

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	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:07-cv-153-CE
COMPUTER INDUSTRY SOLUTIONS,	§	
INC., F/K/A TRILOGY COMPUTER	§	
INDUSTRY SOLUTIONS, INC.,	§	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	
	§	
v.	§	
	§	
SAP AMERICA, INC. AND SAP AG	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	
	§	

**DEFENDANTS SAP AMERICA, INC. AND SAP AG'S PATENT RULE 3-3 AND 3-6
AMENDED INVALIDITY CONTENTIONS FOR U.S. PATENT NOS. 5,708,798,
6,002,854, 5,878,400, 6,553,350, and 7,069,235**

VERSATA EXHIBIT 2066

CAD vs. VERSATA

1047518 3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE NO.
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE ASSERTED PATENTS	7
A. P.R. 3-3(A), (B), AND (C)	7
1. Invalidity of the Asserted Claims of the ‘798 Patent Under 35 U.S.C. § 102	12
a. All Asserted Claims of the ‘798 Patent Are Anticipated by the Prior Art Cited in Appendices A-1, C-1, E-1	12
b. Invalidity of Asserted Claims 1-6 of the ‘798 Patent Under 35 U.S.C. § 103	13
(1) Asserted Claims 1-5 of the ‘798 Patent Would Have Been Obvious.....	15
(2) Asserted Claim 6 of the ‘798 Patent Would Have Been Obvious.....	18
c. The Asserted Claims of the ‘798 Patent Also Would Have Been Obvious Under § 103 and Comiskey.....	20
2. Invalidity of the Asserted Claims of the ‘854 Patent Under 35 U.S.C. § 102	20
3. Invalidity of the Asserted Claims of the ‘854 Patent Under 35 U.S.C. § 103	21
a. Asserted Claims 1, 2, 5, 6-9, 10-12, 13-15, 19-22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 30, 40, 41-43, 44, and 49-51 of the ‘854 Patent 23	
b. Asserted Claims 4, 31, and 39 of the ‘854 Patent	26
c. Asserted Claims 32-37 of the ‘854 Patent.....	27
d. Asserted Claims of the ‘854 Patent Also would Have Been Obvious Under § 103 and Comiskey	28
4. Invalidity of the Asserted Claims of the ‘400 Patent Under 35 U.S.C. § 102	29

5. Invalidity of the Asserted Claims of the ‘400 Patent Under	
35 U.S.C. § 103	30
a. Asserted Claims 1-2, 8-9, 11, 26-27, 31-32, 37, 39, 41, 47, 49, and 51 of the ‘400 Patent Would Have Been Obvious	31
b. Asserted Claims 3-6, 10, 33-36, 42-45, and 50 of the ‘400 Patent Would Have Been Obvious.....	32
c. Asserted Claims 7, 12, 30, 38, 46, and 52 of the ‘400 Patent Would Have Been Obvious	33
d. Asserted Claim 40 of the ‘400 Patent Would Have Been Obvious	34
e. Asserted Claim 48 of the ‘400 Patent Would Have Been Obvious	35
f. Asserted Claims of the ‘400 Patent Also would Have Been Obvious Under § 103 and <i>Comiskey</i>	36
6. Invalidity of the Asserted Claims of the ‘350 Patent Under	
35 U.S.C. § 102	36
7. Invalidity of the Asserted Claims of the ‘350 Patent Under	
35 U.S.C. § 103	38
a. Asserted Claims 27-29 of the ‘350 Patent Would Have Been Obvious	39
b. Asserted Claims 1-6, 8, 12-13, 16-23, 25, and 26 of the ‘350 Patent Would Have Been Obvious.....	40
c. Asserted Claims 7 and 24 of the ‘350 Patent Would Have Been Obvious.....	40
d. Asserted Claim 9 of the ‘350 Patent Would Have Been Obvious	41
e. Asserted Claims 10 and 11 of the ‘350 Patent Would Have Been Obvious.....	42
f. The Asserted Claims of the ‘350 Patent Also would Have Been Obvious Under § 103 and <i>Comiskey</i>	43

8. Invalidity of the Asserted Claims of the ‘235 Patent Under 35 U.S.C. § 102	44
9. Invalidity of the Asserted Claims of the ‘235 Patent Under 35 U.S.C. § 103	45
a. Asserted Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 10, 20, 23, and 26 of the ‘235 Patent Would Have Been Obvious.....	47
b. Asserted Claim 3 of the ‘235 Patent Would Have Been Obvious	49
c. Asserted Claims 4, 5, 12, 15, 16, 24, and 27 of the ‘235 Patent Would Have Been Obvious.....	50
d. Asserted Claim 6 of the ‘235 Patent Would Have Been Obvious	52
e. Asserted Claims 8 and 17 of the ‘235 Patent Would Have Been Obvious.....	53
f. Asserted Claim 13 of the ‘235 Patent Would Have Been Obvious	55
g. Asserted Claims 14 and 25 of the ‘235 Patent Would Have Been Obvious Under § 103.....	56
B. P.R. 3-3(D).....	57
1. Claims 1-6 of the ‘798 Patent Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 57	
2. Claims 1-5, 10-12, 14, 19-25, and 39-44 of the ‘854 Patent Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 112.....	58
3. Claims 2-3, 9-11, 26-27 and 31 of the ‘400 Patent Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 112	59
4. Claims 1 and 17 of the ‘350 Patent Are Invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 112 60	
5. Claims 1-6, 8-10, 12-18, 20, and 23-27 of the ‘235 Patent Are Invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 112.....	60
6. Claim 24 of the ‘235 Patent Is Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 112.....	60
III. ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT PRODUCTION (P.R. 3-4)	61

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

PAGE NO.

In re Comiskey, 499 f.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2007)..... 20,28,36,43

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.