

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was not written for publication and is not binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 17

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte THADDEUS JOHN GABARA
and
KING LIEN TAI

Appeal No. 2000-0628
Application No. 08/838,536

ON BRIEF

Before HAIRSTON, BARRETT, and LEVY, Administrative Patent Judges.

HAIRSTON, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is an appeal from the final rejection of claims 1 through 7, 22 and 23. In an Amendment After Final¹ (paper number 7), claims 3, 4 and 22 were amended.

¹The amendment had the effect of overcoming the indefiniteness rejection of claims 3 and 4 (paper number 8).

Appeal No. 2000-0628
Application No. 08/838,536

The disclosed invention relates to an interconnection between two separate integrated circuit (IC) chips on a multi-chip module.

Claims 1 and 22 are illustrative of the claimed invention, and they read as follows:

1. A multi-chip module (MCM), comprising:

a substrate for supporting a plurality of separate integrated circuit (IC) chips thereon;

first and second separate IC chips mounted on said substrate, said first separate IC chip comprising a first circuit portion coupled to a multiplexing circuit and a buffer by at least one signal conductor; and

interconnecting means that directly couples said at least one signal conductor of said first separate IC chip to said second separate IC chip thereby bypassing said multiplexing circuit and said buffer.

22. A multi-chip module (MCM) comprising:

a first chip having a first conductive path coupled to a second conductive path through a first circuit portion, said second conductive path providing an external electrical coupling for said first chip;

a second chip having a third conductive path, said first chip separate from said second chip;

a substrate, said first chip and said second chip mounted on said substrate; and

an interconnection between said first conductive path and said third conductive path, said interconnection

Appeal No. 2000-0628
Application No. 08/838,536

bypassing at least said first circuit portion.

The references relied on by the examiner are:

Gaverick 1996	5,512,765	Apr. 30,
Katsuki et al. (Katsuki) Dec. 3, 1996	5,581,767	
Sundstrom Feb. 11, 1997	5,602,494	
Bozso et al. (Bozso) 1998	5,760,478	Jun. 2,
		(filed Aug. 20, 1996)

Claims 1 through 4, 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Gaverick.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gaverick in view of Bozso.

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gaverick in view of Sundstrom and Katsuki.

Reference is made to the briefs and the answer for the respective positions of the appellants and the examiner.

OPINION

Turning first to the 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) rejection of claims 1 through 4, 22 and 23, the examiner states (Answer, page 3) that:

Appeal No. 2000-0628
Application No. 08/838,536

Gaverick shows a MCM 10 (see cover Figure, and column 3, line 53 et seq.) with multiple chips which are connected with two data busses (column 4, line 62). Gaverick also shows multiple conductive paths to the chips.

We agree with the examiner that Gaverick discloses all of the referenced structure. On the other hand, we agree with appellants' argument (Brief, page 15; Reply Brief, page 2) that Gaverick uses conventional bonding pads, as opposed to an interconnection/interconnecting means that permits a portion of the circuitry between the two ICs to be bypassed, to connect one IC to another IC. Thus, "Gaverick does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention and as such, fails to anticipate independent Claims 1 and 22" (Brief, page 15). In short, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) rejection of claims 1 through 4, 22 and 23 is reversed.

Turning lastly to the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 5 through 7, these rejections are reversed because we also agree with appellants' argument (Reply Brief, page 2) that "neither Bozso, Sundstrom nor Katsuki cures the deficiencies of Gaverick."

Appeal No. 2000-0628
Application No. 08/838,536

DECISION

The decision of the examiner rejecting claims 1 through 4, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) is reversed, and the decision of the examiner rejecting claims 5 through 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is reversed.

REVERSED

)	
KENNETH W. HAIRSTON)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	
)	
)	
)	BOARD OF PATENT
LEE E. BARRETT))
Administrative Patent Judge)	APPEALS AND
)	
)	INTERFERENCES
)	
STUART S. LEVY)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	

KWH:hh

Appeal No. 2000-0628
Application No. 08/838,536

ROGER S. BURLEIGH
HITT, CHWANG & GAINES, P.C.
225 UNIVERSITY PLAZA
275 WEST CAMPBELL ROAD
RICHARDSON, TX 75080