

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT TRIAL & APPEAL BOARD

CQG, INC. and CQGT, LLC

Petitioners,

v.

TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Patent Owner.

Case CBM2015-00057 (U.S. Patent No. 6,766,304 B2)
Case CBM2015-00058 (U.S. Patent No. 6,772,132 B1)

**PETITIONERS' REQUEST FOR REHEARING
UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.71(c) and 42.71(d)**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Standard of Review.....	3
III. Argument	3
A. The Board Overlooked the Finality of the District Court’s Dismissal of CQG’s Transferred DJ Action and Misapplied <i>Brennan v. Kulick</i> and Section 325(a)(3).....	3
1. The Order of Dismissal Was Undeniably Final.....	4
2. A Final Order of Dismissal Renders the Action a Nullity	5
a. Dismissal Circumstances Are Irrelevant Here.	5
b. The PTAB Has Consistently Granted Institution on Identical Facts.....	6
3. <i>Arguendo</i> , if Circumstances Are To Be Considered, the Circumstances Here Counsel in Favor of Institution.	8
4. Under the Statute, Counterclaims Cannot Bar Institution of a CBM Proceeding.	10
B. The Board Erred When It Asserted that CQG’s Dismissed DJ Claims Effectively Continued in the Illinois Infringement Action	11
1. CQG Did Not Add An Invalidity Counterclaim After Dismissal of Its Colorado DJ Action	11
a. CQG’s Invalidity Counterclaim Already Existed in the Illinois Infringement Action	11
b. CQG’s Non-Infringement and Unenforceability Claims Are Irrelevant Under Section 325(a)(1).....	12

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	<u>Page</u>
2. The Colorado DJ Action Was Not the “But For” Reason for CQG’s Amended Illinois Counterclaims	14
a. Rule 15(a)(2) Permits Liberal Amendment of Counterclaims	14
b. The Court Lacked Authority to “Authorize” CQG’s Amended Counterclaims	15
IV. Conclusion	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

<i>Apple Inc., v. Rensselaer Poly. Inst.</i> , No. IPR2014-00319, Paper No. 12 at 3 (P.T.A.B. Jun. 12, 2014)	7
<i>B. Braun Med., Inc. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 124 F.3d 1419 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	13
<i>C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3 Sys. Inc.</i> , 157 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	13
<i>Callidus Soft. v. Versata Soft., Inc.</i> , No. CBM2013-00053, Paper No. 16 at 6	1, 7, 15
<i>Clio USA, Inc. v. Procter and Gamble Co.</i> , No. IPR 2013-00438, Paper No. 9 at 7-9 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 9, 2014)	7
<i>Cyanotech Corp. v. Bd. of Trs. of the Univ. of Ill.</i> , No. IPR2013-00401, Paper No. 17 at 3, 9-12 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 19, 2013)	<i>passim</i>
<i>In re Gartside</i> , 203 F.3d 1305 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	3
<i>Graves v. Principi</i> , 294 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	5
<i>Holloway v. U.S.</i> , 60 Fed. Cl. 254 (Fed. Cl. 2004)	5, 6
<i>Illumina, Inc. v. Trs. of Columbia Univ. in the City of N.Y.</i> , No. IPR2013-00011, Paper No. 44 at 2 (P.T.A.B. May 10, 2013)	3
<i>Invue Sec. Prods., Inc. v. Merch. Techs., Inc.</i> , No. IPR2013-00122, Paper No. 17 at 8-10 (P.T.A.B. Jun. 27, 2013)	2, 8, 9, 10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (CONTINUED)

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Loral Space & Commc'ns, Inc. v. Viasat, Inc.</i> , Nos. IPR2014-00236, -239, -240, Paper No. 7 at 7 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 21, 2014)	6
<i>Motorola Mobility LLC v. Int'l Ventures I LLC</i> , No. CBM2015-00004, Paper No. 20 at 2 (P.T.A.B. Jul. 24, 2015).....	3
<i>PNY Techs., Inc. v. Phison Elec. Corp.</i> , No. IPR2013-00472, Paper No. 16 at 2 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 23, 2014)	3
<i>Soltys v. Costello</i> , 520 F.3d 737 (7th Cir. 2008)	14
<i>TD Ameritrade Holding Corp. v. Trading Techs. Int'l, Inc.</i> , No. CBM2014-00135, Paper No. 19 at 2 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 2, 2014)	10
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 21(b)	1
35 U.S.C. § 101	10
35 U.S.C. § 315(a)	7
35 U.S.C. § 315(a)(1).....	7, 10, 15
35 U.S.C. § 325(a)(1).....	<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 325(a)(3).....	2, 3, 10, 11
Declaratory Judgment Act.	9
Other Authorities	
37 C.F.R. § 1.7(a).....	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c).....	1, 3

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.