| 1 2 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION | | | | |
|----------|---|--|--|--|--|
| 3 | | | | | |
| 4 | TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL,) INC., | | | | |
| 5 6 | Plaintiff,) | | | | |
| 7 | v.) No. 04 C 5312 | | | | |
| 8 | eSPEED, INC., eSPEED INTERNATIONAL,) LTD., ECCO LLC, and ECCOWARE, LTD.,) Chicago, Illinois | | | | |
| 9 |) September 17, 2007 Defendants.) 10:00 o'clock a.m. | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | |
| 11 | VOLUME 4-A TRIAL TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS | | | | |
| 12 | BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES B. MORAN, and a JURY | | | | |
| 13 14 | APPEARANCES: | | | | |
| 15 | Trading Technologies TRADING TECHNOLOGIES International, Inc., by: INTERNATIONAL, INC., MR. STEVEN F. BORSAND | | | | |
| 16 | 222 South Riverside Drive Chicago, Illinois 60606 | | | | |
| 17 | 312-476-1000 steve.borsand@ | | | | |
| 18 | tradingtechnologies.com and | | | | |
| 19 | McDONNELL, BOEHNEN, HULBERT & BERGHOFF, LTD. | | | | |
| 20 | MR. PAUL H. BERGHOFF MR. S. RICHARD CARDEN | | | | |
| 21 | MR. CHRISTOPHER M. CAVAN MR. MICHAEL D. GANNON MG. JENNIJEED M. KUDGZ | | | | |
| 22 | MS. JENNIFER M. KURCZ MR. MATTHEW J. SAMPSON MR. LEIF R. SIGMOND | | | | |
| 24 | 300 South Wacker Drive Chicago, Illinois 60606 | | | | |
| 25 | 312-913-0001 berghoff@mbhb.com kurcz@mbhb.com | | | | |



| 1 | eSpeed, Inc., eSpeed International, Inc., | |
|----------|---|--|
| 2 | Ecco LLC, Eccoware, LTD., by: | MR. RAYMOND C. PERKINS MR. IMRON T. ALY |
| 3 | - | MR. KEVIN BANASIK MS. ELIZABETH HARTFORD ERICKSON |
| 4 | | MR. ANDREW M. JOHNSTONE MS. TRACEY J. ALLEN |
| 5 | | MR. JAMES M. HILMERT 35 West Wacker Drive |
| 6 | | Chicago, Illinois 60601 312-558-5600 |
| 7 | | glombardi@winston.com rperkins@winston.com |
| 8 | | LAW OFFICES OF |
| 9 | | GARY A. ROSEN, P.C. MR. GARY A. ROSEN |
| 10 | | 1831 Chestnut Street, Suite 802 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 1910 |
| 11 | | 215-972-0600 |
| 12 | Rosenthal Collins Grou | - - |
| 13 | LLC, by: | MR. GEOFFREY A. BAKER 201 Main Street |
| 14 | | Lafayette, IN 47901 765-429-4004 |
| 15 16 | | gabaker@dowellbaker.com |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | Court Reporter: N | IS. CAROLYN COX, CSR, RPR, CRR |
| 24 | C | Official Court Reporter |
| 25 | C | Chicago, Illinois 60604 |
| | | |



| | | 64 |
|----|---|-------|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | HARRIS BRUMFIELD, DIRECT EXAMINATION | 660 |
| 4 | BY MR. BERGHOFF: | |
| 5 | HARRIS BRUMFIELD, PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, SWORN, | 727 |
| 6 | CROSS EXAMINATION | , 2 , |
| 7 | BY MR. LOMBARDI: | |
| 8 | DI MR. HOMBARDI. | |
| 9 | REDIRECT EXAMINATION | 824 |
| 10 | BY MR. BERGHOFF | 0 |
| 11 | PATRICK TROY | 835 |
| 12 | DIRECT EXAMINATION | 835 |
| 13 | BY MR. CARDEN: | |
| 14 | BRIEN GREY | 859 |
| 15 | DIRECT EXAMINATION | 859 |
| 16 | BY MR. SAMPSON: | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| | | |



(The following proceedings were had in open court, outside the presence and hearing of the jury:)

THE COURT: Well, I should bring up today as to where I'm at from where last we met. One is on the use of the declarations by the expert, I'm satisfied that -- well, one, it's probably not hearsay because it relates to state of mind, but in any event, I can see where this sort of thing would -- might be problematic if you had some expert that was relying solely on this kind of evidence, so as one court mentioned, the expert was kind of a mouth piece for the declarant. But here the expert is relying on a lot of things and that's one of the things that's out there and that they can do.

The Japanese prior art. Now, as I understand it, the printed publication description aspect relates to the invention, so what we're really talking about is anticipation. And we've already said no as to the use for anticipation, so the issue is really obviousness, where I think that kind of drops out the restriction to publications doesn't apply.

The TIFFE is obviousness, not anticipation.

And it can come in if authenticated. There is no

translation, but Trading Technologies knew about it for

a long time. Whether Midas Kapiti anticipated, I'm

unclear as to who is going to be arguing what about

1 09:52:24 2 09:52:24 3 09:52:27 09:52:38 09:52:41 7 09:52:46 09:52:52 09:52:57 09:53:00 10 09:53:08 11 12 09:53:14 09:53:18 13 09:53:20 14 09:53:23 15 09:53:29 16 09:53:34 17 09:53:40 18 19 09:53:44 20 09:53:54 21 09:53:58 09:54:02 22 23 09:54:06 24 09:54:10 25 09:54:16

09:54:20 1 09:54:24 09:54:28 3 09:54:31 09:54:34 09:54:40 6 7 09:54:44 09:54:48 8 09:54:59 9 09:55:03 10 09:55:06 11 12 09:55:11 09:55:16 13 09:55:22 14 09:55:25 15 09:55:32 16 09:55:35 17 09:55:38 18 19 09:55:43 20 09:55:50 21 09:56:03 09:56:07 22

that. I just don't understand, but if it's relevant to anticipation, there is a factual dispute on whether it was accessible and I think that's a factual dispute that you're going to have to fight out before the jury and let them hear what the evidence is. And it clearly can come in with respect to obviousness.

Tokyo Stock Exchange, again, obviousness. And here the argument that if more than one person reasonably skilled in the art comes up with essentially the same idea at the same time does have a bearing on obviousness, but it also seems to me you know when you talk about combination patents where somebody is saying something is patentable because I combined this which was known in the art and that that was known in the art for a new and different result, sometimes that's patentable and sometimes it's not and sometimes you end up with an argument about whether it was obvious or not, and I think that's where we're at, unless somebody can convince me otherwise, that even if a static Price Ladder is known in the art and even if in some other invention, patent, the idea of single click or single action is in the art, putting that together is that obvious or not, it seems to me that that's something that both sides can argue and permits that evidence to come in.



23

24

25

09:56:10

09:56:14

09:56:17

DOCKET

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.

