

**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

RESPONDENTS' CORRECTED PRE-HEARING BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
A.	Procedural History	2
B.	The Parties	3
1.	Complainant.....	3
2.	Respondents	3
C.	Overview of the Technology	3
D.	The Patents at Issue—U.S. Patent Nos. 10,961,602 & 11,326,227	5
E.	The Products at Issue	5
1.	The Accused Products.....	5
2.	The Domestic Industry Products.....	6
i.	The DI Precursor Products.....	6
ii.	The DI Direct Products	6
F.	Testing of VinFast, DI Products, and Prior Art Volkswagen Passat	7
II.	JURISDICTION AND IMPORTATION	7
III.	U.S. PATENT NO. 10,961,602	8
A.	Claim Construction	8
1.	Level of Skill of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	8
B.	Noninfringement.....	9
1.	All Asserted Claims of the '602 Patent.....	9
i.	ArcelorMittal failed to establish that Accused Products have the claimed “interdiffusion layer,” “intermediate layer,” “intermetallic layer,” and “superficial layer”9	
ii.	ArcelorMittal failed to establish that Accused Products have a “coating” that “has a thickness greater than 30 micrometers”	12
2.	Claim 2.....	15
3.	Claims 9 and 26	16
C.	No Technical Domestic Industry	16
1.	Overview of the Domestic Industry Products.....	17
i.	Lack of Representativeness.....	18
2.	ArcelorMittal failed to establish DI Direct Products practice the DI Claims	21
i.	All DI Claims of the '602 Patent	21

a. ArcelorMittal failed to establish that DI Direct Products have the claimed “interdiffusion layer,” “intermediate layer,” “intermetallic layer,” and “superficial layer”	21
b. DI Direct Products lack “coatings” that “have a thickness greater than 30 micrometers”	24
ii. Claim 2	26
iii. Claims 7 and 8	27
iv. Claims 9, 18, and 26	28
v. Claim 10	28
D. Invalidity	30
1. ArcelorMittal failed to establish earlier priority date	30
2. Overview of the Prior Art	33
i. [REDACTED] DI Direct Product	33
ii. 2006 Volkswagen Passat	35
iii. Engels	38
iv. Cornette	40
v. Vaissiere	42
vi. Laurent	43
vii. Takagi	44
viii. Hein	46
ix. GMW14400	47
x. Suehiro II	48
xi. Lachmann	50
3. Anticipation Under 35 U.S.C. § 102	52
i. 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	52
ii. Passat 1049	63
a. Claim 1	64
b. Claim 2	68
c. Claim 3	69

d.	Claim 4.....	69
e.	Claim 7.....	69
f.	Claim 8.....	70
g.	Claim 9.....	70
h.	Claim 10.....	70
i.	Claim 18.....	70
j.	Claim 20.....	70
k.	Claim 21.....	71
l.	Claim 22.....	71
m.	Claim 24.....	71
n.	Claim 26.....	72
iii.	Cornette.....	72
a.	Claim 1.....	72
b.	Claim 2.....	78
c.	Claim 3.....	78
d.	Claim 4.....	78
e.	Claim 7.....	79
f.	Claim 8.....	79
g.	Claim 9.....	80
h.	Claim 10.....	80
i.	Claim 18.....	81
j.	Claim 20.....	81
k.	Claim 21.....	81
l.	Claim 22.....	81
m.	Claim 24.....	82
n.	Claim 26.....	82
iv.	Lachman.....	82
a.	Claim 1.....	83
b.	Claim 2.....	86
c.	Claim 3.....	87
d.	Claim 4.....	87

e.	Claim 20.....	88
f.	Claim 21.....	88
g.	Claim 22.....	89
h.	Claim 24.....	89
v.	Engels.....	90
a.	Claim 1.....	90
b.	Claim 2.....	94
c.	Claim 9.....	95
d.	Claim 10.....	96
e.	Claim 18.....	96
f.	Claim 20.....	96
g.	Claim 21.....	97
h.	Claim 22.....	97
i.	Claim 24.....	97
j.	Claim 26.....	97
4.	Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103	97
i.	Level of Skill of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	98
ii.	Takagi Grounds.....	98
a.	Takagi in combination with Cornette	98
b.	Takagi in combination with Cornette and Laurent	114
iii.	Cornette Grounds	116
a.	Cornette alone	116
iv.	Suehiro II Grounds.....	120
a.	Suehiro II in combination with Cornette	120
b.	Suehiro II in combination with Cornette and Laurent	135
v.	Lachman Grounds.....	137
a.	Lachmann alone	137
b.	Lachmann in combination with Cornette.....	139
c.	Lachmann in combination with Laurent	142
vi.	Engels Grounds.....	144
a.	Engels alone	144

b. Engels in combination with Cornette.....	146
c. Engels in combination with Laurent.....	149
5. Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness.....	150
i. No nexus between commercial success and Asserted Patents.....	150
ii. No proof of long-felt but unresolved need.....	153
iii. No unexpected result.....	154
6. Indefiniteness Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 – “Layer”	155
7. Invalidity Under § 101	160
i. The Asserted Patents claim merely describe a “result” of “a natural law” without specifying “any physical structure or steps for achieving the claimed result.”	162
ii. The claims fall under the “product of nature” exception,.....	163
iii. The asserted claims preempt all potential methods for achieving the same result.	163
iv. The Asserted Claims Lack Utility Under Section 101.....	164
IV. U.S. PATENT NO. 11,326,227	164
A. Claim Construction	165
B. Noninfringement.....	165
1. All Asserted Claims of the ’227 Patents.....	165
i. ArcelorMittal failed to establish that Accused Products have the claimed “interdiffusion layer,” “intermediate layer,” “intermetallic layer,” and “superficial layer”	165
ii. ArcelorMittal failed to establish that Accused Products have a “coating” that “has a thickness greater than 30 micrometers”	166
2. Claim 5 of the ’227 patent	166
3. Claims 8 and 11 of the ’227 patent	166
4. Claim 13 of the ’227 patent	167
C. No Technical Domestic Industry	167
1. ArcelorMittal failed to establish DI Direct Products practice the DI Claims	168
i. All DI Claims of the ’227 Patent	168
a. ArcelorMittal failed to establish that DI Direct Products have the claimed “interdiffusion layer,” “intermediate layer,” “intermetallic layer,” and “superficial layer”	168

b.	ArcelorMittal failed to establish that DI Direct Products have a “coating” that “has a thickness greater than 30 micrometers”	168
ii.	Claim 2 of the '227 patent	168
iii.	Claim 5 of the '227 patent	169
iv.	Claim 10 of the '227 patent	169
v.	Claim 13 of the '227 patent	169
vi.	Claims 16 and 17 of the '227 patent	170
D.	Invalidity	171
1.	ArcelorMittal failed to establish earlier priority date	171
2.	Anticipation	171
i.	Passat 1049	171
a.	Claim 1	171
b.	Claim 2	172
c.	Claim 4	173
d.	Claim 5	173
e.	Claim 7	173
f.	Claim 8	174
g.	Claim 9	174
h.	Claim 10	175
i.	Claim 11	175
j.	Claim 13	175
k.	Claim 15	176
l.	Claim 16	176
m.	Claim 17	177
n.	Claim 24	177
ii.	Cornette	177
a.	Claim 1	177
b.	Claim 2	178
c.	Claim 4	179
d.	Claim 5	179
e.	Claim 7	179

f.	Claim 8.....	180
g.	Claim 9.....	180
h.	Claim 10.....	180
i.	Claim 11.....	181
j.	Claim 13.....	181
k.	Claim 15.....	181
l.	Claim 16.....	182
m.	Claim 17.....	182
n.	Claim 24.....	182
iii.	Lachmann.....	183
a.	Claim 1.....	183
b.	Claim 2.....	184
c.	Claim 7.....	184
d.	Claim 8.....	185
e.	Claim 9.....	186
f.	Claim 10.....	186
g.	Claim 11.....	186
h.	Claim 13.....	186
i.	Claim 15.....	187
j.	Claim 24.....	187
iv.	Engels.....	188
a.	Claim 1.....	188
b.	Claim 2.....	189
c.	Claim 4.....	189
d.	Claim 5.....	189
e.	Claim 7.....	189
f.	Claim 9.....	190
g.	Claim 10.....	190
h.	Claim 13.....	190
i.	Claim 15.....	190
j.	Claim 24.....	191

3. Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103	191
i. Takagi Grounds.....	191
a. Takagi in combination with Cornette	191
b. Takagi in combination with Cornette and Vaissiere.....	198
c. Takagi in combination with Cornette and Laurent	199
ii. Cornette Grounds	199
a. Cornette alone	199
iii. Suehiro II Grounds.....	203
a. Suehiro II in combination with Cornette	203
b. Suehiro II in combination with Cornette and Laurent	211
c. Suehiro II in combination with Cornette and Vaissiere.....	211
iv. Lachmann Grounds.....	212
a. Lachmann alone	212
b. Lachmann in combination with Cornette.....	215
c. Lachmann in combination with Vaissiere.....	215
d. Lachmann in combination with Laurent.....	217
v. Engels Grounds.....	217
a. Engels alone	217
b. Engels in combination with Cornette.....	219
c. Engels in combination with Vaissiere.....	221
d. Engels in combination with Laurent	222
4. Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness.....	222
5. Indefiniteness Under 35 U.S.C. § 112	222
6. Subject Matter Under § 101	222
V. NO ECONOMIC DOMESTIC INDUSTRY	222
A. The Tested Domestic Industry Products Are Not Representative of Untested Products Made Using Usibor, Ductibor, and Ultralume with an AS150 Coating (or Equivalent).....	227
1. None of the Tested Products Is a Domestic Industry Product	227
2. None of the Domestic Industry Products Is Representative of Untested Products Based on the Same DI Precursor Products	229

3. A Tested Product Made Using One DI Precursor Product Is Not Representative of Untested Products Made Using a Different DI Precursor Product	230
B. Plant and Equipment / Labor and Capital Investments: DI Precursors	231
1. AM-NS Calvert	231
i. Plant and Equipment	234
ii. Labor and Capital	235
2. [REDACTED]	235
C. Plant and Equipment / Labor and Capital: DI Direct Products	236
1. [REDACTED]	236
2. [REDACTED]	237
3. [REDACTED]	238
4. [REDACTED]	239
5. [REDACTED]	240
6. [REDACTED]	240
7. [REDACTED]	241
D. Alleged Exploitation in ER&D	242
E. Significance / Substantiality	242
VI. REMEDY AND BONDING	245
A. Limited Exclusion Order	245
B. Cease and Desist Order	246
C. Bond	248
VII. CONCLUSION	249