Miscellaneous Docket No. _____

IN THE

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

IN RE TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Petitioner.

On Petition for a Writ of Mandamus to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Patent Trial and Appeal PTAB, Case CBM2015-00161

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Certificate of Interest

Counsel for Petitioner Trading Technologies International, Inc. certify the following (use "None" if applicable; use extra sheets if necessary):

1. The full name of every party or amicus represented by me is:

   Trading Technologies International, Inc.

2. The name of the real party in interest (if the party named in the caption is not the real party in interest) represented by me is:

   Trading Technologies International, Inc.

3. All parent corporations and any publicly held companies that own 10 percent or more of the stock of the party or amicus curiae represented by me are:

   None

4. The names of all law firms and the partners or associates that appeared for the party or amicus now represented by me in the trial court or are expected to appear in this court are:

   Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP.

   Erika H. Arner, Cory C. Bell, Rachel L. Emsley, Joshua L. Goldberg, Kevin D. Rodkey

   Trading Technologies International, Inc.

   Steven F. Borsand

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities iv

STATEMENT OF RELATED CASES vii

I. Preliminary Statement 1

II. Statement of the Issue 3

III. Statement of Relief Sought 3

IV. The Record Establishes that the '304 Patent Does Not Claim a "Data Processing" Method or "Other Operation" and Falls Within the Technological Exception of § 18 3

A. The '304 Patent Claims the Makeup, Structure, and Features of a Technological GUI Tool, Not a "Data Processing" Method or "Other Operation" 4

B. This Court Found the '304 Patent Claims a GUI Tool That Solves Problems of Speed, Accuracy, and Usability in GUIs 9

C. A District Court Found the '304 Patent Claims a Specific Technological GUI Tool 10

D. The Legislative History Confirms Patents to GUI Tools Are Not CBM Patents 11

E. TradeStation Did *Not* Allege that the '304 Patent Claims a "Data Processing" Method or "Other Operation" 12

F. The PTAB Ignored the Dispositive Evidence and Prior Court Opinions in Finding the '304 Patent Is a CBM Patent 13

V. All of the Requirements for Mandamus Are Met 17

A. This Case Is Different from Cases Denying Mandamus, Because the PTAB Is Outside its Jurisdictional Authority 17

B. The '304 Patent Is Clearly and Indisputably Not a CBM Patent 18

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

1. The ’304 Patent Is Indisputably Not a CBM Patent Because It Does Not Claim a “Data Processing” Method or “Other Operation” 18

2. The ’304 Patent Is Also Indisputably Not a CBM Patent Because It Claims a Technological Invention 19

3. The PTAB’s Decision Reflects a Fundamental Misunderstanding of the Claimed GUI Technology 22

4. The ’304 Patent’s Underlying Invention is a GUI Tool Regardless of Claim Form (Method, System or CRM).....24

C. TT Lacks Other Adequate Means to Obtain Relief and Mandamus Is Appropriate to Prevent the PTAB From Exceeding Its Statutory Authority and to Prevent Recurring Error and Undue Prejudice 25

1. Mandamus Is Especially Appropriate Here Because the Error Is Jurisdictional and Recurring.....25

2. TT Will Be Unfairly Prejudiced if the Erroneous CBM Determination Is Not Corrected Now 27

VI. Conclusion 29

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

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Achates Reference Publ'g, Inc. v. Apple Inc.,
803 F.3d 652 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 18

Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank International,
123 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....9, 21, 24

Athlone Indus., Inc. v. Consumer Prod. Safety Comm'n,
707 F.2d 1485 (D.C. Cir. 1983).....27

BancOhio Corp. v. Fox,
516 F.2d 29 (6th Cir. 1975) 26

Belle v. Sellevold,
713 F.2d 1396 (8th Cir. 1983) 26

Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.,
No. 2015-1391, 2016 WL 791107 (Fed. Cir. Mar. 1, 2016) 14

Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Court for D.C.,
542 U.S. 367 (2004).....25

CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.,
654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 24

DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.,
773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 21

In re Dutile,
953 F.2d 61 (5th Cir. 1991) 26

In re EchoStar Commc'ns Corp.,
448 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2006) 17

First Jersey Sec., Inc. v. Bergen,
605 F.2d 690 (3d Cir. 1979) 26, 27

In re Hot-Hed Inc.,
477 F.3d 320 (5th Cir. 2007) 26

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.