Paper No. ____
Filed: October 29, 2015

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TRADESTATION GROUP, INC. AND
TRADESTATION SECURITIES, INC.

Petitioner

v.

TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Patent Owner

Case CBM2015-00161
U.S. Patent 6,766,304 B2

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

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

Contents

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT 1

II. OVERVIEW OF THE CLAIMED INVENTION.....3

III. TRADESTATION'S PETITION FAILS TO SHOW THAT IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT THE CLAIMS OF THE ’304 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER § 112 8

A. TradeStation Fails to Explain that Its § 112 Argument Has Already Been Considered In Litigation, and Rejected 9

B. The ’304 Patent Claims Meet the Written Description Requirement Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 12

1. The term “static price axis” does not require “non-static” price levels or a price axis with some price levels static and other price levels non-static—non-static price levels are an unclaimed, unrecited feature 12

2. The claims meet the written description requirement.....14

IV. TRADESTATION'S PETITION FAILS TO SHOW THAT IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT THE CLAIMS OF THE '304 PATENT ARE PATENT INELIGIBLE UNDER § 101 19

A. TradeStation Fails to Even Mention the District Court Decision Finding the Claims Eligible under 35 U.S.C. § 101 19

B. The District Court Correctly Rejected TradeStation’s § 101 Arguments 25

C. TradeStation’s Arguments Under § 101 Fail to Consider the USPTO’s Most Recent Examination Guidance 34

D. TradeStation’s Incomplete Analysis Cannot Be Saved By a Non-Precedential and Non-Final Board Decision that Predates Both DDR and the PTO’s Own Updated § 101 Guidance.....37

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

V. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C § 322(A)(2) AND 35 U.S.C. § 325(A)(1) BECAUSE TRADESTATION FAILS TO SHOW CQG IS NOT AN RPI, WHILE ADMITTING COORDINATED EFFORTS. 37

A. The Admitted Coordination in Preparing Petitions Against TT's Patents Establishes RPI Status for CQG 39

B. The Agreement to Divide the Petition Filings Amongst Defendants Represents Payment-In-Kind for Those Petitions 40

C. As CQG's Proxy, TradeStation's Petition Should Be Barred Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(a)(1) 42

1. *RPX* illustrates why CQG is an RPI.....43

2. *JP Morgan* presents different circumstances than this case 45

VI. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT REPRESENTS A MISUSE OF THE COVERED BUSINESS METHOD REVIEW PROCESS. 47

A. The Board Has the Authority to Deny the Petition for Misuse of the CBM Review Process.....47

B. TradeStation's Petition Misuses CBM Review Because It Purposefully Delayed Its Repetition of Arguments 49

VII. TRIAL SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED BECAUSE THE '304 PATENT IS NOT A COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT.....52

A. TradeStation's Conclusory and Admittedly "[B]rief" Analysis Falls Short of Establishing That the '304 Patent Claims a "Covered Business Method" And Is Therefore Within the Jurisdictional Scope of Section 18 52

1. TradeStation's reliance on the patent's classification fails to establish CBM eligibility 52

2. TradeStation's reliance on phrases that are "financial in nature" fails to establish CBM jurisdiction.....53

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

3. TradeStation cannot establish CBM jurisdiction by ignoring facts that contradict its conclusion that the claimed invention is a covered business method 54

4. TradeStation technological invention arguments are deficient. 56

a. TradeStation failed to show that claims do not recite a novel and non-obvious technological invention because it did not address the claimed GUI 56

b. TradeStation cannot establish CBM jurisdiction by ignoring facts contrary to its conclusion that the claims are not for a technological invention. 57

5. TradeStation cannot circumvent establishing jurisdiction by pointing to a prior, non-precedential decision denying institution 60

B. Even If the Board Were to Conduct Its Own Analysis, All of the Evidence Shows That the '304 Patent Falls Outside of the Scope of CBM Review. 61

1. The '304 patent does not claim a covered business method. 62

2. The '304 patent claims a technological invention 68

a. There is no evidence to refute the Examiner's original determination that the claimed combination of GUI features is novel and non-obvious. 69

b. The prior art GUIs' had a speed and accuracy problem 70

c. The inventors solved the prior art GUIs' speed and accuracy problem as well as another technical problem of usability. 74

d. The problem previously identified by the Board was incomplete 76

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

VIII. CONCLUSION.....78

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.