

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

REACTIVE SURFACES LTD., LLP,
Petitioner,

v.

TOYOTA MOTOR CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01914

Patent 8,394,618

EXHIBIT 2010
DECLARATION OF JONATHAN DORDICK, Ph.D.

TOYOTA EXHIBIT 2010
Reactive Surfaces LTD., LLP v. Toyota Motor Corporation
IPR2016-01914

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE.....	3
III.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	15
IV.	APPLICABLE LAW	17
V.	MATERIALS REVIEWED	19
VI.	SUMMARY OF OPINIONS.....	21
VII.	ANALYSIS.....	26
A.	The References Included in the Alleged Grounds of Unpatentability All Fail to Teach or Suggest the Use of a Lipase-Containing Coating or Substrate for Facilitating Fingerprint Removal Through Vaporization.....	27
B.	Dr. Rozzell’s Statements About Buchanan Fail to Cure the Deficiencies of the References Included in the Alleged Grounds of Unpatentability.....	29
1.	Buchanan Is Not Analogous Art to the ‘618 Patent.....	30
a.	Buchanan Is Not From the Same Field of Endeavor as the ‘618 Patent	30
b.	Buchanan Is Not Reasonably Pertinent to the Problems Faced by the Inventors of the ‘618 Patent	32
2.	Buchanan Would Not Have Provided a POSITA With a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Using Lipase to Facilitate the Removal of a Fingerprint by Vaporization.....	34
a.	The Methods of Buchanan Were Improperly Designed and The Data of Buchanan Was	

Too Unreliable to Lead a POSITA to Properly Conclude That Fingerprints and Their Components Disappear by Vaporization	37
i. The Experiments of Buchanan Used a Fingerprint Detection Technique That is Not Affected by Changes to the Fingerprint Over Time	38
ii. The Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry Experiments of Buchanan Failed to Analyze the Composition of Actual Fingerprints.....	43
iii. The Experiments of Buchanan Did Not Quantify the Volatile and Nonvolatile Components of Fingerprints	47
b. The Buchanan Data Does Not Support the Conclusion That Vaporization Is Responsible For Fingerprint Disappearance From a Surface	50
i. The Studies Discussed in Buchanan Used “Conventional Dusting” for Fingerprint Enhancement	51
ii. The Fingerprints of Prepubescent Children Include Mostly Aqueous Saline and Lack a Significant Amount of Oily Sebaceous Material	52
iii. Water is Lost from a Fingerprint Over Time.....	54
iv. The Enhanced Clarity of a Conventionally Dusted Fingerprint is the Result of the Original Quality of the Fingerprint, and Not the Result of Changes to the Fingerprint Over Time.....	54

v.	A Fingerprint Undergoes Physical and Chemical Changes Through Several Different Pathways Besides Vaporization	55
vi.	These Other Factors Could Have Explained the Alleged “Disappearance” of Prepubescent Children’s Fingerprints	56
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	56

I. INTRODUCTION

I, JONATHAN S. DORDICK, Ph.D., hereby declare the following:

1. My name is Dr. Jonathan S. Dordick. I am the Vice President for Research and the Howard P. Isermann Professor of Chemical and Biological Engineering, Biomedical Engineering, Materials Science and Engineering, and Biological Sciences at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. My mailing address is 9015 LCII, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, New York 12180. I base the following on my personal knowledge and experience as well as my review of the relevant documents listed below in Section V.

2. I have been retained by counsel as an independent expert for Toyota Motor Corporation (the “Patent Owner”) in this *Inter Partes* Review proceeding, *Reactive Surfaces LTD., LLP v. Toyota Motor Corporation*, IPR2016-01914, before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (the “Board”). I am being compensated for the time I spend on this matter at my customary rate of \$500 per hour, but no part of my compensation is dependent on the outcome of this proceeding.

3. I understand that this proceeding involves U.S Patent No. 8,394,618 (“the ‘618 Patent”) (Ex. 1001). I understand that the application for the ‘618 Patent was filed on June 21, 2010, as U.S. Patent Application No. 12/820,063 (“the ‘063 Application”) (Ex. 1002). I also understand that the ‘618 Patent is assigned to the

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.