

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.,
Petitioners,

v.

TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case CBM2015-00161¹
Patent No. 6,766,304

PETITIONERS' MOTION TO EXCLUDE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. ARGUMENT	3
A. The <i>eSpeed/CQG</i> Transcripts: Exhibits 2029, 2211, 2220, 2222, 2224, 2225, 2228, 2232, 2247, 2251, 2274–2276, 2286–2288, and 2292–2296.....	3
B. The 32 Electronic Trader Declarants: Exhibits 2223	4
C. Third Party Emails: Exhibits 2240–2246, 2250, 2252–2273, and 2277	6
D. Brumfield Sketch and Animations: Exhibits 2212, 2213, and 2214.....	8
E. <i>eSpeed/CQG</i> Jury Verdict Forms & Docket Entry: Exhibits 2030, 2032, 2278 9	
F. Confidential Declaration of Christopher Thomas: Exhibit 2169B (¶¶ 75, 83–86, 89–92, 94–97, 102–104, 106–111, 126–128, 131, 133–34, 136–138, 140, 141, 151–153, 172).....	11
III. CONCLUSION	15

I. INTRODUCTION

TT's Patent Owner Response ("TT's POR") dumps into the record and buries the Board with hundreds of pages of documents without regard to their admissibility. But this proceeding is governed by the Federal Rules of Evidence and those Rules set fair boundaries on the admissibility of evidence. TT's ignores those rules.

TT knows that its evidence suffers from significant admissibility problems. Indeed, it preemptively sought a blanket waiver from the Board so that TT could rely on a "large volume of documents produced in previous district court cases" without regard to the Board's Rules and Federal Rules of Evidence 802 and 901. Paper 38, 2–3. The Board denied TT's request. *See id.* Having been denied permission to do so, TT proceeded to file a tremendous number of documents from the district court cases without regard to the Board's order and the rules governing this proceeding. That evidence should be stricken.

A significant number of the documents submitted by TT violate the prohibition on hearsay. *See* FRE 802. Absent one of the well-established exceptions to hearsay, such as the unavailability of a declarant, hearsay is inadmissible. TT disregards this Rule entirely by introducing hearsay statements from dozens of individuals in an effort to defend the patentability of its claims.

A significant number of TT's documents also fail to meet the basic requirements of authenticity required by Federal Rule of Evidence 901. Despite Petitioners' timely objection, TT offered no competent evidence that cures this objection leaving the Board and Petitioners with no basis to gauge whether the documents are genuine.

TT's evidence also ignores the proper boundaries of expert witness testimony in contravention of Federal Rule of Evidence 702. Rule 702 permits an expert to offer opinions based on his specialized knowledge in the field. But significant portions of Mr. Thomas' declaration are not opinions of Mr. Thomas. Rather, Mr. Thomas purports to offer factual testimony that is not based on his own perception but is instead based upon his review of district court depositions and trial transcripts. That underlying evidence should not be admitted in this proceeding as TT may not use Mr. Thomas "simply as a conduit for introducing hearsay under the guise that the testifying expert used the hearsay as the basis of his testimony." *Marvel Characters, Inc. v. Kirby*, 726 F.3d 119, 136 (2d Cir. 2013) (citation omitted). This testimony is improper and, therefore, should be excluded. *See, e.g., United States v. Dukagjini*, 326 F.3d 45, 58 (2d Cir. 2003).

Moreover, the evidence is inadmissible under FRE 402 because is it not relevant to patent eligibility under 35 U.S.C. § 101, the sole remaining issue in this proceeding. Indeed, no court has ever considered evidence of secondary

considerations in a Section 101 analysis.

Accordingly, Petitioners file this motion pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c) and in accordance with the Board's May 12, 2016 Order modifying Due Date 4. (Paper 38 at 8.)

II. ARGUMENT

A. The *eSpeed/CQG* Transcripts: Exhibits 2029, 2211, 2220, 2222, 2224, 2225, 2228, 2232, 2247, 2251, 2274–2276, 2286–2288, and 2292–2296

The Board should exclude Exhibits 2211, 2220, 2222, 2224, 2225, 2228, 2232, 2247, 2251, 2274–2276, 2286–2288, 2292–2296 (“*eSpeed/CQG* Transcripts”) because they are hearsay to which no valid exception applies. Most of these exhibits are cited in TT’s POR. *See* Paper 67 at 13, 31–34, 38, 41–45, 47, 51, and 67; *see also* Paper 70 (providing limited citations to the record for TT exhibits). In addition, as discussed further in section II.E. *infra*, TT’s technical expert Mr. Thomas relies upon these transcripts to support the assertions in his declaration (Ex. 2169) regarding, for example, the background of the claimed invention and alleged secondary considerations, including “commercial success,” “initial skepticism followed by acceptance,” “widespread copying,” “failure of others,” “praise and accolades,” and “unexpected results.” Petitioners timely objected to each of the *eSpeed/CQG* Transcripts on the basis of, among other things, hearsay. *See* Paper 22 at 16; Paper 69 at 14–16.

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.