Paper No. _____
Filed: September 3, 2014

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TD AMERITRADE HOLDING CORPORATION, TD AMERITRADE, INC.,
and TD AMERITRADE ONLINE HOLDINGS CORP.
Petitioners

v.

TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Patent Owner

Case CBM2014-00131
Patent 7,533,056

Patent Owner's Preliminary Response

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT 1

II. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY THE PETITION BECAUSE PETITIONERS FAIL TO MEET THEIR BURDEN TO ESTABLISH THAT THE '056 PATENT IS FOR A COVERED BUSINESS METHOD 3

A. The Petition's Conclusory Statements Are Insufficient to Meet the Petitioners' Burden of Showing the Claims Are Directed to a Covered Business Method 3

B. The Petition's Conclusory Statements Are Contradicted by the '056 Patent 6

1. Features of Graphical User Interface Tools Are Technical 6

2. The '056 Patent Addresses Technical Problems 7

3. The '056 Patent Provides Technical Solutions to These Technical Problems Using Technical Features 8

III. TRIAL SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED BECAUSE THE INVENTIVE ASPECTS OF THE CLAIMS DO NOT INVOLVE A METHOD OF DOING BUSINESS 11

A. Patents to Novel GUI Tools, Even If Used in the Field of Trading, Are Not Within the Scope of AIA § 18 12

B. The Congressional Record Confirms that Patents to Novel GUIs, Even If Used for Trading, Are Not Within the Scope of AIA § 18 16

IV. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY THE PETITION BECAUSE ALL OF THE GROUNDS IN THE PETITION ARE UNINSTITUTABLE 21

A. Petitioners' 35 U.S.C. § 101 Challenge Is Uninstitutable 22

B. Petitioners' Written Description Challenge Was Previously Rejected by a District Court and Depends on a Proposed Claim Construction that Is Irreconcilable with Petitioners' Previous Admissions 23

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

C. The Indefiniteness Challenge to Claim 7 Is Uninstitutable Because the Petition Fails to Articulate Information Necessary to Show that "Indicates the Default Quantity Working at the Electronic Exchange" Is Indefinite 25

D. All of the Obviousness Grounds for Claims 1-15 Are Uninstitutable Because the Petition Fails to Articulate Why It Raises Any Art or Arguments that Are Not the Same as, or Merely Cumulative of, Art and Arguments Already Considered by the Office 27

E. All of the Obviousness Grounds for Claims 1-15 Are Uninstitutable Because the Petition's Arguments Are Incomplete.....28

1. The Petition Fails to Articulate Where Each of the Claim Elements Is Found in the Cited Art.....28

2. The Petition Fails to Account for Antecedent Basis of "the Desired Price" of Claim 4 for Any of the Grounds 29

V. CONCLUSION.....30

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co.,
927 F.2d 1200 (Fed. Cir. 1991) 25

Diamond v. Diehr,
450 U.S. 175 (1981) 23

Gen. Am. Transp. Corp. v. Cryo-Trans, Inc.,
93 F.3d 766 (Fed. Cir. 1996) 26

In re Warmerdam,
33 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 1994) 25

Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.,
132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012) 22

Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.,
395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005) 26

Process Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp.,
190 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1999) 26

Trading Tech. Int'l, Inc. v. BCG Partners, Inc.,
852 F. Supp. 2d 1027 (N.D. Ill. 2012) 24

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 101 ..... 21, 22, 23

35 U.S.C. § 112 ..... 24, 25

35 U.S.C. § 322(a)(3) 21, 28

35 U.S.C. § 324(a) 21, 25

35 U.S.C. § 325(d) 27

AIA § 18 ..... passim

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 1.75(d)(1) 29

37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(2) 21

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) 25

37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(4) 28

Other Authorities

77 Fed. Reg. 48620 (Aug. 14, 2012) 21

Agilysys, Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.,
CBM2014-00015, Paper 20 (Mar. 26, 2014) 2, 15

Experian Mktg Solutions, Inc. v. Rpost Commc'ns Ltd.,
CBM2014-00064, Paper 13 (July 31, 2014) 4

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.