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). In the present case, appellants' specification describes that the contacts, or studs, are made from tungsten, aluminum, or copper, and the specification also discloses other areas of the device as gate and source regions (14a, 14b and 17a, 17b, respectively). Hence, we find it reasonable to conclude that one of ordinary skill in the art would not interpret the claimed first and second bottom contacts as inclusive of gate and source regions and, therefore, it is our opinion that the gate and source regions of Matthews are not a description of the claimed bottom contacts within the meaning of § 102. In our view, appellants' arguments during prosecution establish, via file wrapper estoppel, that the claimed first and second bottom contacts do not encompass gate and source regions.

As for the examiner's § 103 rejection, the examiner has not presented a rationale why it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Matthews to incorporate the claimed first and second bottom contacts in addition to the gate and source regions.

Appeal No. 2003-2013
Application No. 09/491,230

In conclusion, based on the foregoing, the examiner's
decision rejecting the appealed claims is reversed.

REVERSED

EDWARD C. KIMLIN)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	
)	
)	
)	
)	
)	
JEFFREY T. SMITH)	BOARD OF PATENT
Administrative Patent Judge)	APPEALS AND
)	INTERFERENCES
)	
)	
)	
BEVERLY PAWLIKOWSKI)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	

ECK:clm

Appeal No. 2003-2013
Application No. 09/491,230

Bracewell & Patterson, L.L.P.
Intellectual Property Law
P.O. Box 969
Austin, TX 78767-0969