

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO**

Civil Action No. 05-cv-1584 REB-OES

CQGT, LLC, a Colorado limited liability company; CQG, INC., a Colorado corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC., a Delaware corporation,

Defendant.

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs CQGT, LLC and CQG, Inc., through their attorneys Faegre & Benson LLP, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a), submit this First Amended Complaint against Defendant Trading Technologies International, Inc., and state as follows:

PARTIES

1. Plaintiff CQGT, LLC is a Colorado limited liability company, with its principal place of business in Denver, Colorado. Plaintiff CQG, Inc. is a Colorado corporation, with its principal place of business in Denver, Colorado. Plaintiffs CQGT, LLC and CQG, Inc. shall be referred to herein collectively as Plaintiffs.

2. Defendant Trading Technologies International, Inc. is a Delaware corporation, with its principal place of business in Chicago, Illinois. Defendant Trading Technologies International, Inc. shall be referred to herein as TT.

CQG EXHIBIT 1015

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338, because this case presents a well-pleaded federal question under the Antitrust laws of the United States, 15 U.S.C. § 2; the Patent Act of 1952 (as amended), 35 U.S.C. §§ 1, et seq.; and the Federal Declaratory Judgments Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202. The Court also has supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims in this case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

4. The exercise of *in personam* jurisdiction over TT comports with the laws of the State of Colorado and the constitutional requirements of due process because, upon information and belief, TT and/or its agents transact business and/or offer to transact business within the State of Colorado.

5. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391.

6. There are no current related actions in this District.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

7. On July 20, 2004, the Commissioner for Patents with the United States Patent and Trademark Office issued U.S. Patent No. 6,766,304 (“the ‘304 Patent”) claiming a method and system for “Click Based Trading With Intuitive Grid Display of Market Depth.” A true and correct copy of the ‘304 Patent is attached as **Exhibit A** and incorporated herein.

8. On August 3, 2004, the Commissioner for Patents with the United States Patent and Trademark Office issued U.S. Patent No. 6,722,132 (“the ‘132 Patent”) also claiming a method and system for “Click Based Trading With Intuitive Grid Display of

Market Depth.” A true and correct copy of the '132 Patent is attached as **Exhibit B** and incorporated herein.

9. Upon information and belief, TT is the assignee of the '304 Patent and the '132 Patent.

10. CQG, Inc. was established in 1980 to supply data and market analysis to futures traders. CQG, Inc. has, in the past, developed and sold computer programs and user interfaces which allows traders to view futures trading data and to analyze that data.

11. The computer programs developed and sold by CQG, Inc. include both (1) single click-based computer programs and (2) multiple click-based computer programs. Both of these types of computer programs sold by CQG, Inc. allow traders to place orders and otherwise trade futures.

12. CQGT, LLC is a company which owns and develops the intellectual property which forms the basis for the computer programs and user interfaces sold by CQG, Inc.

13. TT has asserted that Plaintiffs' manufacture and offering for sale and selling of Plaintiffs' products constitutes infringement and/or contributory infringement of the '304 Patent and '132 Patent and all claims thereof. By charging Plaintiffs with infringement of the '304 Patent and '132 Patent, TT's actions have created in Plaintiffs a reasonable apprehension of suit.

14. Representatives of TT have also told representatives of Plaintiffs that TT will file suit against Plaintiffs unless Plaintiffs agree to the terms of a "Settlement

Agreement.” During discussions regarding this “Settlement Agreement,” representatives of TT asserted that Plaintiffs’ single click-based computer programs infringe TT’s Patents, while admitting that TT’s Patents do not cover the multiple click-based computer programs developed by Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs ultimately determined that they could not agree to the terms of the any such “Settlement Agreement.”

15. Therefore, a substantial and continuing justiciable controversy exists between Plaintiffs and TT as to the validity and scope of the ’304 Patent and ’132 Patent, and as to whether any of Plaintiffs’ products infringe any valid claim thereof.

16. Since Plaintiffs have refused to agree to the terms of TT’s “Settlement Agreement,” TT has sued Plaintiffs for patent infringement in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. Upon information and belief, TT has also begun contacting Plaintiffs’ customers who employ CQG’s multiple click-based computer programs. TT has charged these customers with infringement of TT’s Patents, while knowing that TT’s Patents do not cover these products.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement and Invalidity of the ’304 and ’132 Patents
28 U.S.C. § 2201

17. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference Paragraphs 1 through 16 of this Complaint, as if fully set forth herein.

18. Plaintiffs have not infringed or committed contributory infringement of any claims of the ’304 Patent or ’132 Patent by making, using, selling, offering for sale, distributing and/or importing any product, or by practicing any process.

19. Upon information and belief, Plaintiffs allege that the '304 Patent and '132 Patent, and each and every respective claim thereof, are invalid and unenforceable for failure to comply with one or more provisions of Title 35 of the United States Code, including without limitation, Sections 101, 102, 103, and/or 112.

20. TT's charges of infringement of the '304 Patent and '132 Patent with full knowledge of the invalidity of the '304 Patent and '132 Patent makes this an exceptional case warranting an award of Plaintiffs' reasonable attorney's fees and costs under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF
Declaratory Judgment of Patent Misuse

21. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference Paragraphs 1 through 20 of this Complaint, as if fully set forth herein.

22. During discussions regarding TT's "Settlement Agreement," representatives of TT admitted to representatives of Plaintiffs that Plaintiffs' products that employ multiple click-based trading software do not infringe the claims of the '304 Patent and '132 Patent.

23. Upon information and belief, TT has contacted Plaintiffs' customers and charged that their use of Plaintiffs' products that employ multiple-click based trading software does in fact infringe the claims of the '304 and '132 Patents.

24. TT's attempts to assert the claims of the '304 Patent and '132 Patent against Plaintiffs' customers using products that do not infringe the claims of the '304 Patent and '132 Patent, while knowing that the claims of the '304 Patent and '132

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.