

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

Ford Motor Company,

Plaintiff/
Counter-Defendant,

v.

Versata Software, Inc., et al.,

Defendants/
Counter-Plaintiffs.

Case No. 15-10628-MFL-EAS
(consolidated with Case No. 15-cv-11624)

Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**FORD MOTOR COMPANY'S MOTION TO
ADOPT IN PART THE REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION OF THE SPECIAL
MASTER REGARDING CLAIM
CONSTRUCTION (Dkt. #181)**

Ford moves to adopt Sections 1-14 of the Special Master's Report and Recommendation of the Special Master Regarding Claim Construction (Dkt. #181).

Versata does not oppose the motion to adopt.

Ford objects to Section 15 of the Report and Recommendation because the Special Master's recommendation that claims 2, 10, and 16 of U.S Patent No. 7,739,080 are not indefinite was incorrect, as explained in the Brief below. Versata opposes this objection.

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF FORD'S OBJECTION

CONCISE STATEMENT OF ISSUE PRESENTED

Where the scope of dependent claims 2, 10, and 16 of U.S. Patent No. 7,739,080 is not reasonably certain to a person of ordinary skill in the art because, as the Special Master found, those claims are inconsistent with the patent's written description, was the Special Master's wrong to recommend that those claims are not indefinite?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF FORD’S OBJECTION i

CONCISE STATEMENT OF ISSUE PRESENTED..... i

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iii

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. SUMMARY OF THE ‘080 PATENT2

III. APPLICABLE LAW7

IV. ARGUMENT10

V. CONCLUSION.....14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Allen Eng’g Corp. v. Bartell Indus.,
299 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2002)9, 10

Exxon Research & Eng’g Co. v. U.S.,
265 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2001)8

In re Cohn,
438 F.2d 989 (CCPA 1971).....9, 10

In re Moore,
439 F.2d 1232 (CCPA 1971).....9, 10

Microsoft Corp. v. i4i Ltd. P’ship,
564 U.S. 91 (2011).....8

Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.,
134 S.Ct. 2120 (2013).....8

Solomon v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.,
216 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2000)7

South Corp. v. U.S.,
690 F.2d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 1982) (*en banc*).....9

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 112 2, 7, 10

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 1.758

I. INTRODUCTION

Ford objects to Section 15, “Detecting any inconsistencies,” of the Special Master’s Report and Recommendation regarding Claim Construction (Dkt. #181, “R&R”). In that Section, the Special Master addressed Ford’s argument that dependent claims 2, 10, and 16 of U.S. Patent No. 7,739,080 (“the ‘080 patent”) are indefinite. (R&R, pp. 62-69.) Like all the Versata patents in this lawsuit, the ‘080 patent relates to computer software for defining product configuration “models” used to build products, such as automobiles. Because configuration models can be complex, large models are sometimes broken into smaller models, which are later combined before the model is used to answer “configuration questions” concerning whether a particular product configuration is actually buildable.

The ‘080 patent explains that “conventional” methods of combining models could result in conflicting rules, with the result that the consolidated model would be unusable to answer configuration questions. The patented method solves that problem by automating the process of identifying rule conflicts and attempting to resolve them. If all conflicts can be resolved, the process produces a consolidated model that can be used to answer configuration questions. On the other hand, if the conflicts cannot be automatically resolved, no consolidated model is created.

The independent claims of the ‘080 patent describe the automated process of identify and resolving rule conflicts that can result when combining multiple

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.