

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

FORD MOTOR COMPANY,

Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant,

v.

CASE NO. 15-10628-MFL-EAS

*(Consolidated with*

*Case No. 15-11624-MFL-EAS)*

Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

VERSATA SOFTWARE, INC., F/K/A  
TRILOGY SOFTWARE, INC., TRILOGY  
DEVELOPMENT GROUP, INC. AND  
TRILOGY, INC.,

Defendants/Counter-Plaintiffs.

---

**DEFENDANTS'  
OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. THE APPLICABLE LAW.....4

    A. Legal Standards for Claim Construction .....4

III. ARGUMENTS .....9

    A. The ‘651 Patent Family .....9

        1. Summary of the ‘651 Patent Family .....9

        2. The “Configuration” Terms .....12

            a) The specification and claims make clear that “definition” is not independent of “configuring a system,” but rather a necessary step.....13

            b) Configuring a system .....18

            c) Configuration user.....20

            d) User Input.....21

            e) Displaying .....22

        3. System .....24

        4. Analyzing and Determine .....28

            a) Determine .....28

            b) Analyze .....29

        5. Component relationships.....30

    B. The ‘582 family – the “Consistency Checking” Patents .....32

        1. Summary of the ‘582 Patent Family .....32

        2. ‘Set’ equation .....34

    C. The ‘057 Patent.....38

        1. Summary of the ‘057 Patent.....38

        2. Processing each sub-query using at least one configuration sub-model per sub-query.....42

    D. The ‘825 Patent.....46

        1. Summary of the ‘825 Patent.....46

        2. Attribute .....47

..

- 3. Attribute Prioritized .....51
- E. The '080 Patent.....52
  - 1. Summary of the '080 Patent.....52
  - 2. Extending at least one of the ancestor configuration model family spaces  
54
  - 3. Removing [the added space] from the child configuration model family  
space .....57
  - 4. Dependent Claims 2, 10, and 16 of the '080 Patent are Not indefinite. ...58
- IV. CONCLUSION.....62

...

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES****Cases**

<i>3M Innovative Properties Co. v. Tredegar Corp.</i> , 725 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	37
<i>Abtox, Inc. v. Exitron Corp.</i> , 122 F.3d 1019 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	6
<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , No. 2:15-CV-1047-RSP, 2016 WL 4211504 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 10, 2016).....	62
<i>Biosig Instruments, Inc. v. Nautilus, Inc.</i> , 783 F.3d 1374, 1384 (Fed. Cir.) .....	59
<i>Brown v. 3M</i> 265 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	5
<i>Cioffi v. Google, Inc.</i> , 632 F. App'x 1013 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	59
<i>Dow Chem. Co. v. Nova Chemicals Corp. (Canada)</i> , 803 F.3d 620 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	59
<i>Honeywell Int'l, Inc. v. Universal Avionics Sys. Corp.</i> , 493 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	7
<i>Innova/Pure Water, Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration Sys., Inc.</i> , 381 F.3d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	4, 8, 15, 25, 31
<i>Kinglite Holdings Inc. v. Micro-Star Int'l Co.</i> , No. 2:14-cv-03009-JVS-PJW, Dkt. 106 (C.D. Cal. June 10, 2015) .....	6
<i>Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	7
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 517 U.S. 370 (1996).....	4

*Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.*,  
134 S. Ct. 2120 (2014)..... 8, 59

*O2 Micro Int’l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.*,  
521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008) ..... 5, 24

*Omega Eng’g, Inc. v. Raytek Corp.*,  
334 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....36

*Phillips v. AWH Corp.*,  
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) ..... passim

*Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Int’l, Inc.*,  
711 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....6

*Randall May Int’l Inc. v. Pearl Corp.*,  
No. SACV 13–00016 JVS (RNBx), 2014 Markman 2930725 (C.D. Cal.  
Mar. 11, 2014) .....5

*Raytheon Co. v. Roper Corp.*,  
724 F.2d 951 (Fed. Cir. 1983) .....7

*SimpleAir, Inc. v. Sony Ericsson Mobile Commc'ns AB*,  
820 F.3d 419 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....62

*SuperGuide Corp. v. DirecTV Enterprises, Inc.*,  
358 F.3d 870 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....7

*Takeda Pharm. Co. v. Zydus Pharms. USA, Inc.*,  
743 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....8

*Trilogy Software, Inc. v. Selectica, Inc.*,  
405 F. Supp. 2d 731 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 20, 2005).....21

*U.S. Surgical Corp. v. Ethicon, Inc.*,  
103 F.3d 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....4, 5

*Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Inmagine Corp., LLC*,  
No. 6:12-CV-93-LED, 2013 WL 3871360  
(E.D. Tex. July 24, 2013) .....6

# 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.