

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CALLIDUS SOFTWARE INC.
Petitioner

v.

VERSATA DEVELOPMENT GROUP, INC.
Patent Owner

and

VERSATA SOFTWARE, INC.
Real Party-In-Interest

Case CBM2014-00117
Patent 7,908,304

Filed: April 17, 2014

**PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT
REVIEW UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 321 AND §18 OF THE
LEAHY-SMITH AMERICA INVENTS ACT**

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 321 and § 18 of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (“AIA”) and pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.300 *et seq.*, the undersigned hereby requests covered business method (“CBM”) patent review of claims 2-11, 26-29,

Petition for Covered Business Method Review
U.S. Patent No. 7,908,304

33-41, and 44-46 of U.S. Patent 7,908,304 (Exh. 1001) (“the ‘304 patent”), which issued to David Chao et al. on March 15, 2011.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
II. MANDATORY NOTICES	4
A. Real Party-in-Interest.....	4
B. Related Matters	4
C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel	5
D. Service Information	6
III. PAYMENT OF FEES	6
IV. GROUNDS FOR STANDING.....	6
A. The Board has Previously Found that Petitioner has Been Sued for Infringement of the '304 Patent and Held that Petitioner is Not Estopped	6
B. At Least One Challenged Claim is Unpatentable	9
C. The '304 Patent is a CBM Patent.....	9
1. Claims 2-11, 26-29, 33-41, and 44-46 are Each Directed to Financial Products or Services.....	10
2. Claims 2-11, 26-29, 33-41, and 44-46 are Not Directed to a “Technological Invention”	12
V. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED FOR EACH CLAIM CHALLENGED	19
A. Claims for which Review is Requested.....	19
B. Statutory Grounds of Challenge	19

VI.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	20
A.	Broadest Reasonable Interpretation.....	20
B.	Support for Petitioner’s Broadest Reasonable Interpretation.....	22
1.	“Module” / “Modules”	22
2.	“To Generate a Selling Agreement” / “To Define and Create A Selling Agreement”	23
3.	“Engine”	24
4.	“Backbone”	25
5.	“Interface”	27
VII.	CLAIMS 2-11, 26-29, 33-41, AND 44-46 OF THE ‘304 PATENT ARE DIRECTED TO NON-PATENTABLE SUBJECT MATTER.....	28
A.	Inventions Covering Abstract Ideas are Not Eligible for Patent Protection, Regardless of their Form.....	28
B.	Claim 12 of the ‘304 Patent is Directed to an Abstract Idea	30
1.	No More than General Purpose Computer Hardware and Programming are Used to Implement the Validating a Distributor to Begin Selling Products of Claim 12.....	34
2.	Validating a Distributor to Begin Selling Products Can be Accomplished by Hand	36
3.	Claim 12 Fails the Machine-or-Transformation Test	39
C.	Because Dependent Claims 26-29 and 41 Add Only Rudimentary Data Manipulations to the Abstract Idea of Claim 12, They are Not Patent Eligible.	43
D.	Claim 1 of the ‘304 Patent is Directed to an Abstract Idea.....	46
1.	No More than General Purpose Computer Hardware and Programming are Used to Determine Compensation for a Validated Distributor of Claim 1	49

2. Determining Compensation for a Validated Distributor Can be Accomplished by Hand.....	51
3. Claim 1 Fails the Machine-or-Transformation Test	54
E. Dependent Claims 2-11 Define Abstract Ideas that Fail to Tie Down the Claimed Abstract Idea of Claim 1	57
1. Dependent Claim 2 Fails to Add Any Meaningful Specificity to the Abstract Idea of Claim 1, and Is Itself Abstract.....	57
2. Because Dependent Claims 3, 6, and 7 Add Only Basic Computer Functions and Data Manipulations to the Abstract Idea of Claim 1, They are Not Patent Eligible.....	59
3. Dependent Claims 4-5 Are Unpatentable Because They Fail to Add Any Meaningful Specificity to the Abstract Idea of Claim 1	61
4. Dependent Claims 8-11 Are Unpatentable Because They Are Merely Species of the Abstract Idea, and Thus Fail to Add Meaningful Specificity to the Abstract Idea of Claim 1	62
F. Claim 32 of the '304 Patent is Directed to an Abstract Idea.....	64
1. No More than General Purpose Computer Hardware and Programming are Used to Implement the Determining Compensation for a Validated Distributor of Claim 32.....	67
2. Determining Compensation for Validated Distributors Can be Accomplished by Hand	69
3. Claim 32 Fails the Machine-or-Transformation Test	70
G. Dependent Claims 33-40 and 44-46 Define Abstract Ideas that Fail to Tie Down the Claimed Abstract Idea of Claim 32.....	70
1. Dependent Claims 33, 35, and 44 Add Nothing More Than Basic Computer Functions to the Abstract Ideas of Claims 1 and 32.	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.