

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

VOLKSWAGEN GROUP OF AMERICA, INC. and  
PORSCHE CARS NORTH AMERICA, INC.,  
Petitioner

v.

YECHEZKAL EVAN SPERO,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2023-00315<sup>1</sup>  
U.S. Patent No. 9,955,551

---

**PETITIONER VOLKSWAGEN GROUP OF AMERICA, INC.’S REPLY TO  
PATENT OWNER’S OPPOSITION TO PETITIONER’S MOTION TO  
EXCLUDE EVIDENCE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c)**

***Mail Stop “PATENT BOARD”***

Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

---

<sup>1</sup> Porsche Cars North America, Inc., which filed a petition in IPR2023-01225, has been joined as a party to this proceeding.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|     |                                                                                                                                                                                               |   |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| I.  | INTRODUCTION.....                                                                                                                                                                             | 1 |
| II. | ARGUMENT .....                                                                                                                                                                                | 2 |
| A.  | Patent Owner did not dispute the Petition’s POSA definition, the<br>agreed-upon definition has not changed, and there is no credible<br>argument that Dr. Turk’s testimony is admissible..... | 2 |
| B.  | Patent Owner waived its right to dispute the POSA definition. ....                                                                                                                            | 4 |
| C.  | Patent Owner misrepresents Petitioner’s considerations for the<br>POSA’s skill level. ....                                                                                                    | 5 |

## I. INTRODUCTION

This Motion to Exclude is simple. The parties agreed that a POSA required “at least 2 years of *industry experience in the area of automotive lighting and lighting-control systems*.” Pet., 7; POR, 9 (emphasis added unless noted). Patent Owner did not dispute the definition despite the invitation to do so. Dr. Turk *himself* accepted this level of skill. Yet Dr. Turk falls short of this skill level, so his testimony is not admissible under *Kyocera* and the FRE.

Patent Owner’s disingenuous assertion that the POSA definition was a “new” argument in Petitioner’s Reply is belied by its acknowledgement—*before filing its POR*—that it understood Petitioner’s challenge to Dr. Turk’s qualification as a POSA: “*To the extent you are implying that Dr. Turk’s education or experience does not satisfy Petitioner’s proposed level of skill in the art*, then please review Petitioner’s Expert’s qualifying statement: ‘a higher level of education or skill might make up for less experience and vice versa.’ (Ex. 1003, ¶45.)” EX2027, 1; Opp., 5 (“Petitioner first suggested its new narrow interpretation of the POSA level in its objection to Ex.2001 on July 6, 2023.”). Patent Owner nonetheless declined the Board’s invitation to explain “the extent” Patent Owner “believes the level of ordinary skill affects this proceeding” (Institution Decision, 7). Patent Owner cannot now feign, with self-serving hindsight, that it “understood” its POPR POSA definition was “effectively incorporated” in

Petitioner's definition. Opp., 3.

Patent Owner now veers in a new direction, alleging the “seminal” issue is “whether optics and sensing/imaging experience are relevant to the POSA level.” *Id.*, 1. But this diversion misses the mark entirely. Whether other technologies may also be “relevant” to the POSA level does *not* eliminate the agreed-upon requirement here that a POSA have “at least 2 years of industry experience in the area of automotive lighting and lighting-control systems.” *Id.*, 2. Of course, in “adaptive motor vehicle headlamps with LED light sources” (MTE, 4 (cited by Opp., 1)), experience in optics and sensing/imaging—within the context automotive lighting and lighting control—may aid a POSA's knowledge and understanding. But optics and sensing/imaging as it pertains to, for example, Dr. Turk's experience with computer vision/facial recognition (EX2001, ¶¶7, 10, 12, 15-16; EX2006, ¶¶9-10, 12, 14, 17-20; EX2002, 4) does *not* satisfy (or replace) the agreed-upon industry experience in “automotive lighting and lighting-control systems.” Pet., 7.

## II. ARGUMENT

### A. Patent Owner did not dispute the Petition's POSA definition, the agreed-upon definition has not changed, and there is no credible argument that Dr. Turk's testimony is admissible.

Patent Owner again acknowledges it did not dispute the POSA definition (Opp., 3); and Dr. Turk *himself* accepted the level of skill (EX1053, 22:14-23:13)

that he does not meet. So his declarations must be excluded. *Kyocera Senco Indus. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*, 22 F.4th 1369, 1375-78 (Fed. Cir. 2022). The POSA definition in *Kyocera* also permitted a “sliding scale” of education and experience. *Id.* at 1376. But that did not excuse the need for experience in the specified field of power nailer design, *id.* at 1377-78, just as here it does not excuse the need for experience in automotive lighting and lighting-control systems.

Arguing merits, not admissibility, Patent Owner claims that Petitioner’s Reply provides a “new interpretation of its proposed POSA skill level, one that requires specific industry experience.” Opp., 4 (emphasis in Opp.). The Board need look no further than the Petition itself, which plainly required “at least 2 years of industry experience in the area of automotive lighting and lighting-control systems,” Pet., 7, to find that Patent Owner’s argument is demonstrably false.

Of course there is no requirement that Dr. Turk have the “same exact CV as Dr. Jiao.” Opp., 4; *cf. Tecossl, Inc. v. Avid Labs, LLC*, 5:19-cv-00043, Dkt. No. 183 (E.D. Ky. Feb. 9, 2024) (granting motion to exclude proffered expert because his “substantially impressive resume” could not overcome that he lacked the technical experience required of a POSA). But as Patent Owner again acknowledges, Dr. Turk has no experience with a vehicle headlamp company, an LED (or any other light source) company, or lighting design, or awards/patents for a vehicle forward lighting system. Opp., 4-5. These are *not pre-requisites* of a

POSA here, despite Patent Owner’s attempt to paint them as “new” additions to the POSA definition. *See id.* But their absence, along with Dr. Turk’s unfamiliarity with key terms and authorities, revealed in his direct and cross-examination testimony, is *further evidence* he is not a POSA. Tellingly, Patent Owner did not even attempt to rebut Petitioner’s discussion of Dr. Turk’s reliance on a supposed “test” that he did not even supervise, or Dr. Turk’s inability to answer basic questions about LEDs during his deposition—two pieces of evidence that further demonstrate Dr. Turk is not a POSA. MTE, 8. And while Dr. Jiao of course acknowledged that optics and imaging/sensing may be part of adaptive automotive lighting, it does not follow that any person with generic experience in optics and imaging/sensing is qualified to opine on a POSA’s understanding of “automotive lighting and lighting-control systems.” *See id.*, 3-4. Patent Owner has not met *its burden* of establishing Dr. Turk’s testimony as admissible; so it must be excluded.

Finally, Dr. Turk’s alleged experience on an “illumination portion” of a Martin Marietta project (MTE, 6-7) still falls short—Patent Owner even *admits* that “adaptive automotive lighting, such as that claimed in the ’551 Patent is more sophisticated than just illumination,” Opp., 12, as in Dr. Turk’s project.

**B. Patent Owner waived its right to dispute the POSA definition.**

Precisely contrary to Patent Owner’s position, Opp., 5-6, it did, in fact, waive its right to contest the POSA definition by choosing not to do so in its POR.

Patent Owner made *no attempt* to distinguish or respond to Petitioner’s controlling authorities. MTE, 14 (citing *Intuitive Surgical, Finjan, In re Nuvasive*, CTPG, p. 52). Instead, Patent Owner again argues Petitioner provided a “new interpretation” of the POSA in the Reply, in order to make its *own* new POSA arguments. Opp., 4-6. But Petitioner’s position has never changed. So Patent Owner’s new arguments were waived, despite its remorse. “Patent Owner could have, and should have, raised this [POSA-definition] argument in its Patent Owner Response,” if it was disputed. *Intuitive*, IPR2020-00650, Paper 33, at 33 n.4 (citing 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b)). Instead, Patent Owner agreed with Petitioner. POR, 9; EX1053, 22:14-23:13.

**C. Patent Owner misrepresents Petitioner’s considerations for the POSA’s skill level.**

Again arguing merits and not admissibility, Patent Owner makes numerous unsupported assertions about what Petitioner allegedly “did not consider” for the POSA definition. Opp., 6-8. But Petitioner, via Dr. Jiao, listed myriad considerations for the POSA skill level. EX1003, ¶¶29-32. And Dr. Jiao provided plenty of context on the patent’s purpose, education of those in the field, and types of technological problems and solutions faced by those in the art. *Id.*, ¶¶44-62. In deposition, Dr. Jiao confirmed that the relevant “experience” is industry experience “[i]n the area of automotive lighting and lighting control.” EX2025, 89:20-90:7.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC

/Jason A. Fitzsimmons/

Jason A. Fitzsimmons  
Registration No. 65,367  
Attorney for Petitioner  
Volkswagen Group of America, Inc.

Date: March 13, 2024

1101 K Street, NW, 10th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 371-2600

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE (37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e))**

I certify that the above-captioned **PETITIONER VOLKSWAGEN  
GROUP OF AMERICA, INC.'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S  
OPPOSITION TO PETITIONER'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE  
EVIDENCE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c)** was served in its entirety on  
March 13, 2024, upon the following parties via electronic mail:

**Yechezkal Evan Spero**

Sangeeta G. Shah (Lead Counsel)  
David S. Bir (Back-up Counsel)  
Andrew B. Turner (Back-up Counsel)  
BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.  
[TRCH0112IPR@brookskushman.com](mailto:TRCH0112IPR@brookskushman.com)  
[TRCH0112IPR1@brookskushman.com](mailto:TRCH0112IPR1@brookskushman.com)

**Porsche Cars North America, Inc.**

Edgar H. Haug (Lead Counsel)  
Robert E. Colletti (Back-up Counsel)  
HAUG PARTNERS LLP  
[ehaug@haugpartners.com](mailto:ehaug@haugpartners.com)  
[rcolletti@haugpartners.com](mailto:rcolletti@haugpartners.com)  
[PTAB-Porsche@haugpartners.com](mailto:PTAB-Porsche@haugpartners.com)

Respectfully submitted,  
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC

/Jason A. Fitzsimmons/

Jason A. Fitzsimmons  
Registration No. 65,367  
Attorney for Petitioner  
Volkswagen Group of America, Inc.

Date: March 13, 2024  
1101 K Street, NW, 10th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 371-2600