	MELINDA HAAG (CABN 132612) United States Attorney				
2 3	J. DOUGLAS WILSON (DCBN 412811) Chief, Criminal Division				
4 5	JOHN H. HEMANN (CSBN 165823) PETER B. AXELROD (CSBN 190843) Assistant United States Attorneys				
6	450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055				
7	San Francisco, California 94102-3495 Telephone: (415) 436-7200 FAX: (415) 436-7234 john.hemann@usdoj.gov				
8					
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff				
10					
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
12	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
13	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION				
14	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	) CASE NO. CR-11-0573-JSW			
15 16	Plaintiff,  v.	<ul> <li>BILL OF PARTICULARS AS TO TRADE SECRET</li> <li>1, AS ALLEGED IN COUNTS THREE AND FIVE</li> <li>OF THE SECOND SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT</li> </ul>			
17 18	WALTER LIEW, CHRISTINA LIEW, USA PERFORMANCE TECHNOLOGY, INC., AND ROBERT MAEGERLE,	) ) )			
19	Defendants.	) ) )			
20		,			
21	The United States hereby provides the following particulars regarding Trade Secret 1, as alleged				
22	in Counts Three and Five of the Second Superseding Indictment.				
23	1. The United States will argue that Defendants reasonably believed the entire, integrated				
24	DuPont chloride-route process to manufacture TiO2 was a DuPont trade secret.				
25	2. The United States also will argue that Defendants reasonably believed that certain				
26	components and subparts of the DuPont chloride-route process to manufacture TiO2 were				
27	DuPont trade secrets, specifically the following:				
28	a. Chlorinator Fluidization Air Requirements;				
	BILL OF PARTICULARS CASE NO. CR-11-0573-JSW 1				

1	b.	Chlorinator Design;
2	c.	Chlorination Reaction Front End Layout;
3	d.	Oxidation Reactor Design;
4	e.	Fume Disposal Systems;
5	f.	Oxidation Flue Pond Design and Piping;
6	g.	SR Condenser Design;
7	h.	Non-Reversing Cyclone Design;
8	i.	SR Condensate Tank;
9	j.	Contact Condensers;
10	k.	Gas Flow to O2 Rx Insert;
11	1.	Flash Tank Design;
12	m.	Slurry Tank;
13	n.	Fume Scrubbers;
14	0.	Equipment Arrangement;
15	p.	Oxidation Screw Conveyors;
16	q.	Oxidation Bag Filters;
17	r.	Chlorine Handling Facilities;
18	S.	Purge Rate;
19	t.	Slurry Pumping Data;
20	u.	AlCl3 Generator;
21	V.	Chlorinator Velocity; and
22	w.	Nitrogen Flow to Chlorinator.
23	3. The U	nited States also will argue that Defendants reasonably believed that certain
24	compo	nents and subparts of the DuPont chloride-route process to manufacture TiO2 were
25	DuPon	at trade secrets and integrated these trade secrets into their design of the following
26	compo	nents:
27	a.	Spray Machine; Chlorination Reaction; Spiral Nozzle with Assembly; Inconel

28

(identified by defendants in September 2009 as their component SP-3100);

- b. Spray Condenser Rotary Valve; Chlorination Reaction; 12"; Inconel; Variable Speed
   (identified by defendants in September 2009 as their component RV -3100);
- c. Oxidation Reactor; Oxidation-Oxidation Preheat and Reaction; Reaction Zone Dia:
   200 mm; Inconel, ceramic lined with castables (identified by defendants in September
   2009 as their component R -5500);
- d. Oxidation Bagfilter Screw Conveyor; Oxidation Separation and Slurrying; 2
   directional center O/L 7 t/h ea capacity; Inconel (identified by defendants in
   September 2009 as their component CV-5780);
- e. Degassing Screw Conveyor; Oxidation Separation and Slurrying; 15.1 t/hr; Inconel (identified by defendants in September 2009 as their component CV-5790);
- f. Oxidation Discharge Rotary Valve; Oxidation Separation and Slurrying; 10" IPS
   Inconel (identified by defendants in September 2009 as their component R-5790);
- g. Slurry Tank Agitator; Oxidation Separation and Slurrying; ID: 4m, Ht: 5m, Cone Ht: 3.5m, Cone angle 60, (77.5 M3); Stainless Steel/titanium (identified by defendants in September 2009 as their component A-5800); and
- h. MG -7420, -7520, & -7620; Micron Grinder; Post-Treatment Grinding; 8 in IPS,
   4200kg/hr; Stainless Steel 304 (identified by defendants in September 2009 as their components MG-7420, -7520, & -7620).
- 4. The Second Superseding Indictment alleges that Trade Secret 1 includes Trade Secret 2.

  The United States will argue that Defendants reasonably believed that Trade Secret 2, which showed ways and means of producing TiO2, was a compilation and combination of DuPont trade secrets regarding that manufacturing process.
- The Second Superseding Indictment alleges that Trade Secret 1 includes Trade Secret 3.
   The United States will argue that Defendants reasonably believed that Trade Secret 3 was a DuPont trade secret.
- 6. The Second Superseding Indictment alleges that Trade Secret 1 includes Trade Secret 4.

  The United States will argue that Defendants reasonably believed that Trade Secret 4, which showed ways and means of producing TiO2, was a compilation and combination of DuPont

## Case3:11-cr-00573-JSW Document363 Filed07/02/13 Page4 of 4

1		trade secrets regarding that manufacturing process.	
2	7.	7. The Second Superseding Indictment alleges that Trade Secret 1 includes Trade Secret	et 5.
3		The United States will argue that Defendants reasonably believed that Trade Secret :	5, which
4		showed ways and means of producing TiO2, was a compilation and combination of	DuPont
5		trade secrets regarding that manufacturing process.	
6			
7		Respectfully submitted,	
8		MELINDA HAAG	
9		United States Attorney	
10		John H. Hemann	
11	Dated: Ju	July 1, 2013  JOHN H. HEMANN	
12		PETER B. AXELROD	
		Assistant United States Attorneys	
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			