

Paper No. _____
Filed: March 6, 2015

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TD AMERITRADE HOLDING CORP., TD AMERITRADE, INC.,
AND TD AMERITRADE ONLINE HOLDINGS CORP.

Petitioners

v.

TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Patent Owner

Case CBM2014-00135
Patent 6,772,132

Patent Owner's Response

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	THE CLAIMS ARE DIRECTED TO PATENTABLE TECHNOLOGY—A GUI TOOL	2
A.	The Patented Invention Solved Technical Problems with Prior GUIs	3
1.	The Conventional GUIs	3
2.	The Problem with Conventional GUIs: Missing Intended Prices.....	5
3.	The Claimed Solution to the Problem: A New GUI That Improved Speed, Accuracy, and Usability.....	6
B.	The Claimed Features and Functionality of the Improved GUI Are an Inventive Concept, Not Conventional.....	12
1.	The Claimed GUI Features Were the Inventive Contribution.....	15
C.	A New GUI Is New Technology.....	17
III.	THE CURRENT § 101 FRAMEWORK.....	19
IV.	THE CLAIMS ARE PATENT ELIGIBLE BECAUSE THERE IS NO PREEMPTION CONCERN	20
A.	The Claims Fail to Impermissibly Preempt Because There Is Evidence that Other Ways to Practice the Abstract Idea Using a Computer Exist.....	21
1.	Non-Infringing TT Product that Allows Placing a Trade Order in Response to Observing Market Data	22
2.	Non-Infringing TD Product that Allows Placing a Trade Order in Response to Observing Market Data.....	23
3.	Non-Infringing CQG Product that Allows Placing a Trade Order in Response to Observing Market Data.....	24

- 4. Non-Infringing ORC Product that Allows Placing a Trade Order in Response to Observing Market Data.....27
- V. UNDER A PROPER APPLICATION OF THE *ALICE* TEST, THE CLAIMS ARE ELIGIBLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. 101.....27
 - A. The Claims Are Not Directed to the Abstract Idea Adopted in the Institution Decision29
 - B. The Claims Recite an Inventive Concept Other Than an Abstract Idea.....33
- VI. THE PTAB SHOULD NO LONGER ADOPT THE PETITION’S § 101 ANALYSIS35
 - A. There Is No Evidence That the Claims Recite a Conventional GUI or an Abstract Idea.....35
 - B. Software Inventions Are Patentable Even If Performed On a Generic Computer37
 - C. New Case Law Confirms That the Claims are Patent Eligible.....39
- VII. THE PTAB SHOULD DISMISS THE PROCEEDING BECAUSE IT LACKS JURISDICTION42
 - A. The Decision Misapplied the Technological Invention Test.....46
 - 1. The Claim Limitations Recite Novel and Nonobvious Technology.....46
 - a. The Claims Recite a Technological Feature That Is Novel and Nonobvious.....47
 - 2. The Claims Solve Technical Problems with a Technical Solution.....50

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. v. CLS Bank Int'l</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Bancorp Servs., L.L.C. v. Sun Life Assur. Co. of Canada (U.S.)</i> , 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	28
<i>In re Bilski</i> , 545 F.3d 943 (Fed. Cir. 2008)(en banc), <i>aff'd on other grounds, Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 130 S. Ct. 3218 (2010)	28
<i>Bilski v Kappos</i> , 561 U.S. 593 (2010)	37
<i>DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.</i> , 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Diamond v. Chakrabarty</i> , 447 U.S. 303 (1980).....	19
<i>Funk Bros. Seed Co. v. Kalo Inoculant Co.</i> , 333 U.S. 127 (1948).....	20
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Mfrs. & Traders Trust Co.</i> , 2014 WL 7215193 (D. Del. Dec. 18, 2014).....	41
<i>Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs.</i> , 132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012).....	19, 29, 33
<i>MCM Portfolio LLC v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , No. 15-1091 (Fed. Cir.).....	43
<i>OpenTV, Inc. v. Netflix Inc.</i> , No. 14-cv-01525-RS, 2014 WL 7185921 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 16, 2014).....	41
<i>Parker v. Flook</i> , 437 U.S. 584 (1978).....	37

Smartflash LLC v. Apple, Inc.,
Dkt. 423 at 18, 20 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 21, 2015)41

Trading Techs. Inst'l, Inc. v. eSpeed, Inc.,
595 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 5, 15

Trading Techs. Int'l, Inc. v. CQG,
05-cv-4811 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 24, 2015) 2, 15

Trading Techs. Int'l, Inc., v. eSpeed, Inc. et al.,
Case No. 04-cv-5312, Dkt. 1140 (Jan. 3, 2008)16

Ultramercial v. Hulu, LLC,
772 F.3d 709 (2014)..... 20, 38

Statutes

AIA § 18(d).....46

35 U.S.C. § 101.....*passim*

35 U.S.C. § 326(e).....36

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.301(b)46, 50, 51

79 Fed. Reg. 241, 74635 (Dec. 16, 2014)22

U.S. Const. art. III, § 1.....42

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.