| | Case5:13-cv-05161-PSG Docu | ment18 | Filed12/17/13 | Page1 of 22 | | | |
|--|---|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Christopher Sargent (Cal. Bar No. 246285) Ansel Halliburton (Cal. Bar No. 282906) COMPUTERLAW GROUP LLP 401 Florence Street | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Palo Alto, CA 94301 (650) 327-9800 | | | | | | |
| 5 | (650) 618-1863 fax jrusso@computerlaw.com csargent@computerlaw.com | | | | | | |
| 6 | ahalliburton@computerlaw.com | | | | | | |
| 7 8 | Attorneys for Plaintiff XIMPLEWARE CORP. | | | | | | |
| 9 | United State | S DISTR | ICT COURT | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 10 | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | | |
| 12 | XimpleWare Corp. , a California Corporation, | Case | No. 5:13-cv-0516 | 61-PSG | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Plaintiff; | AME | NDED COMPLAIN | T FOR: | | | |
| 13 14 | Plaintiff; v. | | nded Complain irect Patent In | | | | |
| | V. | (1) D (2) IN | IRECT PATENT IN NDUCING PATENT | IFRINGEMENT Infringement | | | |
| 14 | v. Versata Software, Inc., f/k/a Trilogy Software, Inc., a Delaware corporation; | (1) D (2) Ir (3) D | IRECT PATENT IN NDUCING PATENT ECLARATORY RE | IFRINGEMENT Infringement lief | | | |
| 14 15 | v. Versata Software, Inc., f/k/a Trilogy Software, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Trilogy Development Group, Inc., a California corporation; Ameriprise | (1) D (2) Ir (3) D | IRECT PATENT IN NDUCING PATENT | IFRINGEMENT Infringement lief | | | |
| 14 15 16 | v. Versata Software, Inc., f/k/a Trilogy Software, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Trilogy Development Group, Inc., a California corporation; Ameriprise Financial, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Ameriprise Financial Services, Inc., a | (1) D (2) Ir (3) D Jury | IRECT PATENT IN NDUCING PATENT ECLARATORY RE | IFRINGEMENT Infringement lief | | | |
| 14 15 16 17 | v. Versata Software, Inc., f/k/a Trilogy Software, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Trilogy Development Group, Inc., a California corporation; Ameriprise Financial, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Ameriprise Financial Services, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Aurea Software, Inc a/k/a Aurea, Inc., a Delaware corporation; | (1) D (2) Ir (3) D Jury | IRECT PATENT IN NDUCING PATENT ECLARATORY RE | IFRINGEMENT Infringement lief | | | |
| 14 15 16 17 18 | v. Versata Software, Inc., f/k/a Trilogy Software, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Trilogy Development Group, Inc., a California corporation; Ameriprise Financial, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Ameriprise Financial Services, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Aurea Software, Inc a/k/a Aurea, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Pacific Life Insurance Company, a Nebraska corporation; United HealthCare | (1) D (2) Ir (3) D Jury | IRECT PATENT IN NDUCING PATENT ECLARATORY RE | IFRINGEMENT Infringement lief | | | |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 | v. Versata Software, Inc., f/k/a Trilogy Software, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Trilogy Development Group, Inc., a California corporation; Ameriprise Financial, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Ameriprise Financial Services, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Aurea Software, Inc a/k/a Aurea, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Pacific Life Insurance Company, a Nebraska corporation; United HealthCare Services, Inc., a Minnesota corporation; Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, a | (1) D (2) Ir (3) D Jury | IRECT PATENT IN NDUCING PATENT ECLARATORY RE | IFRINGEMENT Infringement lief | | | |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | v. Versata Software, Inc., f/k/a Trilogy Software, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Trilogy Development Group, Inc., a California corporation; Ameriprise Financial, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Ameriprise Financial Services, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Aurea Software, Inc a/k/a Aurea, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Pacific Life Insurance Company, a Nebraska corporation; United HealthCare Services, Inc., a Minnesota corporation; Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, a New York corporation; The Prudential Insurance Company of America, a New | (1) D (2) Ir (3) D Jury | IRECT PATENT IN NDUCING PATENT ECLARATORY RE | IFRINGEMENT Infringement lief | | | |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | v. Versata Software, Inc., f/k/a Trilogy Software, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Trilogy Development Group, Inc., a California corporation; Ameriprise Financial, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Ameriprise Financial Services, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Aurea Software, Inc a/k/a Aurea, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Pacific Life Insurance Company, a Nebraska corporation; United HealthCare Services, Inc., a Minnesota corporation; Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, a New York corporation; The Prudential Insurance Company of America, a New Jersey corporation; Wellmark, Inc., an Iowa corporation, Waddell & Reed Financial, | (1) D (2) Ir (3) D Jury | IRECT PATENT IN NDUCING PATENT ECLARATORY RE | IFRINGEMENT Infringement lief | | | |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | v. Versata Software, Inc., f/k/a Trilogy Software, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Trilogy Development Group, Inc., a California corporation; Ameriprise Financial, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Ameriprise Financial Services, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Aurea Software, Inc a/k/a Aurea, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Pacific Life Insurance Company, a Nebraska corporation; United HealthCare Services, Inc., a Minnesota corporation; Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, a New York corporation; The Prudential Insurance Company of America, a New Jersey corporation; Wellmark, Inc., an Iowa | (1) D (2) Ir (3) D Jury | IRECT PATENT IN NDUCING PATENT ECLARATORY RE | IFRINGEMENT Infringement lief | | | |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | v. Versata Software, Inc., f/k/a Trilogy Software, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Trilogy Development Group, Inc., a California corporation; Ameriprise Financial, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Ameriprise Financial Services, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Aurea Software, Inc a/k/a Aurea, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Pacific Life Insurance Company, a Nebraska corporation; United HealthCare Services, Inc., a Minnesota corporation; Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, a New York corporation; The Prudential Insurance Company of America, a New Jersey corporation; Wellmark, Inc., an Iowa corporation, Waddell & Reed Financial, Inc., a Delaware corporation; and Aviva US. | (1) D (2) Ir (3) D Jury | IRECT PATENT IN NDUCING PATENT ECLARATORY RE | IFRINGEMENT Infringement lief | | | |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | v. Versata Software, Inc., f/k/a Trilogy Software, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Trilogy Development Group, Inc., a California corporation; Ameriprise Financial, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Ameriprise Financial Services, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Aurea Software, Inc a/k/a Aurea, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Pacific Life Insurance Company, a Nebraska corporation; United HealthCare Services, Inc., a Minnesota corporation; Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, a New York corporation; The Prudential Insurance Company of America, a New Jersey corporation; Wellmark, Inc., an Iowa corporation, Waddell & Reed Financial, Inc., a Delaware corporation; and Aviva US. Corporation, an Iowa corporation, | (1) D (2) Ir (3) D Jury | IRECT PATENT IN NDUCING PATENT ECLARATORY RE | IFRINGEMENT Infringement lief | | | |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | v. Versata Software, Inc., f/k/a Trilogy Software, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Trilogy Development Group, Inc., a California corporation; Ameriprise Financial, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Ameriprise Financial Services, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Aurea Software, Inc a/k/a Aurea, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Pacific Life Insurance Company, a Nebraska corporation; United HealthCare Services, Inc., a Minnesota corporation; Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, a New York corporation; The Prudential Insurance Company of America, a New Jersey corporation; Wellmark, Inc., an Iowa corporation, Waddell & Reed Financial, Inc., a Delaware corporation; and Aviva US. Corporation, an Iowa corporation, | (1) D (2) Ir (3) D Jury | IRECT PATENT IN NDUCING PATENT ECLARATORY RE | IFRINGEMENT Infringement lief | | | |

Computerlaw Group LLP www.computerlaw.comsm 1 Plaintiff XimpleWare Corp. alleges the following against Defendants Versata Software, Inc., f/k/a Trilogy Software, Inc., Trilogy Development Group, Inc., and Aurea Software, Inc. 2 3 a/k/a Aurea, Inc. (collectively "Versata" or the "Versata Defendants"); and against Ameriprise Financial, Inc., Ameriprise Financial Services, Inc., Pacific Life Insurance Company, United 4 HealthCare Services, Inc., Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, The Prudential Insurance 5 Company of America, Wellmark, Inc., Waddell & Reed Financial, Inc., and Aviva USA 6 Corporation (collectively the "Customer Defendants"; and the Versata Defendants and the 7 8 Customer Defendants are collectively the "Defendants"):

NATURE OF ACTION

10 1. This action involves claims of patent infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271 et seq. and declaratory relief.

PARTIES

2. Plaintiff XimpleWare Corp. ("XimpleWare") is a corporation organized under the laws of, and registered to do business in, California, with its principal place of business in Milpitas, California.

16 3. Plaintiff XimpleWare is the designer, developer, and distributor of advanced 17 computer software and, as an enterprise that practices its own patents, it has delivered to the 18 marketplace advanced computer software that provides enterprises, Fortune 5000 corporations, 19 firms, and other businesses with an advanced data processing solution for challenging data 20processing problems. Plaintiff XimpleWare has a number of licensed customers including 21 Matrikon, Inc., Smith & Tinker, Inc., United Stationers Technology Services LLC, and Zoosk, 22 Inc.

23 4. Defendant Versata Software, Inc., f/k/a Trilogy Software, Inc. ("Versata") is a private corporation registered to do business in California, organized under the laws of Delaware, 24 25 with its principal place of business in Austin, Texas.

26 5. Defendant Trilogy Development Group, Inc. ("Trilogy") is a corporation 27 organized under the laws of California, with its principal place of business in Austin, Texas. On

1

28

9

11

12

13

14

Case5:13-cv-05161-PSG Document18 Filed12/17/13 Page3 of 22

information and belief, Trilogy acquired Defendant Versata in or about February 2006, and
 Trilogy is now the parent company of Versata and its subsidiaries.

6. Defendant Aurea Software, Inc. a/k/a Aurea, Inc. ("<u>Aurea</u>") is a corporation
registered to do business in California, organized under the laws of Delaware with its principal
place of business in Austin, Texas. On information and belief, Aurea merged with Trilogy and
Versata in October, 2013.¹

7 7. Defendant Ameriprise Financial, Inc. is a corporation registered to do business in
8 California, organized under the laws of Delaware, with its principal place of business located in
9 Minneapolis, Minnesota. On information and belief, Ameriprise is a leading diversified financial
10 services provider, providing a range of financial planning products and is a customer of Versata
11 and Trilogy.

8. Defendant Ameriprise Financial Services, Inc. is a corporation registered to do
 business in California, organized under the laws of Delaware, with its principal place of business
 located in Minneapolis, Minnesota. On information and belief, Defendant Ameriprise Financial
 Services, Inc. is a subsidiary of Defendant Ameriprise Financial, Inc. (together, Ameriprise
 Financial, Inc. and Ameriprise Financial Services Inc. shall be referred to as "Ameriprise").

Defendant Pacific Life Insurance Company ("<u>Pacific Life</u>") is a Nebraska
 corporation with its principal place of business in Newport Beach, California. On information
 and belief, Pacific Life is a customer of Versata and Trilogy.

10. Defendant United HealthCare Services, Inc. ("<u>UHS</u>") is a public corporation
registered to do business in California organized under the laws of Minnesota with its principal
place of business in Minnetonka, Minnesota. On information and belief, UHS is a diversified
managed health care company and a customer of Versata and Trilogy.

24 11. Defendant Metropolitan Life Insurance Company ("<u>MetLife</u>") is a public
25 corporation registered to do business in California organized under the laws of New York with its
26 principal place of business in New York, New York. On information and belief, MetLife is a

27

28 <u>1 http://www.aurea.com/pressrelease/20131013</u> Amended Complaint 2 global provider of insurance, annuities, and employment benefit programs and is a customer of
 Versata and Trilogy.

12. Defendant The Prudential Insurance Company of America ("<u>Prudential</u>") is a
public corporation registered to do business in California organized under the laws of New
Jersey with its principal place of business in Newark, New Jersey. On information and belief,
Prudential provides insurance and financial services and is a customer of Versata and Trilogy.

7 13. Defendant Wellmark, Inc. ("<u>Wellmark</u>") is a corporation organized under the laws
8 of Iowa, operating under the fictitious names "Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Iowa" and
9 "Wellmark Blue Cross and Blue Shield." Wellmark has its principal place of business in Des
10 Moines, Iowa. On information and belief, Wellmark is an insurance company and a customer of
11 Versata and Trilogy.

12 14. Defendant Waddell & Reed Financial, Inc. ("<u>W&R</u>") is a public corporation
13 registered to do business in California, organized under the laws of Delaware with its principal
14 place of business in Overland Park, Kansas. On information and belief, W&R provides asset
15 management and financial planning services and is a customer of Versata and Trilogy.

16 15. Defendant Aviva USA Corporation ("<u>Aviva</u>") is a company organized under the
17 laws of Iowa with its principal place of business in West Des Moines, Iowa. On information and
18 belief, Aviva is a subsidiary of Aviva, plc., a multinational insurance company headquartered in
19 London, United Kingdom, and is a customer of Versata and Trilogy.

16. Plaintiff is informed and believes and on that basis alleges (collectively
hereinafter "<u>on information and belief</u>"), that at all relevant times Trilogy was and is the
operating entity of, and has effective, if not actual, control over the business decisions made by
its subsidiaries, Versata and Aurea.

24 17. On information and belief, at all relevant times, Versata and Aurea were the mere
25 solely controlled instrumentalities of Trilogy and functioned as Trilogy's *alter egos*, and all
26 undertakings by Versata and Aurea were known by, sanctioned, or done at the direction and
27 under the sole control of Trilogy, or by others serving under Trilogy's direction and/or sole
28 control.

Case5:13-cv-05161-PSG Document18 Filed12/17/13 Page5 of 22

18. 1 On information and belief, at all relevant times, Trilogy, Versata, Aurea, and a number of other entities have acted and continue to act in conspiracy to obscure Versata's 2 3 liability for Patent infringement, breaches of contract, and other wrongful conduct. On information and belief, those acts consist of, but are not limited to, the comingling of corporate 4 funds and assets; failure to segregate funds and assets of the separate entities; concealment and 5 misrepresentation of the identity and ownership of the corporations; disregard for formalities and 6 failure to maintain arms' length relationships among the various entities; the use of the corporate 7 8 entity to procure labor, services, or merchandise for another entity; the manipulation of assets 9 and liabilities between entities so as to concentrate the assets in one and the liabilities in another; contracting with one another with intent to avoid performance by use of a corporate entity as a 10 11 shield against liability of another entity; and the use of a corporation to transfer to it the existing liability of another entity. 12

13 19. By reason of the foregoing, this Court should pierce the corporate veils of Versata
14 and Aurea, and hold Trilogy or any other parent company or controlling persons or entities liable
15 for Versata's monetary and other obligations as determined at trial.

16

Computerlaw Group LLP www.computerlaw.comsm

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

17 20. This Court has exclusive subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and
18 1338(a) because Federal courts have exclusive jurisdiction in patent cases, and because those
19 claims are Federal questions.

20 21. This Court has personal jurisdiction over all defendants because all Defendants do
21 substantial business in this District.

22 22. Venue is proper, under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1391(c), 1391(d), and 1400(b). This
action raises federal questions (patent infringement); substantial part of the events giving rise to
this action occurred in this District; the creation, infringement, and sale of software at issue
involved corporations registered to do business in California with California subsidiaries,
branches, and partners found in and doing business in this district; and at least one act of
infringement took place in this District.

Case5:13-cv-05161-PSG Document18 Filed12/17/13 Page6 of 22

BACKGROUND FACTS

XML Parsing

3 23. A parser is a piece of software that reads certain electronic files and makes the
4 information from those files available to applications and programming languages, acting as a
5 go-between as underlying code which can be written in any number of programming languages
6 and what a user sees when the program runs.

24. Extensible Markup Language (known as XML) is a set of rules for encoding
documents electronically. Known as a metalanguage, XML allows one to design a markup
language which is in turn used for the easy interchange of documents on the World Wide Web.
XML is itself a subset of a standard called SGML, and can be used to design a tagging scheme
that allows elements of a document to be marked according to their content rather than their
format.

13 25. Information stored in XML documents can be used more effectively when
14 parsed—read line by line or node by node to fetch pieces of information for the program to read
15 and translate. In essence, parsing is the act of analyzing a set of characters or data and then
16 determining, recognizing, deciphering, or acquiring the significant data and commands from a
17 sequence of programming code, and translating the code which allows the program to do the job
18 for which it was designed.

19

Formation of XimpleWare

20 26. In October 2002, Zhengyu "Jimmy" Zhang founded XimpleWare (the
21 "<u>Company</u>") with a since-departed co-founder Hui Tian. Mr. Ying Shum (who has since passed
22 away) was an advisor to the Company during its early stages. Using experience gained from
23 fifteen years in the software engineering field, Mr. Zhang started XimpleWare with the goal of
24 achieving maximum efficiency for XML processing by using dedicated integrated circuits as a
25 system on a chip (SOC). Mr. Tian left the venture in 2003, and since then Mr. Zhang has handled
26 all creative and managerial responsibilities at XimpleWare.

5

27

//

28

1

Mr. Zhang chose the name "XimpleWare" for his new venture to evoke the
 efficiency, speed, and simplicity with which his innovative source code parses XML. The name
 also included the letters X-M-L, further identifying XimpleWare's goal and product in the
 marketplace.

5 28. Mr. Zhang began writing the XimpleWare Source code (the "<u>Source Code</u>") in
6 2004, and has since put in over 10,000 work hours of computer programming into developing
7 and improving the XimpleWare product.

8 29. In its nascent stages, XimpleWare was funded entirely by seed money from
9 friends and family of the original founders, mostly from Mr. Zhang and his parents. Mr. Tian still
10 holds a minority stake in the company, but apart from Mr. Zhang, Mr. Tian, and Ying Shum,
11 there are no other owners, venture capital groups, angel investors, or parties with an interest in
12 XimpleWare.

Open Source Software

30. Open source software is software whose source code is available free of charge
for the public to use, copy, modify, sublicense, or distribute. While some developers choose to
provide their product entirely free of charge, many developers and companies—including large
public companies like Oracle and IBM—make use of open source licensing and its collaborative
nature to create or incorporate code into products that can be licensed for profit outside the open
source community.

31. By licensing one's source code as part of the open source community, or making
modifications to someone else's source code under an open source license, the creator retains
certain protections, depending on the permissiveness of the particular license, from improper use
of his or her intellectual property. To that end, most, if not all, open source licenses apply certain
requirements and restrictions for the method and manner in which code extracted from an open
source repository can be used, and attaches conditions to any such use.

32. There are many commonly used open source licenses, including the GNU General
Public License, the BSD License, and the Apache License.

13

Case5:13-cv-05161-PSG Document18 Filed12/17/13 Page8 of 22

1 33. Due to the fundamental properties of XML technology, XML parsing innovations are very hard to sell. A parser is not an end-user product, *i.e.*, is a component that must be 2 3 integrated into another existing product, analogous to how an engine is a component that must be integrated into a car-it has little utility on its own, but matters a great deal to the larger product. 4 XimpleWare therefore made the business decision to license its Source Code under the GNU 5 General Public License version 2 ("GPL"). A copy of the GPL is attached to this Complaint as 6 7 Exhibit 1. By licensing its technology under the GPL, XimpleWare enabled potential 8 commercial licensees to evaluate XimpleWare's technology before going into commercial 9 production, and allowed free non-commercial use of its technology, which would likely spur adoption in the overall market for high-efficiency XML processing software. 10

34. The GPL requires, among other things, (1) that any changes made to the code
carry notices stating that the files were changed, and the date of all changes; (2) any code created
or derived from GPL-protected code must also be licensed under the GPL; (3) copyright notices
must print or display when the code is run; and (4) that when distributed, the program must be
accompanied by the complete machine-readable source code.

35. The text of the GPL contains a lengthy "Preamble" section. This preamble is not a
legally operative part of the GPL, as is generally understood in the open source community. For
example, Lawrence Rosen, an attorney and noted open source expert, states in a 2004 book:

The preamble, of course, is not an operative part of the GPL license. It is not among its *terms and conditions*. There is nothing in its words that must be obeyed. It is merely a helpful preface so that you can better understand the GPL in its context.

22 LAWRENCE ROSEN, OPEN SOURCE LICENSING: SOFTWARE FREEDOM AND INTELLECTUAL

23 PROPERTY LAW 109 (Prentice Hall 2004) (emphasis in original).

36. XimpleWare chose the GPL approach because it is one of the most restrictive
open source licenses available, requiring that any derivative code incorporating GPL-protected
code must be returned to the open source community in its entirety. This concept is often referred
to as "copyleft," which the Free Software Foundation explains succinctly on its "Frequently
Asked Questions" page for the GPL:

19

20

21

Case5:13-cv-05161-PSG Document18 Filed12/17/13 Page9 of 22

| 1 2 | [Q:] You have a GPL'ed program that I'd like to link with my code to build a proprietary program. Does the fact that I link with your program mean I have to GPL my program? [A:] Yes. | | | | |
|----------|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3 | Frequently Asked Questions about version 2 of the GNU GPL, Free Software Foundation, | | | | |
| 4 | http://www.gnu.org/licenses/old-licenses/gpl-2.0-faq.html (last accessed Dec. 16, 2013) | | | | |
| 5 | (archived at <u>http://perma.cc/LLM9-3SED</u>). In other words, if Developer A creates Product A and | | | | |
| 6 | licenses it under the GPL, and Developer B creates Product B which incorporates Product A, | | | | |
| 7 | then Developer B must also license Product B under the GPL. | | | | |
| 8 | 37. In general, a computer cannot run source code directly. Before a computer can run | | | | |
| 9 | a program, its source code must be translated into machine-readable form called "object code" ² | | | | |
| 10 | which is also sometimes referred to as a "binary" or "binaries" because object code is not | | | | |
| 11 | human-readable text, but rather machine-readable binary code. | | | | |
| 12 | 38. The GPL also requires that any distribution of the binary version of a GPL- | | | | |
| 13 | licensed software must be accompanied by either source code or an offer to provide source code. | | | | |
| 14 | This is explained clearly in Section 3 of the GPL, as well as the Free Software Foundation's GPL | | | | |
| 15 | "Frequently Asked Questions" page: | | | | |
| 16 17 | [Q:] I downloaded just the binary from the net. If I distribute copies, do I have to get the source and distribute that too? | | | | |
| 17 | [A:] Yes. The general rule is, if you distribute binaries, you must distribute the complete corresponding source code too. The exception for the case where you | | | | |
| 19 | received a written offer for source code is quite limited. ³ | | | | |
| 20 | 39. The GPL requires strict compliance, and, under its Section 4, any failure to | | | | |
| 21 | comply with any of the GPL's multiple conditions means there is no license granted and this | | | | |
| 22 | means any use, distribution, or other exploitation is not licensed and all rights the violator could | | | | |
| 23 | have obtained under the GPL are voided: | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | |
| 25 | ² "Object Code," Merriam-Webster.com, <u>http://www.merriam-</u> | | | | |
| 26 | webster.com/dictionary/object%20code ("a computer program after translation from source code | | | | |
| 27 | usually into machine language by a compiler") (last accessed Dec. 16, 2013). ³ Frequently Asked Questions about version 2 of the GNU GPL, Free Software Foundation, | | | | |
| • • | http://www.gnu.org/licenses/old-licenses/gpl-2.0-faq.html (last accessed Dec. 16, 2013) | | | | |

 28
 Interior of the interinterior of the interior of the interior of the interior

You may not copy, modify, sublicense, or distribute the Program except as expressly provided under this License. Any attempt otherwise to copy, modify, sublicense or distribute the Program is void, and will automatically terminate your rights under this License...

GPL at § 4.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The XimpleWare Product

40. The complete XimpleWare software product, known as "VTD-XML" or "VTD-XML Extended" (collectively, the "Product"), is made up of a number of constituent parts, each with individual functions, and is written in several different programming languages. Most of the code, however, is written in Java, which is one of the most popular programming languages in use today.

41. XML is ubiquitous in today's business world. For example, since 2007, the file formats for Microsoft Office are based on XML,⁴ and many web pages are coded in XML.⁵

42. The XimpleWare Source Code and Product reads and parses XML at a rate estimated to be five to ten times faster than other current XML parsing programs, effecting greater efficiency and speed. It also provides indexing and incremental capabilities that are crucial to many high performance XML applications and are not available in any other XML parsing libraries. Efficiency and speed are critical in many applications of XML, especially in large scale enterprise data interchange applications where entire server computers are dedicated to handling streams of XML data. If XML data can be processed faster, then fewer servers are needed, less leased space in data centers is needed for those servers, and less energy is required to power those servers—altogether greatly reducing computing needs and costs.

43. The Product is an enabler for any program that uses XML in its applications, but to see the upside in the parsing speed, customers have to try it.

⁴ Tom Ngo, "Office Open XML Overview", Ecma International, <u>http://www.ecma-</u> 25 international.org/news/TC45 current work/OpenXML%20White%20Paper.pdf (last accessed

²⁶ Sep. 10, 2013) (archived at http://perma.cc/0fyzpuJ6Vzg).

⁵ Murray Altheim and Shane McCarron, eds., XHTML[™] 1.1 - Module-based XHTML - Second 27 Edition, W3C Recommendation, World Wide Web Consortium, Nov. 23, 2010,

http://www.w3.org/TR/xhtml11/ (last accessed Sep. 10, 2013) (archived at 28 http://perma.cc/05zB2mzwJW8). 9

44. XimpleWare has had interest and licensing discussions with several industry leaders, and has established its VTD-XML software as a leading technology in XML parsing.

The XimpleWare Source Code

45. Over the course of over ten years, Mr. Zhang updated and improved the Source 4 Code and Product (and still does), checking out sections of code to work on and then checking it 5 back into an open source database called SourceForge. SourceForge is a community-based 6 website where software developers can publish source code to a global audience, and can join 7 8 and collaborate on open source projects.⁶

9 46. One of the principal tools SourceForge provides is version control systems. A 10 version control system is a computer program that manages a set of source code. Programmers 11 use version control systems by "checking out" a copy of the source code to their own computer, 12 making changes, and then submitting those changes back into the version control system in a 13 process called "checking in." Each check-in is documented in the version control system with 14 time, date, and contributor information, as well as comments from the programmer describing his or her changes. With a version control system, it is possible to review all changes to a set of 15 16 source code and to know who made those changes.

17 47. SourceForge also provides a system where programmers not affiliated with a 18 project may submit suggested changes to members of the project. The members may then choose 19 to check those changes in to the version control system, or to reject them. As with any other 20 check-in, time, date, contributor, and other information are logged in the version control system.

21 48. One version control system offered by SourceForge is the Concurrent Versions System, commonly known as "CVS". Like other version control systems, CVS tracks who made 22 23 which changes to the managed source code, and CVS keeps a log of those revisions.

49. 24 XimpleWare placed its Source Code on SourceForge, and managed that Source Code in SourceForge's CVS system. 25

26

1

2

²⁷ ⁶ SourceForge "About" page, http://sourceforge.net/about (last accessed Sep. 10, 2013) (noting SourceForge has "3.4 million developers [who] create powerful software in over 324,000 28 projects") (archived at http://perma.cc/0fwQ1xw51i1). Amended Complaint 10

| 1 | The XimpleWare Issued Patents | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | 50. XimpleWare applied for, and the United States Patent and Trademark Office | | | |
| 3 | issued, three patents (the "Patents"): | | | |
| 4 | A. U.S. Patent No. 7,133,857, issued Nov. 7, 2006, titled "Processing structured | | | |
| 5 | data" (the "<u>'857 Patent</u>")B. U.S. Patent No. 7,620,652, issued Nov. 17, 2009, titled "Processing structured | | | |
| 6 | data" (the " <u>'652 Patent</u> ") C. U.S. Patent No. 7,761,459, issued July 20, 2010, titled "Processing structured | | | |
| 7 | data" (the " <u>459 Patent</u> ") | | | |
| 8 | 51. All of the Patents received a term extension to February 2024 under 35 U.S.C. | | | |
| 9 | § 154(b). The named inventors on all of the Patents are Jimmy Zhang and Hui Tian, and all right, | | | |
| 10 | title, and interest are assigned to XimpleWare. | | | |
| 11 | 52. The first patent (the '857 Patent), filed in 2002 and issued in 2006, is titled | | | |
| 12 | "Processing Structured Data," and contains 43 claims (including 7 independent claims) covering | | | |
| 13 | methods, apparatuses, and program storage devices for "efficiently processing a structured data | | | |
| 14 | file" or "efficiently processing structured data"—including XML. The '857 Patent has been cited | | | |
| 15 | by five other issued U.S. patents-including patents issued to IBM, HP, and Canon-and by | | | |
| 16 | three published U.S. patent applications. | | | |
| 17 | 53. The '652 Patent, filed in 2006 and issued in 2009, contains 35 claims (including 8 | | | |
| 18 | independent claims) for methods, apparatuses, and program storage devices, and focuses on | | | |
| 19 | efficiently processing structured data like XML. The '652 Patent has been cited by two issued | | | |
| 20 | U.S. patents by IBM and Canon and by one published U.S. patent application. | | | |
| 21 | 54. The '459 Patent, filed in 2006 and issued in 2010, contains 24 claims (including 4 | | | |
| 22 | independent claims) for methods, apparatuses, hardware devices, and program storage devices, | | | |
| 23 | and again focuses on efficiently processing structured data like XML. The '459 Patent has been | | | |
| 24 | cited by two issued U.S. patents and one published U.S. patent application. | | | |
| 25 | 55. There has been no challenge to any of the XimpleWare Patents or any other | | | |
| 26 | XimpleWare intellectual property rights. | | | |
| 27 | 56. The XimpleWare Source Code and Product practice the XimpleWare Patents. | | | |
| 28 | // | | | |

57. XimpleWare owned the three XimpleWare Patents throughout the period of the
 Defendants' infringing acts, and still owns the patents. XimpleWare uses the patent numbers on
 its Product and in its documentation to give actual and constructive notice of the existence of the
 XimpleWare patents.

58. XimpleWare's SourceForge project page also clearly indicates that the VTD-XML 5 software is licensed under the GPL; the XimpleWare web site has always made clear that any 6 and all commercial projects and those involving any distribution, requires a commercial license 7 8 under the commercial terms and conditions to be concluded with XimpleWare, and that generally 9 requires a signed written agreement between the parties and payment of commercial royalties to XimpleWare. Multiple other commercial parties who could not come within the GPL's strict 10 11 conditions have agreed to sign and have signed commercial licenses with XimpleWare and the 12 custom and practice in the industry is for the proposed licensee to do appropriate due diligence 13 and to assure that his, her or its project is strictly within the GPL's conditions or else to contact 14 XimpleWare to discuss the requirements for commercial licensing.

15

Defendants Copy XimpleWare's Patented Source Code

16 59. In the summer of 2013, XimpleWare learned of a Texas lawsuit between
17 Defendants Versata and Ameriprise over a contract dispute (the "<u>Texas Litigation</u>").

18 60. According to documents filed in the Texas Litigation, Versata licensed its DCM
19 software to Ameriprise until Ameriprise attempted to write its own software using programmers
20 in India to replace the Versata product. Versata then sued for misappropriation, among other
21 claims.

22 61. During the prosecution of the Texas Litigation, Ameriprise informed XimpleWare
23 that it had discovered portions of XimpleWare's Source Code in the source code of Versata's
24 DCM product, and with said XimpleWare Source code, none of the conditions of the GPL
25 license had been met. There was also no evidence of any commercial license from XimpleWare
26 and no reproduction of XimpleWare's copyright notice in Versata's DCM product.

- 27
- 28

//

Case5:13-cv-05161-PSG Document18 Filed12/17/13 Page14 of 22

Based upon documents XimpleWare received from Ameriprise, for months and 1 62. 2 without ever contacting XimpleWare to check on the validity of its alleged reliance, Versata 3 asserted a theory in the Texas Litigation that XimpleWare's Source Code was licensed under an Oracle-based exception to the GPL known as the "classpath exception." The "classpath 4 5 exception" is an Oracle-based exception to the GPL that has been promulgated by Oracle Corporation (www.oracle.com) of Redwood City, California (owner of the Java programming 6 7 language) for certain Java-related software packages. XimpleWare has never used and never 8 authorized this exception or any exception other than commercial licensing directly with 9 XimpleWare; neither Oracle nor any other company is authorized to make any statement on behalf of XimpleWare. 10

11 63. The only copyright or license notices that XimpleWare has ever placed on its
12 VTD-XML Source Code give notice that the Source Code is licensed under the GPL for those
13 strictly complying with all conditions of the GPL, and that it is otherwise commercially available
14 through license directly from XimpleWare. XimpleWare has never utilized the "classpath
15 exception," nor has it ever made any exceptions to licensing its Source Code under the unaltered
16 GPL other than through paid commercial licenses obtained directly from XimpleWare.

17 64. None of the defendants in this case did, have done, or have attempted to do any
18 appropriate due diligence with XimpleWare, and therefore none of the Defendants in this case
19 can assert truthfully that they are innocent infringers or that they otherwise relied reasonably in
20 any way in commencing, continuing, or refusing to discontinue their respective infringements.

65. Versata's commercial distribution of the XimpleWare Product or Source Code
outside the terms of the GPL was knowing and willful. According to documents filed in the
Texas Litigation, Versata maintained in the course of business a list of open source software
components that it included in its DCM product, and that list included VTD-XML as well as the
fact that VTD-XML and several other components were licensed under the GPL—without any
mention of the "classpath exception."

27 66. XimpleWare has never granted Versata any commercial license, permission, or
28 authorization to use and redistribute any XimpleWare Product or Source Code.

13

Case No. 5:13-cv-05161-PSG

67. The only license the Versata Defendants have ever had was the GPL. However, by
 failing to meet any of the required conditions of the GPL license, no license was granted to any
 of the Versata Defendants and any alleged rights any of them had or purported to have to
 XimpleWare's VTD-XML computer software were void *ab initio* and terminated instantly and
 automatically, and all distributions and other exploitations including all attempts to sublicense
 were unauthorized, void, and without effect, and each constituted a wilful infringement of
 XimpleWare's rights.

8 68. On information and belief, Versata has distributed thousands of unauthorized
9 copies of the Product or the Source Code to a number of customers like the Customer
10 Defendants, and Versata has illegally collected revenues on the sale and distribution of the
11 derivative DCM product incorporating XimpleWare's Source Code, in violation of
12 XimpleWare's Patents. XimpleWare estimates Versata's total sales of the infringing DCM
13 product to exceed \$300,000,000.

14 69. The majority of Ameriprise financial advisors are not Ameriprise employees.
15 According to Ameriprise's own 2012 Annual Report, filed publicly with the U.S. Securities and
16 Exchange Commission, Ameriprise operates a "nationwide network of more than 9,700
17 advisors," of which "more than 7,400 are independent franchisees or employees or contractors of
18 franchisees."

70. On information and belief, Ameriprise distributed DCM and VTD-XML to these
 thousands of non-employee financial advisors. According to its 2012 Annual Report, "The
 support [Ameriprise] offer[s] to [its] franchisee advisors includes generalist and specialist
 leadership support, technology platforms and tools, training and marketing programs"
 (emphasis added). On information and belief, DCM is among the "technology platforms and
 tools" that Ameriprise provides its outside advisors.

71. On information and belief, when Ameriprise made its outside distributions of
DCM and VTD-XML, it did so under a commercial license (and not the GPL) without any
attribution to XimpleWare, without any XimpleWare copyright notice, without any XimpleWare

Computerlaw Group LLP www.computerlaw.comsm

Source Code, and without any offer to convey the XimpleWare Source Code—all in violation of
 the GPL and all of which were void under the GPL.

3 72. XimpleWare has never granted Ameriprise or any other Defendant in this case any
4 commercial license, permission, or authorization to use and redistribute any XimpleWare Product
5 or Source Code.

73. Defendants have infringed, and are still infringing on XimpleWare's intellectual
property rights by making, selling, and using the DCM product that practices the XimpleWare
Patents, and the Defendants will continue to do so unless this Court enjoins them.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

DIRECT PATENT INFRINGEMENT

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

10 11

9

1274.XimpleWare incorporates the allegations in paragraphs 1–73 as if set forth here in13full.

14 75. XimpleWare designs and licenses software designed to more effectively and more
15 efficiently parse XML in an almost limitless range of products and applications.

76. XimpleWare has made substantial investments of time and money, as well as great
efforts over a period of ten or more years developing a faster, more efficient way to parse XML.
These investments in research and development have, over the years, yielded many innovations,
including the innovations disclosed and claimed in the Patents.

20 77. The '857, '652, and '459 were duly and legally issued to XimpleWare, as assignee
21 of the inventors named therein, for an invention entitled "Processing Structured Data." True and
22 correct copies of the Patents are attached as Exhibits 2, 3, and 4, respectively.

23 78. The Patents are valid and enforceable.
24 79. At all material times since the original issue dates, XimpleWare has been the
25 owner of the entire right, title, and interest in the Patents.

26 80. XimpleWare's Product as well as its Source Code practices each of the
27 independent claims of the Patents.

81. On information and belief, Defendants have infringed and continue to infringe
 XimpleWare's Patents and each of them by making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale in the
 United States a number of products that practice the claims contained in the Patent, and will
 continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.

82. Without entering a commercial license with XimpleWare and without strict
compliance with any of the conditions for the GPL license, the Versata Defendants incorporated
the XimpleWare Product and/or Source Code into a number of their own products (the "<u>Versata</u>
<u>Products</u>"), including but not limited to the Versata DCM product. Therefore, the Versata
Products necessarily practice at least independent Claims 1 and 7 the '857 Patent, independent
Claims 1 and 9 of the '652 Patent, and independent Claim 1 of the '459 Patent.

11 83. The Versata Products and each of them literally infringe because every element of
12 each of those Claims is included in DCM, and are necessarily included in any other product into
13 which Defendants incorporated the XimpleWare Source Code or Product. The Versata
14 Defendants used and sold its infringing products in the United States, and did so willfully.

84. On information and belief, and without entering a commercial license with
XimpleWare and without strict compliance with any of the conditions for the GPL license, the
Customer Defendants purchased the Versata Products from the Versata Defendants without
authorization. The Customer Defendants infringed and continue to willfully infringe the Patents
by using the infringing Versata Products, incorporated into the Customer Defendants' internal
software systems which the Customer Defendants used and continue to use in their daily course
of business.

85. On information and belief, and without entering a commercial license with
XimpleWare and without strict compliance with any of the conditions for the GPL license, the
Customer Defendants have distributed without authorization DCM and VTD-XML to thousands
of non-employee independent contractor or franchisee advisors or "producers."

26 86. Defendants' conduct constitutes direct infringement of XimpleWare's patent
27 rights under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

28

 \parallel

Case5:13-cv-05161-PSG Document18 Filed12/17/13 Page18 of 22

1 87. At all times, Defendants' patent infringement was and is knowing and willful. The GPL, a copy of which must be included with all GPL-licensed source code, was always included 2 3 with every version of the XimpleWare Source Code available on SourceForge. XimpleWare's SourceForge project page-which XimpleWare has records of the Versata Defendants visiting-4 clearly indicates that VTD-XML is licensed under the GPL. Further, according to documents 5 filed in the Texas Litigation, Versata maintained in the course of business a list of open source 6 software components that it included in its DCM product, and that list included VTD-XML, and 7 8 included the fact that VTD-XML was licensed under the GPL version 2. Therefore, Defendants 9 actually knew or reasonably should have known that the Source Code was the work of XimpleWare, for which Defendants did not have a commercial license, and Defendants did in 10 11 fact copy, adapt, and distribute works practicing the XimpleWare parents, derived from the 12 Source Code in either source or compiled form without authorization from XimpleWare. No 13 Defendants have ever obtained a commercial license from XimpleWare.

14 88. Defendants' direct infringement of XimpleWare's exclusive patent rights has
15 damaged, and/or will damage XimpleWare's business, causing irreparable harm for which there
16 is no adequate remedy at law, unless Defendants are enjoined by this Court pursuant to 35 U.S.C.
17 § 283.

18 89. Defendants' direct infringement of XimpleWare's Patents is the direct and
19 proximate cause of damages to XimpleWare, and XimpleWare is entitled to compensatory
20 damages in an amount to be determined at trial.

90. Defendants' direct infringement of the Patents entitles XimpleWare to preliminary
and permanent injunctive relief pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 283, an award of all damages sustained
by XimpleWare as a result of Defendants' infringement, and enhanced damages adequate to
compensate for Defendants' collective and willful infringement of XimpleWare's patent rights
together with attorneys' fees and costs, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284 and 285.

26

27

28

//

//

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

INDUCING PATENT INFRINGEMENT

(AGAINST VERSATA DEFENDANTS)

4 91. XimpleWare incorporates the allegations in paragraphs 1–73 as if set forth here in
5 full.

6 92. The Versata Defendants have infringed and induced infringement of the '857,
7 '652, and '459 Patents.

8 93. The Versata Defendants deliberately downloaded the XimpleWare Source Code 9 from the SourceForge open source repository and incorporated it into DCM and a number of other products. On information and belief, the Versata Defendants then sold those products to a 10 11 number of customers, without authorization, including, but not necessarily limited to, the 12 Customer Defendants who incorporated those products into their own internal systems, which 13 the Customer Defendants used and continue to use in the daily course of business without any 14 authorization and without entering a commercial license with XimpleWare and without strict compliance with any of the conditions for the GPL license. 15

94. Without entering a commercial license with XimpleWare and without strict
compliance with any of the conditions for the GPL license, the Versata Defendants, in violation
of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b), have knowingly aided, abetted, and actively induced the Customer
Defendants and others to infringe XimpleWare's Patents.

95. The Versata Defendants have committed contributory infringement of
XimpleWare's exclusive rights has damaged and will continue to damage XimpleWare's
business, causing irreparable harm for which there is no adequate remedy at law, unless it is
enjoined by this Court pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 283.

96. The Versata Defendants' infringement of XimpleWare's exclusive patent rights
has damaged, and/or will damage XimpleWare's business, causing irreparable harm for which
there is no adequate remedy at law, unless Defendants are enjoined by this Court pursuant to 35
U.S.C. § 283.

1

2

97. The Versata Defendants' willful contributory infringement of XimpleWare's
 Patents is the direct and proximate cause of damages to XimpleWare, and XimpleWare is entitled
 to compensatory damages in an amount to be determined at trial.

98. The Versata Defendants' infringement of the Patents entitles XimpleWare to
preliminary and permanent injunctive relief pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 283, an award of all
damages sustained by XimpleWare as a result of Defendants' infringement, and enhanced
damages adequate to compensate for Defendants' collective and willful infringement of
XimpleWare's patent rights together with attorneys' fees and costs, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284
and 285.

10 11

14

THIRD CLAIM FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

12 99. XimpleWare incorporates the allegations in paragraphs 1–73 as if set forth here in13 full.

100. XimpleWare owns each and every of the three issued Patents.

15 101. XimpleWare has the superior, and indeed only, right to continue to use, make,
16 sell, or offer for sale its Source Code, subject to the GPL, as the lawful owner of the Patents.

17 102. Versata improperly downloaded and exploited XimpleWare's Source Code
18 without a commercial license with XimpleWare, and without strict compliance with any of the
19 conditions for the GPL license, all to XimpleWare's detriment. On information and belief,
20 Versata has incorporated the Source Code into its DCM product, and sold it to, among others,
21 Ameriprise and a number of other companies.

22 103. XimpleWare requests that this Court declare that United States Patents Nos.
23 7,133,857, 7,620,652, and 7,761,459 and each of them are valid and enforceable.

24 104. The requested declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time to affirm
25 XimpleWare's rights to exclusive use and sale of its protected intellectual property rights under
26 federal patent law.

27

105. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

XimpleWare prays for judgment against all Defendants, and each of them, and those persons in control of or acting in concert with them as follows:

A. On the First Claim for Relief, for preliminary and permanent injunctive relief
enjoining the manufacture, production, marketing, or sale by Defendants, or any of them, of any
product practicing the '857, '652, and/ or '459 Patents; for all damages sustained by XimpleWare
as a result of Defendants' infringement; and for an award to XimpleWare of enhanced damages
adequate to compensate for Defendants' collective infringement, up to and including trebling of
XimpleWare's damages for the Versata Defendants' willful infringement.

B. On the Second Claim for Relief, for preliminary and permanent injunctive relief
enjoining the Versata Defendants or any of them from contributing to the manufacture,
production, marketing, or sale of any product practicing the '857, '652, and/ or '459 Patents; for
all damages sustained by XimpleWare as a result of the Versata Defendants' infringement; and
for an award to XimpleWare of enhanced damages adequate to compensate for the Versata
Defendants' collective and willful infringement, up to and including trebling of XimpleWare's
damages for the Versata Defendants' willful infringement.

C. On the Third Claim for Relief, for a declaration that:

1. XimpleWare is the sole owner of the XimpleWare Patents;

2. The XimpleWare Patents are valid and enforceable; and

3. As such, XimpleWare has the exclusive right to make sell, offer for sale,
distribute, and copy and otherwise exploit the XimpleWare Product and Source Code.

D. On all Claims for Relief, for a constructive trust of all benefits Defendants gained,
and disgorgement of all revenues and profits associated with Defendants' licensing or sale of
products containing the XimpleWare Source Code.

E. For costs of suit including any applicable interest and reasonably attorneys' fees
as allowed by law.

27 F. For such other, further, and different relief as the Court deems just and proper.

20

28

Computerlaw Group LLP www.computerlaw.comsm

17

18

| 1 | JURY TRIAL DEMAND | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on each and every cause of action which is triable | | | | | | |
| 3 | 3 by or which may otherwise be tried by jury in this act | by or which may otherwise be tried by jury in this action. | | | | | |
| 4 | 4 | COMPUTERLAW GROUP LLP | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | |
| 6 | 6 Dated: December 17, 2013 By: | /s/ Jack Russo Jack Russo | | | | | |
| 7 | 7 | Christopher Sargent Ansel Halliburton | | | | | |
| 8 | 8 | Attorneys for Plaintiff XIMPLEWARE CORP. | | | | | |
| 9 | 9 | XIMPLEWARE CORP. | | | | | |
| 10 | 0 | | | | | | |
| 11 | 1 | | | | | | |
| 12 | 2 | | | | | | |
| 13 | 3 | | | | | | |
| 14 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 15 | 5 | | | | | | |
| 16 | 6 | | | | | | |
| 17 | 7 | | | | | | |
| 18 | 8 | | | | | | |
| 19 | 9 | | | | | | |
| 20 | 0 | | | | | | |
| 21 | 1 | | | | | | |
| 22 | 2 | | | | | | |
| 23 | 3 | | | | | | |
| 24 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 25 | 5 | | | | | | |
| 26 | 6 | | | | | | |
| 27 | 7 | | | | | | |
| 28 | 8 | | | | | | |