

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION

VERSATA SOFTWARE, INC., f/k/a	§	
TRILOGY SOFTWARE, INC.;	§	
VERSATA DEVELOPMENT GROUP,	§	
INC., f/k/a TRILOGY DEVELOPMENT	§	
GROUP, INC.; and VERSATA	§	
COMPUTER INDUSTRY SOLUTIONS,	§	
INC., f/k/a TRILOGY COMPUTER	§	
INDUSTRY SOLUTIONS, INC.,	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:07-CV-153-CE
	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	
	§	
v.	§	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
	§	
SAP AMERICA, INC. and SAP AG,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

VERSATA'S RESPONSE TO
SAP'S RENEWED MOTION FOR JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW OR NEW
TRIAL REGARDING LIABILITY ISSUES (DKT. NO. 351)

VERSATA EXHIBIT 2093
SAP v. VERSATA
CASE CBM2012-00001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. ARGUMENT2

A. SAP Fails To Apply The Proper Deference To The Jury’s Verdict.....2

B. The Jury’s Verdict Of Infringement Is Supported By Substantial Evidence.....2

1. Versata Presented More Than Sufficient Proof That The Accused Software Products—As Made And Sold By SAP—Contain Computer Program Code/Instructions That Met The Elements Of The Asserted Claims.2

2. Versata Presented More Than Sufficient Proof That SAP Also Infringed Claim 29 Indirectly Through Inducement And Contributory Infringement.9

3. Versata Presented More Than Sufficient Evidence That The Requirement Of “Denormalized Numbers” As Construed Was Met.....10

C. SAP Is Not Entitled To JMOL Based On Its Best Mode Invalidity Defense—The Jury Did Not Err In Rejecting That Defense.14

1. The Jury Could Have Reasonably Credited The Inventor’s Testimony That “Group Combinations” Were Not Necessarily The Best Mode Of Practicing His Invention In 1996 When The Patents Were Filed.14

2. The Jury Was Not Required To Find That The Patents Failed To Disclose “Group Combinations”—There Was Substantial Evidence To The Contrary.....15

3. The Jury Was Not Required To Find That “Group Combinations” Is Required To Practice The Claimed Inventions—There Was Substantial Evidence To The Contrary.....15

D.	SAP’s Purported Presentation Of A Host Of “Other Bases” For JMOL Or A New Trial Is Insufficient To Create An Issue For Post Trial Or On Appeal.	16
III.	CONCLUSION.....	16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	Page(s)
<i>ACCO Brands, Inc. v. ABA Locks Mfr. Co.</i> , 501 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	8
<i>AccuScan, Inc. v. Xerox Corp.</i> , 76 Fed. Appx. 290 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	13
<i>Ball Aerosol and Specialty Container, Inc. v. Limited Brands, Inc.</i> , 555 F.3d 984 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	8
<i>Biodex Corp. v. Loredan Biomedical, Inc.</i> , 946 F.2d 850 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	13
<i>Collaboration Props., Inc. v. Tandberg ASA</i> , No. 05-CV-1940, 2006 U.S. Dist LEXIS 42465 (N.D. Cal. June 23, 2006).....	7
<i>Conoco, Inc. v. Energy & Envtl. Int'l, L.C.</i> , 460 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	6
<i>Cross Medical Products, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	8
<i>Eaton Corp. v. Parker-Hannifin Corp.</i> , 292 F.Supp.2d 555 (D. Del. 2003).....	14, 15
<i>Ecolab, Inc. v. Paraclipse, Inc.</i> , 285 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	12
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> , 251 F.3d 955 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	14, 15, 16
<i>Ellis v. Weasler Eng'g, Inc.</i> , 258 F.3d 326 (5th Cir. 2001)	2
<i>Finisar Corp. v. DirecTV Group, Inc.</i> , 523 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	9
<i>Frazier v. Honeywell Int'l, Inc.</i> , 518 F. Supp. 2d 831 (E.D. Tex. 2007).....	2
<i>Grenada Steel Indus., Inc. v. Ala. Oxygen Co.</i> , 695 F.2d 883 (5th Cir. 1983)	3, 15

i4i Ltd. P'ship v. Microsoft Corp.,
 No. 6:07-CV-113, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 70104 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 11, 2009) passim

Int'l Rectifier Corp. v. IXYS Corp.,
 361 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....2, 3, 6

Microprocessor Enhancement Corp. v. Tex. Instruments Inc.,
 520 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....7

Omega Eng'g. Inc. v. Raytek Corp.,
 334 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....13

Pall Corp. v. PTI Techs., Inc.
 259 F.3d 1383 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....13

Pineda v. United Parcel Serv., Inc.,
 360 F.3d 483 (5th Cir. 2004)2

Reeves v. Sanderson Plumbing Prods., Inc.,
 530 U.S. 133 (2000).....2

Ricoh Co. Ltd. v. Katun Corp.,
 486 F. Supp. 2d 395 (D.N.J. 2007)7

SRI Int'l Inc. v. Internet Sec. Sys.,
 No. 04-1199-SLR, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 73981 (D. Del. Aug. 20, 2009)8

Storage Computer Corp. v. Veritas Software Corp.,
 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3887 (N.D. Tex. 2004).....8

Storage Computer Corp. v. Veritas Software Corp.,
 2004 U.S. App. LEXIS 14543 (Fed. Cir., June 15, 2004).....8

Versata Software, Inc. v. Sun Microsystems, Inc.,
 No. 2:06-CV-358-TJW, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 63645 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 19, 2008).....1, 6

Warner-Jenkinson Co. v. Hilton Davis Chem. Co.,
 520 U.S. 17 (1997).....13

Wenger Mfg. v. Coating Machinery Sys., Inc.,
 239 F.3d 1225 (Fed Cir. 2001).....13

Yodlee, Inc. v. Cashedge, Inc.,
 No. C-05-01550-SI, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 86699 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 29, 2006)7

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.