

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAP AMERICA INC. AND SAP AG,
Petitioners,

v.

VERSATA DEVELOPMENT GROUP INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case CBM2012-00001
Patent 6,553,350

Before the honorable MICHAEL P. TIERNEY, SALLY C. MEDLEY and RAMA
G. ELLURU.

PETITIONERS' REPLY BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Statement of Relief Requested	1
II.	Preliminary Statement	1
III.	Statement Identifying Material Facts in Dispute.....	2
IV.	Versata’s Arguments That Its Claims Are Not Abstract Rest On Unclaimed Limitations And Contradict The Patent	3
A.	The claims consist almost entirely of the abstract ideas of arranging customer and product hierarchies and calculating a product price.....	3
B.	Claiming the abstract idea of calculating a price using several separate steps does not make the claims patentable under § 101.	4
C.	Versata’s claim that the recited storing, retrieving, sorting, eliminating, and determining impart patentability because they are “specific, practical and advantageous” is belied by the patent.	5
V.	Versata’s Arguments Regarding Computer Involvement In The Claims Do Not Show Any Particular Machine Or Unconventional Subject Matter.....	7
A.	Versata’s arguments rely on limitations absent from the claims.	7
B.	Claim 17 does not require any computer at all.	10
C.	The other claims add nothing but routine, conventional matter.	12
VI.	The Board Properly Construed The Claims, And Versata’s Alternative Constructions Would Not Affect The § 101 Analysis	14
A.	The broadest reasonable interpretation is the proper standard.....	14
B.	The Board’s claim constructions are properly supported.	16
C.	Versata’s constructions would not change the § 101 analysis.....	17
VII.	Dr. Siegel’s Expert Testimony Should Be Credited.....	18

VIII.	Mr. Liebich’s Testimony Should Be Given No Weight Because He Is Not Qualified to Opine About A Person Skilled In The Art.....	20
A.	Mr. Liebich lacks the undisputed requirements of a person skilled in the art.	20
B.	Mr. Liebich’s non-expert opinions should be given no weight.	21
C.	Mr. Liebich’s newly-added views are admitted to be irrelevant and are contradicted by Versata’s positions in litigation.	22
IX.	Versata’s Arguments About SAP Prior Art Are Irrelevant To A Proper Section 101 Analysis	23
X.	Conclusion	24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page(s)
<i>Arrythmia Research Tech. v. Corazonix Corp.</i> , 958 F.2d 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1992).....	9, 10
<i>Bancorp Servs., L.L.C. v. Sun Life Assurance Co.</i> , 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	1, 8, 12, 13
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 130 S. Ct. 3218 (2010).....	5, 6
<i>CyberSource, Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	12, 13
<i>Dealertrack, Inc. v. Huber</i> , 674 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	5, 12
<i>Diamond v. Diehr</i> , 450 U.S. 175 (1981).....	19, 23
<i>Fort Props., Inc. v. Am. Master Lease L.L.C.</i> , 671 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	12
<i>Gottschalk v. Benson</i> , 409 U.S. 63 (1972).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	15
<i>In re Etter</i> , 756 F.2d 852 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	15
<i>In re Yamamoto</i> , 740 F.2d 1569 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	15
<i>Lyons v. Nike, Inc.</i> , 874 F. Supp. 2d 986 (D. Or. 2012)	22
<i>Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.</i> , 132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012).....	4, 13, 19, 23
<i>Morpho Detection, Inc. v. Smiths Detection, Inc.</i> , No. 2:11cv498, 2012 WL 6004085 (E.D. Va. Nov. 30 2012)	22
<i>Parker v. Flook</i> , 437 U.S. 584 (1978)	4, 13
<i>Research Corp. Techs. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 627 F.3d 859 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	9

<i>SiRF Tech., Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 601 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	8, 10
<i>Sundance, Inc. v. DeMonte Fabricating Ltd.</i> , 550 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	22
<i>Williamson v. Verizon Commc’ns Inc.</i> , No. 11 Civ. 4948, 2012 WL 5425033 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 7, 2012)	21

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 101	<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	15
35 U.S.C. § 326	15
Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (AIA) § 18	1

Other Authorities

157 Cong. Rec. S1375 (daily ed. Mar. 8, 2011) (statement of Sen. Kyl)	15
---	----

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.221	15
37 C.F.R. § 42.300(b)	15
Fed. R. Evid. 702(a)	22

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.