UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD Ford Motor Company Petitioner, v. Versata Software, Inc. Patent Owner. U.S. Patent No. 7,739,080 CBM Case No.: 2016-00101

DECLARATION OF DEBORAH L. McGUINNESS, Ph.D.



Case No.: CBM2016-00101 Atty. Dkt. No.: FPGP0131CBMR1 Patent No.: 7,739,080

TABLE OF CONTENTS

II. Qualifications and Professional Experience	List o	of Exhibits	3	
III. Relevant Legal Standards	I.	Introduction.	4	
IV. While the disclosure of a patent specification is determined from the perspective of a person having ordinary skill in the art, the disclosure for purposes of analyzing a means-plus-function claim cannot be supplemented through expert opinion. For example, undisclosed subject matter that an expert might consider "obvious" or "known to those of skill in the art" at the time of the invention is not a part of the written description unless that subject matter is disclosed in the specification. Qualifications of one of ordinary skill in the art	II.	Qualifications and Professional Experience	5	
perspective of a person having ordinary skill in the art, the disclosure for purposes of analyzing a means-plus-function claim cannot be supplemented through expert opinion. For example, undisclosed subject matter that an expert might consider "obvious" or "known to those of skill in the art" at the time of the invention is not a part of the written description unless that subject matter is disclosed in the specification. Qualifications of one of ordinary skill in the art	III.	Relevant Legal Standards	9	
VI. The '080 patent claims cover what humans can do	IV.	perspective of a person having ordinary skill in the art, the disclosure for purposes of analyzing a means-plus-function claim cannot be supplemented through expert opinion. For example, undisclosed subject matter that an expert might consider "obvious" or "known to those of skill in the art" at the time of the invention is not a part of the written description unless that subject matter is disclosed in the		
A. Independent claims 1, 3, 4, and 22	V.		12	
B. The dependent claims	VI.	The '080 patent claims cover what humans can do	12	
skilled artisan with reasonable certainty				
general purpose computer and the '080 patent does not disclose an algorithm	VII.	<u>.</u>	29	
	VIII.	general purpose computer and the '080 patent does not disclose an	31	
IX Conclusion 35	IX.	Conclusion		



Case No.: CBM2016-00101 Atty. Dkt. No.: FPGP0131CBMR1

Patent No.: 7,739,080

List of Exhibits

Exhibit No.	Description	Identifier
1001	U.S. Patent No. 7,739,080	'080 patent
1002	Versata Complaint in the <i>Versata</i> lawsuit	
1003	Versata Counterclaim in the <i>Ford</i> lawsuit	
1004	A Guide to the Legislative History of the America Invents Act; Part II of II, 21 Fed. Cir. Bar J. No. 4 (2002), pp. 539-653	AIA Legislative History Guide
1005	U.S. Patent No. 7,200,582	'582 patent
1006	Declaration of Deborah L. McGuinness	McGuinness Decl.
1007	File history of the '080 patent	'080 file history
1008	McGuinness Curriculum Vitae	·
1009	Stefik, Introduction to Knowledge Systems (1995)	Stefik
1010	McDermott, R1: an Expert in the Computer Systems Domain, Proceedings AAAI-80 (1980)	McDermott
1011	McGuinness et al., An Industrial-Strength Description Logic-Based Configurator Platform, IEEE Intelligent Systems (1998)	
1012	McGuinness et al., <i>Description Logic in Practice:</i> A CLASSIC: Application, Proceedings of the 14th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Montreal, Canada, (August 1995)	
1013	Versata's identification of "means" structure for claim 22 of the '080 patent from the <i>Ford</i> lawsuit	
1014	Versata's Opening Claim Construction Brief in the <i>Ford</i> lawsuit	



Case No.: CBM2016-00101 Atty. Dkt. No.: FPGP0131CBMR1

Patent No.: 7,739,080

I, Deborah L. McGuinness, Ph.D., declare as follows:

I. Introduction

1. I am making this declaration at the request of Ford Motor Company in a Covered Business Method Review proceeding concerning U.S. Patent No. 7,739,080 ("the '080 Patent").

- 2. I am being compensated for my work in this matter at my standard consulting rate of \$500 per hour and, when working while traveling, \$600. My compensation does not depend on the outcome of this proceeding.
- 3. I have been asked to provide my opinions related to the patentability of claims 1-22 of the '080 patent.
- 4. In preparation of this declaration, I have studied Exhibits 1001, 1005, and 1007-1014 as listed in the Exhibit List shown above in my report.
 - 5. In forming the opinions expressed below, I have considered:
 - (a) The patents and file histories identified in the List of Exhibits;
 - (b) The relevant legal standards as explained to me by Ford's counsel, including the standard for patentability under 35 United States Code §§ 101 and 112, ¶ 2; and
 - (c) My knowledge and experience based upon my work and study as described below, considering the patentability of the '080 patent from the



Case No.: CBM2016-00101 Atty. Dkt. No.: FPGP0131CBMR1

Patent No.: 7,739,080

viewpoint of a person having ordinary skill in the relevant art as of the priority date of the '080 patent, which I am told is April 19, 2004.

II. Qualifications and Professional Experience

6. I have provided my full background in the curriculum vitae that is attached as Ex. 1008, which more fully details my 30-plus years of experience in computer science and electrical engineering. I am also an inventor on five patents, four of which directly relate to product configuration: U.S. Patent Nos. 5,720,008, 5,974,405, 6,256,627, 6,385,600, and 6,457,002.

- 7. My academic training includes completing the requirements for a Bachelor of Science in Computer Science and a Bachelor of Arts in Mathematics from Duke University in 1980. I completed a Master of Science degree from the Electrical Engineering and Computer Science Department of the University of California at Berkeley in 1981. I also completed a Ph.D. in Computer Science from Rutgers University in 1996.
- 8. I began my professional career immediately after my Bachelor's degree and began work for AT&T Bell Laboratories in 1980. I was immediately accepted into the Bell Laboratories "One Year on Campus" program which supported me to be a full time Master's student at Berkeley. Upon completion of my M.S. in 1981, I returned to Bell Laboratories and began work at the Home of the Future at the Home Information Systems Laboratory. In 1984, I transferred to



DOCKET

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.

