

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor: Jeffery Bruce McGeorge § Attorney Docket No.: PGR-2012-111
United States Patent No.: 7,941,357 §
Formerly Application No.: 10/451022 §
Issue Date: January 25, 2011 §
PCT Filing Date: October 26, 2001 § Case No: CBM2013-00005
Former Examiner: Ella Colbert § Patent Owner: Market-Alerts Pty Ltd

For: Trading System

MAIL STOP PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark
Office Post Office Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

**PATENT-OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO THE
PETITION FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW OF A COVERED BUSINESS
METHOD UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 321 AND § 18**

On June 20, 2012, Patent-Owner Markets-Alert Pty. Ltd. (“Markets-Alert”) filed complaints in the United States District Court for the District of Delaware (“Lawsuits”) against various defendants for infringement of U.S. Patent No. 7,941,357, entitled “Trading System” (“357 Patent”). The Lawsuits are: *Markets-Alert Pty. Ltd. v. Bloomberg Finance L.P. et al.*, No. 12-CV-00780-GMS (D. Del. filed June 20, 2012) (“Bloomberg Case”); *Markets-Alert Pty. Ltd. v. The Charles Schwab Corporation, et al.*, No. 12-781-GMS (D. Del. filed Jun. 20, 2012)(“Schwab Case”) ; *Markets-Alert Pty. Ltd. v. E*TRADE CLEARING LLC et*

al., No. 12-CV-00782-GMS (D. Del. Filed June 20, 2012) (“ETrade Case”); *Markets-Alert Pty. Ltd. v. TD Ameritrade Holding Corp. et al.*, No. 12-CV-00783-GMS (D. Del. filed June 20, 2012) (“TDA Case”); *Markets-Alert Pty. Ltd. v. OM Securities, LLC, et al.*, No. 12-784-GMS (D. Del. filed Jun. 20, 2012) (“TradeMonster Case”); and *Markets-Alert Pty. Ltd. v. eSignal.com, Inc., et al.*, No. 12-785-GMS (D. Del. Filed Jun. 20, 2012) (“Esignal Case”).

On October 15, 2012, Petitioners filed a Petition for Post-Grant Review of a Covered Business Method (“CBM”) (“CBM Review”) under 35 U.S.C. § 321 and § 18 (“Petition”) with respect to the ‘357 Patent. The Petitioners are: Bloomberg Inc., Bloomberg L.P., and Bloomberg Finance L.P. (“Bloomberg”), The Charles Schwab Corporation and Charles Schwab & Co., Inc. (“Schwab”), E*TRADE Financial Corporation, E*TRADE Securities LLC, and E*TRADE Clearing LLC (“ETrade”), optionsXpress Holdings Inc. and optionsXpress, Inc. (“OXH”), and TD Ameritrade Holding Corp., TD Ameritrade, Inc., TD Ameritrade IP Company, Inc., and thinkorswim Group Inc. (“TDA”).

Markets-Alert hereby submits its Preliminary Response to the Petition (“Response”).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND ON THE '357 PATENT INVENTION.....	4
III. REQUIREMENTS FOR CBM REVIEW	7
IV. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED FOR FAILING TO MEET THRESHOLD OR STANDING REQUIREMENTS FOR CBM REVIEW	9
V. THE PETITION SHOULD ALSO BE DENIED FOR FAILING TO SET FORTH THE REQUIRED CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	16
A. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....	17
B. PROPER CONSTRUCTION OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS	19
1. “Receiving on the network of computers instructions from a user to specify watch data defining an event, the watch data including a stock market technical analysis request specifying technical analysis formulae...”	20
2. “Using the network of computers to periodically apply the user-specified watch data...”	22
3. “Causing a real-time notification by the network of computers to be provided to the user... the real-time notification directed to a remote communications device of the user...”	23
4. “Causing a real-time notification by the network of computers to be provided to the user... so that the user can then provide instructions for share market transactions on an instantaneous basis”	23
5. “Receiving instructions from the user to provide technical analysis criteria of overall stock market trends”	25
VI. THE PETITION SHOULD FURTHER BE DENIED FOR FAILING TO SHOW THAT THE CLAIMS ARE MORE LIKELY THAN NOT TO BE INVALIDATED	25
A. CLAIMS 1-4 ARE DEFINITE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2ND ¶	25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
B. THE SUBMITTED PRIOR ART FAILS TO MEET THE HIGH STANDARDS OF CBM REVIEW	30
C. THE SUBMITTED PRIOR ART REFERENCES FAIL TO ANTICIPATE ANY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102	35
1. PCT Publication WO 00/11587 to Satow et al. (“Satow”) does not anticipate the ‘357 Patent claims.....	37
2. TradeStation does not anticipate the ‘357 Patent claims	42
a. S&C Review	42
b. TradeStation Web Archive	45
3. WOWS does not anticipate the ‘357 Patent claims	47
a. WOWS Guide.....	47
b. WOWS Web Archive	52
4. Trading Expert Pro does not anticipate the ‘357 Patent Claims	53
5. Investor/RT does not anticipate the ‘357 Patent claims	56
6. eSignal Press Release does not anticipate the ‘357 Patent claims	57
D. THE SUBMITTED PRIOR ART REFERENCES FAIL TO RENDER OBVIOUS ANY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103	59
1. Some articulated reasoning with rational underpinning is required for motivation to combine	60
2. None of the asserted combinations teach the entire invention.....	62
VII. CONCLUSION.....	63

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

FEDERAL CASES

<i>Acromed Corp. v. Sofamor Danek Group, Inc.</i> , 253 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	36
<i>Am. Calcar, Inc. v. Am. Honda Motor Co.</i> , 651 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	36
<i>Audi AG v. Shokan Coachworks, Inc.</i> , 592 F. Supp. 2d 246 (N.D.N.Y. 2008).....	33
<i>Chamilia, LLC v. Pandora Jewelry, LLC</i> , 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 71246 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 24, 2007)	33
<i>Comark Commc'ns, Inc. v. Harris Corp.</i> , 156 F.3d 1182, 1186 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	20
<i>Ex Parte Joseph J. Krivulka and Leonard L. Mazur</i> , Appeal 2010-003098, 2010 Pat. App. LEXIS 13234 at (Bd. Pat. App. & Interf. September 30, 2010)	34
<i>Ex Parte William Philip Shaouy and Matthew Bunkley Trevathan</i> , 2007 Pat. App. LEXIS 3263, at (Bd. Pat. App. & Interf. May 24, 2007)	34
<i>Fuji Photo Film Co., Ltd. v. International Trade Com'n</i> , 386 F.3d 1095 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	20
<i>Haemonetics Corp. v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.</i> , 607 F.3d 776 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	26
<i>Halliburton Energy Services, Inc. v. M-I LLC</i> , 514 F.3d 1244 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	26
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	61
<i>In re Miller</i> , 441 F.2d 689,169 USPQ 597 (CCPA 1971).....	28
<i>In re Paulsen</i> , 30 F.3d 1475, 31 USPQ2d 1671 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	26

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.