

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

EVERLIGHT ELECTRONICS CO.,
LTD, and EMCORE CORPORATION,

Plaintiffs,

No. 12-cv-11758

v

NICHIA CORPORATION, and
NICHIA AMERICA CORPORATION,

Defendants.
_____ /

JURY TRIAL - VOLUME III of XII

PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE GERSHWIN A. DRAIN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
Theodore Levin United States Courthouse
231 West Lafayette Boulevard
Detroit, Michigan
Thursday, April 9, 2015

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiffs:

MR. A. MICHAEL PALIZZI
MR. MICHAEL C. SIMONI
Miller, Canfield, Paddock and
Stone, PLC
150 W. Jefferson Avenue, Suite 2500
Detroit, Michigan 48226
(313) 486-7645

MR. RAYMOND N. NIMROD
MR. MATTHEW A. TRAUPTMAN
MS. ANASTASIA M. FERNANDS
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan,
LLP
51 Madison Avenue, 29th Floor
New York, New York 10010
(212) 849-7412

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

APPEARANCES:

For the Defendants:

MR. STEVEN J. RIZZI
MR. RAMY E. HANNA
MR. RYAN SCHMID
Foley and Lardner, LLP
90 Park Avenue, 37th Floor
New York, New York 10016
(212) 682-7474

MS. LISA S. MANKOFSKY
Foley & Lardner, LLP
3000 K Street N. W, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20007
(202) 672-5300

MR. JOHN R. TRENTACOSTA
Foley & Lardner
500 Woodward Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48226
(313) 234-2800

Reported by:

Merilyn J. Jones, RPR, CSR
Official Federal Court Reporter
merilyn_jones@mied.uscourts.gov

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WITNESSES: PLAINTIFF

PAGE

ERIC BRETSCHNEIDER

Direct examination by Mr. Traupman

14

WITNESSES: DEFENDANT

None

EXHIBITS:

Identified

Received

1 different amounts of yttrium, and by definition, unless it's
2 50/50, that gives you different amounts of gadolinium. So they
3 are two variations of YAG.

4 Q. Just to summarize, Claims 2 and 3 require how many
5 phosphors?

6 A. One.

7 Q. And Claims 5,6 and 8 require at least how many phosphors?

8 A. Two.

9 Q. So did you review some prior art references to determine
10 if the claims of the '925 patent are invalid?

11 A. Yes, well over 100.

12 Q. So other than those 100 prior art references, what other
13 materials did you review in forming those opinions?

14 A. Again, the patents; the prosecution history of the
15 patents; inventors' notebooks; depositions of the inventors; I
16 considered the education level and experience level of the
17 inventors; my experience in the LED industry; and again, quite
18 a few prior art references.

19 Q. All right. And up here on slide 56 we talk about the
20 title is, a level of ordinary skill in the art. What's your
21 understanding of what a person of ordinary skill in the art is?

22 A. This is basically saying the average person in the
23 industry. This is the level of knowledge, expertise and
24 understanding you would expect the typical person to have at
25 the time of the patent.

1 Q. All right. And did you provide a definition of a person
2 of ordinary skill in the art for this case for these two Nichia
3 patents?

4 A. Yes, I did.

5 Q. What's your definition of a person of ordinary skill in
6 the art?

7 A. This is the long version, but it would be a person with a
8 Bachelors degree in engineering, chemistry or physics, with
9 four to five years experience working in the LED field, or an
10 advanced degree, such as a Masters or Ph.D. in engineering,
11 physics or chemistry, with little to no experience working with
12 LEDs.

13 Q. Do you meet that definition of a person of ordinary skill
14 in the art?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And did you apply that definition of a person of ordinary
17 skill in the art throughout your analysis?

18 A. Yes, I did.

19 Q. Do you understand that Nichia and its expert have proposed
20 a different definition of a person of ordinary skill in the
21 art?

22 A. Yes, they have.

23 Q. If you applied Nichia's definition of a person of ordinary
24 skill in the art instead of your definition of a person of
25 ordinary skill in the art, how would that affect your opinions?

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.