

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAP AMERICA, INC. ET AL.

Petitioner

v.

Patent of VERSATA DEVELOPMENT GROUP, INC.

Patent Owner

Case CBM2012-00001

Patent 6,553,350

**PATENT OWNER VERSATA DEVELOPMENT GROUP, INC.'S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

**FILED UNDER SEAL
CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS'
EYES ONLY MATERIAL**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Callidus Ex. 1007 CBM2013-00054 (Callidus v. Versata)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iv

EXHIBIT LISTx

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT1

II. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED9

III. STATEMENT OF REASONS WHY NO POST-GRANT REVIEW SHOULD BE INSTITUTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 324.....10

A. The ‘350 Patent Is Not A “Covered Business Method Patent”10

1. The ‘350 Patent is for a Technological Invention.....11

a. The subject matter of each of the challenged claims of the ‘350 patent as a whole recites a technological feature that is novel and unobvious16

b. The subject matter of each of the challenged claims of the ‘350 patent as a whole solves a technical problem using a technical solution30

2. The ‘350 Patent Claims Do Not Fall Within the Scope of Section 18(d)(1) of the AIA31

a. The plain meanings of “financial product” and “financial service” does not include the pricing technology claimed in the ‘350 patent.....33

b. The challenged claims are not directed to a method or apparatus for performing data processing or other operations used in the practice, administration or management of a financial product or service37

c. Senator Schumer’s remarks cannot provide a scope for “financial products or services” that omits statutory language42

B. The Petition Fails To Demonstrate That It Is More Likely Than Not That The Challenged Claims Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 10245

1.	All of the Challenged Claims Require “Denormalized Numbers”	46
2.	SAP in the District Court Case Took the Position That the R/3 Prior Art System Described in the R/3 Prior Art System Documentation Does Not Use “Denormalized Numbers”	50
3.	The District Court, After Considering SAP’s Evidence, Determined that the R/3 Prior Art System Was Not Even Material to the Patentability of the ‘350 Patent Claims	52
4.	Contrary to SAP’s Position, Evidence that the R/3 Prior Art System Does Not Use Denormalized Numbers, Is Highly Relevant to Analyzing the R/3 Prior Art System Documentation	54
C.	The Petition Fails to Show that the Challenged Claims are more likely than not Unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112	57
D.	Petitioner Should Not Be Permitted to Challenge the ‘350 Patent Based On the Same Validity Issues That Failed In the District Court Case and On Which a Final Judgment Has Been Rendered	61
E.	The Relief Requested In The Petition Challenging Validity Of The Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 Is Not Available	68
IV.	CONCLUSION	80

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Advanced Display Sys., Inc. v. Kent State Univ.,
2002 WL 1489555 (N.D. Tex. July 10, 2002).....67

Amcast Indus. Corp. v. Dextrex Corp.,
45 F.3d 155 (7th Cir. 1995)63

Ammex, Inc. v. United States,
334 F.3d 1052 (Fed. Cir. 2003)66

Aristocrat Techs. Austral. Pty Ltd. v. Int’l Game Tech.,
543 F.3d 657 (Fed. Cir. 2008) 77, 78, 79

Astrazeneca UK Ltd. v. Watson Labs., Inc.,
No. 10-915, slip op. (D. Del. Nov. 21, 2012)67

Bhd. Of R.R. Trainmen v. Baltimore & Ohio R.R. Co.,
331 U.S. 519 (1947).....70

Blonder-Tongue Lab. v. Univ. of Ill. Found.,
402 U.S. 313 (1971).....76

Bowers Inv. Co. v. United States,
695 F.3d 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2012)66

Burlington N. R.R. v. Hyundai Merch. Marine Co.,
63 F.3d 1227 (3d Cir. 1995)67

Classen Immunotherapies, Inc. v. Biogen IDEC,
659 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011)73

Coalition for Clean Air v. United States EPA,
971 F.2d 219 (9th Cir. 1992)44

Crossroads Sys. (Texas), Inc. v. Dot Hill Sys. Corp.,
2006 WL 1544621 (W.D. Tex. May 31, 2006)67

DealerTrack, Inc. v. Huber,
674 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 77, 79

Diamond v. Diehr,
450 U.S. 175 (1981)..... passim

<i>Duncan v. Walker</i> , 533 U.S. 167 (2001).....	44
<i>Ethicon, Inc. v. Quigg</i> , 849 F.2d 1422 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	64
<i>Garcia v. United States</i> , 469 U.S. 70 (1984).....	44, 79
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	75, 76, 77, 78
<i>Huron Holding Corp. v. Lincoln Mine Operating Co.</i> , 312 U.S. 183 (1941).....	63
<i>In re Baxter Int'l, Inc.</i> , 678 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	64
<i>In re Baxter Travenol Labs.</i> , 952 F.2d 388 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	55
<i>In re Bergy</i> , 596 F.2d 952 (C.C.P.A. 1979) <i>vacated as moot</i> , 444 U.S. 1028 (1980).....	passim
<i>In re Construction Equip. Co.</i> , 665 F.3d 1254 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	64
<i>In re Freeman</i> , 30 F.3d 1459 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	67
<i>In re Moore</i> , 439 F.2d 1232 (C.C.P.A. 1971)	59
<i>In re Swanson</i> , 540 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	64, 65
<i>Kewanee Oil Co. v. Bicron Corp.</i> , 416 U.S. 470 (1974).....	76
<i>Mars Inc., v. Nippon Conlux Kabushiki-Kaisha</i> , 58 F.3d 616 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	65
<i>Meritor Transmission Corp. v. Eaton Corp.</i> , 2006 WL 3951711 (W.D.N.C. Setp. 26, 2006)	67
<i>MySpace, Inc. v. Graphon Corp.</i> , 672 F.3d 1250 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	71

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.