

**H WUNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

**Before The Honorable Monica Bhattacharyya
Administrative Law Judge**

In The Matter Of

CERTAIN HIGH-STRENGTH ALUMINUM
OR ALUMINUM-ALLOY COATED
STEEL, AND AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS
AND AUTOMOBILES CONTAINING
SAME

Inv. No. 337-TA-1402

COMPLAINANT'S PRE-HEARING BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Procedural History	3
B. The Parties	3
1. Complainant ArcelorMittal	3
2. The VinFast Respondents	4
C. Overview of the Technology	5
D. The Patents at Issue	5
E. The Products at Issue	9
1. VinFast's Accused Products	9
2. The Domestic Industry Products	9
F. ArcelorMittal's Testing of VinFast and DI Products	11
II. JURISDICTION	13
III. THE '602 PATENT	14
A. Claim Construction	14
1. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	14
2. Agreed Constructions	14
B. Infringement	15
1. Claim 1	16
2. Claim 2	19
3. Claim 3	20
4. Claim 7	24
5. Claim 8	24
6. Claim 9	25

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
7. Claim 20.....	25
8. Claim 21.....	25
9. Claim 22.....	27
10. Claim 24.....	28
11. Claim 26.....	30
C. Dr. Brown’s Opinions on Infringement	31
1. Dr. Brown’s Opinions Depend on an Improper Meaning of “Layer”	31
2. Dr. Brown’s Annotations Do Not Show Noninfringement	36
3. Dr. Brown’s “Coating” Thickness Opinions	39
4. Dr. Brown’s Opinions Regarding Claim 2	40
5. Dr. Brown’s Opinions Regarding Claims 9 and 26	40
D. Domestic Industry – “Technical Prong”	41
1. Claim 1	46
2. Claim 2	49
3. Claim 3	50
4. Claim 4	52
5. Claim 7	54
6. Claim 8	54
7. Claim 9	54
8. Claim 10	55
9. Claim 18	55
10. Claim 20	56

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
11. Claim 21	56
12. Claim 22	58
13. Claim 24	58
14. Claim 26	61
E. Dr. Brown’s Opinions on Technical Domestic Industry	61
1. Dr. Brown’s Opinions Depend on an Improper Meaning of “Layer”	61
2. Dr. Brown’s Annotations Do Not Show the Direct DI Products Fail to Practice the Claims of the ’602 Patent	62
3. Dr. Brown’s “Coating” Thickness Opinions	63
4. Dr. Brown’s Opinions Regarding Claim 2	63
5. Dr. Brown’s Opinions Regarding Claims 7 and 8	64
6. Dr. Brown’s Opinions Regarding Claims 9, 18, and 26	64
7. Dr. Brown’s Opinions Regarding Claim 10	65
F. Validity	65
1. Priority Date of the Asserted Patents	65
2. Overview of Alleged Prior Art References	66
3. The ’602 Patent is Not Anticipated or Obvious Under §§ 102 and 103	71
4. The Claims of the ’602 Patent Are Not Invalid Based on “Preferred Hot Stamping Process” Or “Technical Domestic Industry”	114
5. The Claims of the ’602 Patent Are Not Invalid for Lack of Written Description Under ¶ 112	115
6. The Claims of the ’602 Patent Are Not Indefinite Under § 112	118
7. The ’602 Patent Is Not Invalid Under § 101	128

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
IV. THE '227 PATENT	134
A. Claim Construction	134
1. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	134
2. Agreed Constructions	134
B. Infringement	135
1. Claim 1	135
2. Claim 2	138
3. Claim 4	138
4. Claim 5	139
5. Claim 7	139
6. Claim 8	140
7. Claim 9	140
8. Claim 10	140
9. Claim 11	141
10. Claim 13	141
11. Claim 15	141
12. Claim 16	142
13. Claim 17	144
14. Claim 24	147
C. Dr. Brown's Opinions on Infringement	148
1. Dr. Brown's Opinions Regarding Claims 8 and 11	148
2. Dr. Brown's Opinions Regarding Claim 13	148

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
D. Domestic Industry – “Technical Prong”	148
1. Claim 1	149
2. Claim 2	152
3. Claim 4	152
4. Claim 5	153
5. Claim 7	153
6. Claim 9	153
7. Claim 10	154
8. Claim 13	154
9. Claim 15	154
10. Claim 16	154
11. Claim 17	156
12. Claim 24	158
E. Dr. Brown’s Opinions on Technical Domestic Industry	158
1. Dr. Brown’s Opinions Regarding Claim 2	158
2. Dr. Brown’s Opinions Regarding Claim 5	159
3. Dr. Brown’s Opinions Regarding Claim 10	159
4. Dr. Brown’s Opinions Regarding Claim 13	159
5. Dr. Brown’s Opinions Regarding Claims 16 and 17	159
F. Validity	160
1. The ’227 Patent is Not Anticipated or Obvious Under §§ 102 or 103	160

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
2. The Claims of the '227 Patent Are Not Invalid Based on “Preferred Hot Stamping Process” Or “Technical Domestic Industry”	177
3. The Claims of the '227 Patent Are Not Invalid for Lack of Written Description Under ¶ 112	177
4. The Claims of the '227 Patent Are Not Indefinite Under § 112	177
5. The '227 Patent Is Not Invalid Under § 101	178
V. DOMESTIC INDUSTRY – ECONOMIC PRONG	178
A. Significant Investment in Plant and Equipment/Labor and Capital – Precursor Products	182
1. AM/NS Calvert	182
2. [REDACTED]	198
B. Summary of DI Precursor Investments	203
C. Significant Investment in Plant and Equipment/Labor and Capital – Direct Products	205
1. [REDACTED]	205
2. [REDACTED]	208
3. [REDACTED]	211
4. [REDACTED]	214
5. [REDACTED]	217
6. [REDACTED]	220
7. [REDACTED]	223
D. Significant Exploitation of the Asserted Patents in Engineering, Research, and Development	225
E. Significance/Substantiality	226
VI. REMEDY AND BONDING	236

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
A. Limited Exclusion Order.....	236
B. Cease and Desist Order.....	238
C. Bond.....	241