

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

ONE WORLD TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,  
D/B/A TECHTRONIC INDUSTRIES POWER EQUIPMENT  
Petitioner,

v.

CHERVON (HK) LIMITED,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2020-00885  
U.S. Patent No. 9,648,805

---

**DECLARATION OF MATTHEW J. LEVINSTEIN IN  
SUPPORT OF PATENT OWNER'S OPPOSITION TO  
PETITIONER'S MOTION TO UPDATE ITS  
MANDATORY NOTICES**

---

I, Matthew J. Levinstein, declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in the state of Illinois. I am a member in good standing in all jurisdictions and forums where I have been admitted to practice.
2. I am designated as Back-Up Counsel to represent Patent Owner Chervon (HK) Limited (“Patent Owner”) in this proceeding, pending *pro hac vice*. I am also counsel of record in the parallel district court litigation: *Chervon (HK) Limited et al. v. One World Technologies, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 1:19-cv-01293 (D. Del.), filed on July 11, 2019 (the “Litigation”). The Litigation involves the same patent at issue in this proceeding.
3. As a result of representing Patent Owner in this forum and in the Litigation, I have an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in this proceeding. As a result of my representation of Chervon (HK) Limited in these matters, I have acquired substantial understanding of the underlying technological issues at stake in this matter.
4. I am submitting this Declaration in support of Patent Owner’s Opposition to Petitioner’s Motion to Update its Mandatory Notices to Add Real-Parties-in-Interest.

5. Patent Owner is in possession of certain exemplary documents that further support that: (i) the unnamed RPIs—Techtronic and Homelite in particular—were intimately involved in the design and/or development of the accused products in the Litigation (the “Documents”); (ii) Petitioner knew the unnamed RPIs were intimately involved in the design and/or development of the accused products in the Litigation; (iii) the unnamed RPIs should have been named as RPIs by Petitioner when Petitioner filed its Petition; and (iv) Petitioner did not name the unnamed RPIs because it was engaging in gamesmanship and/or in bad faith.
6. The Documents belong to Petitioner and/or Techtronic, who have designated them “Highly Confidential—Outside Counsel’s Eyes Only—Subject to Prosecution Bar” under the terms of the protective order entered in the Litigation.
7. Petitioner did not address the Documents (or the unnamed RPIs’ contributions to the design and/or development of the accused products from the Litigation more generally) in its Motion to Update its Mandatory Notices. (*See generally* Paper 12.)
8. On September 10, 2020, Patent Owner sought Petitioner’s permission to attach the Documents to Patent Owner’s Opposition to Petitioner’s

Motion to Update its Mandatory Notices from Petitioner’s counsel.  
(*See EX2020*, Correspondence Between Messrs. Erik M. Bokar and Edward H. Sikorksi, at 1.).

9. Patent Owner intended to file the Documents—TTI1293\_00000736, TTI1293\_00000764, and TTI1293\_00001293—under seal. (*See id.*, at 2.)
10. Petitioner refused Patent Owner’s request. (*See id.*, at 1.)
11. Counsel for Petitioner is the same as in the Litigation. Petitioner could have permitted Patent Owner to submit these documents on an “under seal” basis in the interests of full disclosure and so that the Board could evaluate Patent Owner’s Motion on a complete record.
12. Petitioner’s refusal of a routine request is demonstrative of Petitioner’s continued gamesmanship and bad faith with respect to its RPI disclosure obligations.

I hereby declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements are made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the patents at issue.

Dated: September 10, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

/Matthew J. Levinstein /  
Matthew J. Levinstein (*Pro Hac*  
*Vice* pending)

# 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.