

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TRADESTATION GROUP, INC.,
TRADESTATION SECURITIES, INC., IBG LLC, and
INTERACTIVE BROKERS LLC.

Petitioner

v.

TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Patent Owner

Case CBM2015-00161¹
U.S. Patent 6,766,304 B2

**PATENT OWNER'S MOTION TO SUBMIT SUPPLEMENTAL
INFORMATION AND BRIEFING UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.223(b)**

¹ Case CBM2016-00035 has been joined with this proceeding.

Patent Owner (“TT”) moves to submit supplemental information and briefing under 37 C.F.R. § 42.223(b), as authorized by the Board. Paper 86.² Although TT has been trying to submit this information for months, Petitioners have objected due to the district court protective order (“PO”) under which the information was produced. Because Petitioners only recently withdrew their PO objections, TT could not have provided this information earlier.

It is in the interests of justice for TT to be permitted to submit supplemental information and briefing because Petitioners’ documents and testimony directly support TT’s positions on patent eligibility, while contradicting Petitioners’ position. Petitioners falsely claim that GUIs are not technological in nature, GUIs are not functional and instead are merely an arrangement of known elements on a computer screen that have no purpose beyond aesthetics, and that there is no inventive concept disclosed and claimed in TT’s patents. And yet, evidence from Petitioners’ files tells a different story. There is no burden or prejudice to

² Pursuant to the Board’s order, TT has only summarized the supplemental information without directly filing them and interprets the Board’s order to preclude quoting from the documents as well. However, the language of the documents strongly supports TT’s position and TT would welcome the opportunity to submit quotes, excerpts, and the documents themselves.

Petitioners that will result from TT submitting such information as they may address it in their Reply due September 9, 2016. Thus, TT seeks to submit the documents described below along with a 10-page supplemental brief.

I. THE INFORMATION REASONABLY COULD NOT HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED EARLIER DUE TO PETITIONERS' REPEATED CONFIDENTIALITY OBJECTIONS AND THE TIMING OF RECEIPT OF THE INFORMATION

TT could not have reasonably submitted the information it seeks to supplement the record with earlier. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.223(b). First, TT did not receive all of the documents, testimony, or authentication of the evidence until the second week of June, after TradeStation (“TS”) and IB depositions from June 8-13, 2016. *See infra* § II. Thus, the earliest TT could have possibly submitted this body of evidence (if not for Petitioners’ PO objections) was after those depositions.

Second, TT could not submit this information in its Patent Owner Responses (“PORs”) due two weeks later because Petitioners have continuously and strategically objected to TT’s reliance or filing of any of Petitioners’ confidential information based on the fact that Petitioners produced such information under the district court’s PO³, and not the PTAB’s. Indeed, TT has acted diligently from even

³Petitioners have objected based the district court PO that provides that confidential information “shall not be used for any purpose other than in this Proceeding.” Ex. 2407, ¶11. The PO was entered more than a year before

before the date discovery was completed (June 13) to make this evidence of record, engaging Petitioners numerous times to try to resolve the PO issues to use the documents produced in the litigation in the PTAB. For example, in early May, TT requested that Petitioners produce this information in the PTAB proceedings under the default PO (*see* Ex. 2395), but Petitioners refused this streamlining, demanding TT instead seek the information as Additional Discovery (*see* Ex. 2396).

In late May, TT's litigation counsel again requested that Petitioners agree that TT could use the information at the PTAB notwithstanding the PO, but Petitioners again objected, delaying weeks to confer on this point. Ex. 2397. TT's PTAB counsel repeated its request to Petitioners' PTAB counsel on May 31 (Ex. 2398), and held conferrals on June 2 (Ex. 2399 at 1-3) and June 7 (Ex. 2400). The disagreement culminated with the Board call on June 13, where Petitioners admitted that "documents that are merely proprietary to [TS] could be reproduced separate from the litigation without violating that protective order." Ex. 2140 at 18:22-19:9. The Board authorized TT to file a Motion for Additional Discovery by June 15, but Petitioners' objections based on the PO still stood in the way of TT filing or referencing Petitioners' information in that motion.

As such, TT filed an emergency motion with the district court, noticed for June 15, seeking permission to bring such documents to the Board's attention. On

enactment of the AIA creating CBM and IPR proceedings, and the PTAB itself.

June 14, Petitioners reached out to TT and offered to “moot” TT’s district court motion (*see* Ex. 2401) and later agreed that TT could reference and file a representative sample of the documents in its Motion. TT agreed to the proposal and withdrew its district court motion. However, this Board denied TT’s motion for Additional Discovery on Friday, June 24. As TT’s PORs were due the following Monday, on June 27, there was no time for TT to seek relief from the district court prior to filing the PORs.

On July 1, TT sought relief from the district court PO to file the materials in an offer of proof before the PTAB. The district court granted the motion on July 7, stating that the basis was “because the PTAB has to have all material, relevant information, to make its determination. And to have all of this relevant information that I’ve deemed to be appropriate in this litigation and not have it in front of them doesn’t move the proceeding” Ex. 2402 at 13:17-21.

TT requested a call with the Board on July 8 to seek authorization to file an offer of proof. The Board held the call on July 15, and on July 19, the Board denied TT’s request but suggested that TT seek supplemental information and briefing at this stage of the proceeding. Paper 76, at 6.

Thus, the week of July 25, TT notified Petitioners that TT would file a motion with the district court seeking leave to file the requested materials with the Board as supplemental information. On July 29, Petitioners notified TT that they

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.