

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT TRIAL & APPEAL BOARD

TRADESTATION GROUP, INC. AND
~~CQG~~TRADESTATION SECURITIES, INC. ~~and CQGT, LLC~~

Petitioners,

v.

TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Patent Owner:

U.S. Patent No. 6,766,304 B2

**PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD REVIEW UNDER 35
U.S.C. § 321 AND § 18 OF THE LEAHY-SMITH AMERICA INVENTS ACT**

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

I. TABLE OF CONTENTS

II. Introduction 1

III. Mandatory Notices (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)) 1

 A. Real ~~Party-in-Interest~~Parties-in-Interest 1

 B. Related Matters 1

 C. Lead and Back-up Counsel Including Service Information 2

III. Payment of Fees 3

IV. Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. 42.304(a)) 3

 A. ~~CQG Has~~Petitioners Have Standing to File a Petition Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.302(a) 3

 B. ~~CQG TradeStation~~ Is Not Estopped ~~from Filing a Petition~~ Under 37 ~~C.F.R. §~~CFR 42.302(b) by ~~Having Filed a Now-Dismissed DJ Action in 2005~~ 3 Non-Party CQG’s Earlier-Filed CBM Petition, and TradeStation Is the Sole Party-in-Interest in this Proceeding 4

 1. ~~Institution of CBM Review Is Not Precluded by CQG’s Earlier Filed Declaratory Judgment Action, Because Such Action Was Dismissed Without Prejudice~~ 4

 2. ~~The Rules Promulgated by the PTO Under Section 18 of the AIA Do Not Prohibit Institution of CBM Review, Because a Petitioner First Filed a Declaratory Judgment Action~~ 10

 3. ~~35 U.S.C. § 325(a)(1) Does Not Apply to CBM Review and Does Not Bar the Institution of CBM Review that Is Initiated After the Filing of a Declaratory Judgment Action~~ 13

 C. The ’304 Patent Is Eligible Available for Covered Business Method Patent Review Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.301 178

1.	The USPTO Has Already Determined that the '304 Patent Is a Covered Business Method Patent.....	19 <u>10</u>
	a. Classification	<u>10</u>
	b. Claim Language	<u>11</u>
2.	The '304 Patent Is Not for a “Technological Invention”	21 <u>12</u>
3.	The Claimed Subject Matter of the '304 Patent as a Whole Does Not Recite a Technical Feature that Is Novel and Unobvious Over the Prior Art.....	23 <u>14</u>
4.	The Claimed Subject Matter of the '304 Patent as a Whole Does Not Solve a Technical Problem Using a Technical Solution	25 <u>17</u>
	a. Plain Language	<u>17</u>
	b. Legislative History	<u>18</u>
V.	Identification of Challenge Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b).....	29 <u>22</u>
	A. Specific Statutory Grounds of Challenge.....	30 <u>22</u>
	B. A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	30 <u>22</u>
	C. Claim Construction	30 <u>23</u>
VI.	Detailed Explanation of Reasons That Claims 1–40 of the '304 Patent Are Unpatentable	32 <u>24</u>
	A. Ground 1: Claims 1–40 Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 101	32 <u>24</u>
	1. New PTO Guidelines	33 <u>25</u>
	a. Ultramercial, LLC v. Hulu, LLC, 657 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	<u>26</u>
	b. DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P., 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	<u>27</u>
	2. Indicators of Abstract Ideas	37 <u>29</u>

3.	Economic Practices Are Abstract Ideas.....	39 <u>31</u>
4.	The '304 Patent Is Not Patentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 Because All of Its Claims Are Directed to an Abstract Idea.....	41 <u>33</u>
a.	<u>The Claims of the '304 Patent Are Directed to an Abstract Idea</u>	<u>36</u>
b.	<u>The Claim Elements—Either Separately or as an Ordered Combination—Do Not Provide “Something More”</u>	<u>39</u>
c.	<u>Claims Fail the Machine-or-Transformation Test</u>	<u>44</u>
(1)	<u>The '304 Patent Claims Are Not Tied to a Particular Machine</u>	<u>45</u>
(2)	<u>The '304 Patent Claims Do Not Transform a Particular Article into a Different State or Thing</u>	<u>47</u>
d.	<u>Dependent Claims</u>	<u>48</u>
e.	<u>Other Related TT Patents Have Been Determined to Be Abstract by the Board</u>	<u>48</u>
B.	Ground 2: Claims 1–40 Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph, for Lacking Sufficient Written Description of a Price Column Where Only Some Prices Move, Not All.....	59 <u>53</u>
1.	Claim Coverage.....	61 <u>55</u>
2.	Written Description.....	62 <u>56</u>
3.	Possession.....	65 <u>59</u>
VII.	Conclusion.....	66 <u>60</u>

EXHIBITS

<u>TS 1001</u>	<u>U.S. Patent No. 6,766,304</u>
<u>TS 1002</u>	<u>File History, U.S. Patent No. 6,766,304</u>
<u>TS 1003</u>	<u>TD Ameritrade Holding Corp. v. Trading Tech. Int'l, Inc., Case CBM2014-00136, Decision Denying Institution (Paper No. 19), at pp. 7–12 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 2, 2014)</u>
<u>TS 1004</u>	<u>Memorandum Opinion and Order, Dkt. #735, Trading Tech. Int'l, Inc. v. CQGT, LLC, et al., 05-cv-4811, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division</u>
<u>TS 1005</u>	<u>TD Ameritrade Holding Corp. v. Trading Tech. Int'l, Inc., Case CBM2014-00136, Petition (Paper No. 4) (P.T.A.B. May 20, 2014)</u>
<u>TS 1006</u>	<u>TD Ameritrade, Patent Owner's Preliminary Response (Paper No. 18), at pp. 6-7 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 3, 2014)</u>
<u>TS 1007</u>	<u>TD Ameritrade Holding Corp. v. Trading Tech. Int'l, Inc., CBM2014-00131, Decision to Institute (Paper No. 19), at p. 15 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 2, 2014)</u>
<u>TS 1008</u>	<u>TD Ameritrade Holding Corp. v. Trading Tech. Int'l, Inc., CBM2014-00133, Decision to Institute (Paper No. 19), at p. 14 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 2, 2014)</u>
<u>TS 1009</u>	<u>TD Ameritrade Holding Corp. v. Trading Tech. Int'l, Inc., CBM2014-00137, Decision to Institute (Paper No. 19), at p. 14 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 2, 2014)</u>
<u>TS 1010</u>	<u>TD Ameritrade Holding Corp. v. Trading Tech. Int'l, Inc., CBM2014-00135, Decision to Institute (Paper No. 19), at p. 14 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 2, 2014)</u>
<u>TS 1011</u>	<u>Kemp II, et al. US 6,772,132</u>
<u>TS 1012</u>	<u>Statement of Reasons for Allowance in the '304 patent</u>
<u>TS 1013</u>	<u>Declaration of Dr. John Phillips Mellor ("Mellor decl.")</u>
<u>TS 1014</u>	<u>Excerpts of Appendices for Mellor Declaration</u>
<u>TS 1015</u>	<u>Lodewijk Petram, "The World's First Stock Exchange"</u>
<u>TS 1016</u>	<u>"Futures/ Option Purchasing System Trading Terminal Operation Guide", Tokyo Stock Exchange Operation System Division</u>

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.