[redacted]

UNITED 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**	**Investigation No. 337-TA-1402**

EXPERT REPORT OF DR. STUART B. BROWN REGARDING
INVALIDITY OF U.S. PATENTS 10,961,602 AND 11,326,227

Dated: November 25, 2024.

Signed: Stuart Brown

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS 2

A. Background and Qualifications 2

B. Compensation and Prior Testimony 3

C. Scope of Work 4

D. Materials Considered 4

III. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS 5

IV. UNDERSTANDING OF APPLICABLE LEGAL STANDARDS 6

A. Priority 7

B. Patent Eligibility (35 U.S.C. § 101) 7

C. Anticipation (35 U.S.C. § 102) 9

D. Obviousness (35 U.S.C. § 103) 11

E. Indefiniteness (35 U.S.C. § 112) 14

V. STATE OF THE ART 15

A. Hot-stamping of coated steel strips to obtain multi-layer coatings was well known 15

VI. THE ASSERTED PATENTS 18

A. Overview of ’602 and ’227 Patents 18

B. Prosecution History of ’227 and ’602 Patents 20

VII. PRIORITY DATES OF THE ASSERTED CLAIMS 21

VIII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 22

IX. OPINION AS TO THE LEVEL OF SKILL OF A PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART 23

X. OVERVIEW OF THE PRIOR ART 24

A. 2006 Volkswagen Passat 24

[redacted]

B. Engels 34

C. Cornette 38

D. Vaissiere 40

E. Laurent 41

F. Takagi 42

G. Hein 44

H. GMW14400 46

I. Nishibata WO 47

J. Nishibata US 48

K. Suehiro II 48

L. Lachmann 52

XI. ANALYSIS OF THE ’602 PATENT IN VIEW OF THE PRIOR ART 54

A. Takagi in combination with Cornette 54

B. Takagi in combination with Cornette and Laurent 81

C. Takagi in combination with Cornette and Nishibata US 84

D. Takagi in combination with Hein and GMW14400 88

E. Takagi in combination with Hein, GMW14400, and Laurent 111

F. Takagi in combination with Hein, GMW14400, and Nishibata WO 113

G. Cornette 115

H. Cornette in combination with Nishibata US 158

I. Suehiro II alone or Suehiro II in combination with Cornette 160

J. Suehiro II in combination with Cornette and GMW14400 190

K. Suehiro II in combination with Cornette and Laurent 192

L. Suehiro II in combination with Cornette and Nishibata US 196

M. Engels 199

ArcelorMittal Ex. 2003
Posco Co. LTD. v. ArcelorMittal
IPR2024-01377
Page 3 of 5

[redacted]

N. Engels in combination with Cornette 222

O. Engels in combination with Laurent 226

P. Engels in combination with Nishibata WO 228

Q. Engels in combination with Cornette and Nishibata WO 230

R. Engels in combination with Cornette and Laurent 231

S. Engels in combination with Takagi 231

T. Passat 1049 234

U. Lachman 262

V. Lachmann in combination with Cornette 283

W. Lachmann in combination with Laurent 289

X. Lachmann in combination with Nishibata US 292

XII. ANALYSIS OF THE ’227 PATENT IN VIEW OF THE PRIOR ART 295

A. Takagi in combination with Cornette 295

B. Takagi in combination with Cornette and Vaissiere 308

C. Takagi in combination with Cornette and Laurent 309

D. Takagi in combination with Hein and GMW14400 310

E. Takagi in combination with Hein, GMW14400, and Vaissiere 322

F. Takagi in combination with Hein, GMW14400, and Laurent 323

G. Cornette 324

H. Cornette in combination with Nishibata US 342

I. Suehiro II in combination with Cornette 344

J. Suehiro II in combination with Cornette and Vaissiere 358

K. Suehiro II in combination with Cornette and Laurent 360

L. Engels 360

M. Engels in combination with Cornette 373

ArcelorMittal Ex. 2003
Posco Co. LTD. v. ArcelorMittal
IPR2024-01377
Page 4 of 5

[redacted]

N. Engels in combination with Takagi 376

O. Engels in combination with Hein.....379

P. Engels in combination with Vaissiere.....382

Q. Engels in combination with Laurent 382

R. Passat 1049.....383

S. Lachmann.....401

T. Lachmann in combination with Cornette.....411

U. Lachmann in combination with Vaissiere.....412

V. Lachmann in combination with Laurent 413

XIII. NO SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NONOBVIOUSNESS 414

XIV. THE ASSERTED PATENTS ARE INVALID BECAUSE THE PREFERRED HOT STAMPING PROCESSES AND THE ALLEGED TECHNICAL DOMESTIC INDUSTRY HOT STAMPING PROCESSES OVERLAP WITH KNOWN PRIOR ART HOT STAMPING.....420

A. Prior Art Hot Stamping Processes Were Able to Create the Claimed Four-Layer Structure 422

B. The Preferred Hot Stamping Processes of the Asserted Patents Overlaps With Prior Art Hot Stamping Processes.....431

C. The Hot Stamping Processes That Generate the Alleged Domestic Industry Products Overlap With Prior Art Hot Stamping Processes 437

D. Magna Hot-Stamping of USIBOR 1500P in the United States in 2004.....443

XV. THE ASSERTED CLAIMS ARE INVALID UNDER SECTION 112 456

A. The Asserted Claims Are Indefinite 456

XVI. THE ASSERTED CLAIMS DO NOT RECITE PATENT ELIGIBLE SUBJECT MATTER 471

XVII. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS AND CONCLUSION.....473

Appendix A: Materials Considered 1

ArcelorMittal Ex. 2003
Posco Co. LTD. v. ArcelorMittal
IPR2024-01377
Page 5 of 5