

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

FORD MOTOR COMPANY

Petitioner

v.

TRILOGY DEVELOPMENT GROUP, INC.

Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2017-00150

Patent 7,882,057

---

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

***Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"***

Patent Trial and Appeal Board

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION .....1

II. FORD’S PETITION IS UNTIMELY .....5

    A. For more than a year, Versata and Ford have continuously been involved in a patent-infringement dispute.....5

    B. Ford’s IPR petition is time barred under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b). .....9

    C. The Board, in its discretion, should deny institution because Ford improperly used its first petition as a roadmap for drafting its second.....15

III. TECHNICAL OVERVIEW .....21

    A. Versata is a pioneer in configuration technology, and the ’057 patent represents a significant advance.....21

    B. Overview of the ’057 Patent.....23

    C. Overview of Loomans .....29

    D. Overview of Stahl.....31

IV. ARGUMENT.....33

    A. Ford does not show that the cited references teach or suggest every claim feature. ....33

        1. Ford does not show that the cited references teach “dividing one or more configuration queries” such that “the multiple configuration sub-queries represent the one or more configuration queries” as recited in every independent claim. ....35

            a. Stahl’s disclosure that “we can interpret the different leaf nodes of the query” does not disclose the claimed “dividing.” .....37

            b. Stahl does not disclose dividing such that “the multiple configuration sub-queries represent the one or more configuration queries” as claimed. ....41

            c. Ford provides no reason explaining why a skilled artisan would incorporate Stahl’s “interpretation” into Loomans’ system. ....44

2.	Ford does not show that the cited references teach that “each configuration sub-model includes data to define compatibility relationships between parts” as recited in every independent claim. ....	47
3.	Ford does not show that the cited references teach that “each configuration sub-model collectively models the configurable product” as recited in every independent claim. ....	53
4.	Ford does not show that the cited references teach “processing of each sub-query using at least one configuration sub-model per sub-query” as recited in every independent claim. ....	56
B.	The Board should reject Ford’s means-plus-function analysis. ....	57
C.	Ford’s obviousness analysis is inadequate, because Ford never ascertains the differences between the references and the claims. ....	59
V.	CONCLUSION.....	61

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

*Apple Inc. v. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute*  
IPR2014-00319, Paper no. 12 (PTAB June 12, 2014) ..... 9, 10, 12

*Coalition for Affordable Drugs (Adroca) LLC v. Acorda Therapeutics, Inc.*  
IPR2015-01853, Paper no. 13 (PTAB Mar. 11, 2016) .....20

*Conopco, Inc. v. Proctor & Gamble Co.*  
IPR2014-00506, Paper no. 25 (PTAB Dec. 10, 2014) .....15

*Conopco, Inc. v. Proctor & Gamble Co.*  
IPR2014-00628, Paper no. 21 (PTAB Oct. 20, 2014) .....16

*CQG, Inc. v. Trading Techs. Int’l, Inc.*  
CBM2015-00057, Paper no. 13 (PTAB July 10, 2015) ..... 10, 13, 14

*Cyanotech Corp. v. Bd. of Trustees of the Univ. of Illinois*  
IPR2013-00401, Paper no. 17 (PTAB Dec. 19, 2013) .....13

*eBay, Inc. v. Advanced Auctions LLC*  
IPR2014-00806, Paper no. 14 (PTAB Sept. 25, 2014)..... 9, 10, 12

*Ericsson Inc. and Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC*  
IPR2014-01170, Paper no. 9 (PTAB Feb. 17, 2015).....59

*Gordon \* Howard Associates, Inc. v. LunarEye, Inc.*  
IPR2014-01213, Paper no. 11 (PTAB Feb. 3, 2015).....12

*Graham v. John Deere Co.*  
383 U.S. 1 (1966).....60

*Histologics, LLC v. CDX Diagnostics, Inc.*  
IPR2014-00779, Paper no. 6 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2014)..... 9, 10, 12

*In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.*  
829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. July 25, 2016)..... 44, 58

*Nautique Boat Co. v. Malibu Boats, LLC*  
IPR2014-01045, Paper no. 13 (PTAB Nov. 26, 2014).....13

*Nvidia Corp. v. Samsung Elecs. Corp.*  
IPR2016-00134, Paper no. 9 (PTAB May 4, 2016) .....20

*Oracle Corp. v. Click-to-Call Techs. LP*  
IPR2013-00312, Paper no. 26 (PTAB Oct. 30, 2013).....11

*Toyota Motor Corp. v. Cellport Sys., Inc.*  
IPR2015-01423, Paper no. 7 (PTAB Oct. 28, 2015)..... 15, 16

*Travelocity.com L.P. v. Cronos Technologies LLC*  
CBM2014-00082, Paper no. 12 (PTAB Oct. 16, 2014) .....60

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....14

35 U.S.C. § 315(a) .....13

35 U.S.C. § 315(b) ..... passim

35 U.S.C. § 316(e) .....58

35 U.S.C. § 325(d) .....15

**Rules**

37 C.F.R. § 42.108 .....14

# 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.