

Paper No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Filed: June 26, 2016

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 CBM2015-00172<sup>1</sup>  
U.S. Patent 7,783,556 B1

---

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

---

<sup>1</sup> Case CBM2016-00040 has been joined with this proceeding.

**CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. OVERVIEW OF THE CLAIMED INVENTION ..... 1

III. THE CLAIMS OF THE '556 PATENT ARE PATENT ELIGIBLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101 ..... 6

A. TT'S CLAIMS ARE NOT DIRECTED TO AN "ABSTRACT IDEA" UNDER *ALICE* PRONG ONE..... 8

1. Petitioners Incorrectly Ignore and Overgeneralize the Claim Elements in Arguing that the Claims Are Directed to an Abstract Idea..... 8

2. TT's Claims Are Eligible under Part I of *Alice* Because They Improve the Functioning of the Computer..... 10

3. TT's Claims Are Eligible Under Part I of *Alice* Because the Claimed Invention is Undoubtedly Not Abstract..... 13

4. TT's Claims Are Eligible Under Part I of *Alice* Because GUIs are Technology ..... 14

5. TT's Claims Are Eligible Under Part I of *Alice* Because They Are Not Directed to a Fundamental Economic or Longstanding Commercial Practice, A Business Method, Or a Generic GUI..... 16

6. TT's Claims Are Eligible Under Part I of *Alice* Because They Do Not Preempt Petitioners' Purported Abstract Idea..... 19

B. THE CLAIMS ARE ELIGIBLE UNDER PART 2 OF *ALICE* BECAUSE THEY RECITE AN INVENTIVE CONCEPT ..... 20

1. TT's Claims As A Whole Establish An Inventive Concept ..... 24

IV. The '556 Patent Is Not a CBM Patent ..... 32

A. The '556 Patent Does Not Claim "Data Processing" or "Other Operation" (e.g., a Business Method)..... 32

1. The Claims of the '556 Patent Are Directed to a GUI Tool, Not "Data Processing" ..... 32

2. The Statutory Definition of CBM Requires More Than a Recitation of Financial Activity or a Financial Purpose ..... 33

B. The '556 Patent Falls Under the Technological Exception ..... 36

1. Technical Feature that is Novel and Unobvious..... 37

2. The Claimed Invention Solves a Technical Problem with a  
Technical Solution ..... 37

3. The Claims of the '556 Patent Do Not Merely Solve A Business  
Problem..... 40

4. Use of Known Technologies Does Not Render the Claims Non-  
Technical..... 41

V. The '556 Patent Does Not Cover Signals ..... 43

VI. CONCLUSION..... 44

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

<b>Cases</b>	<b>Page (s)</b>
<i>Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC v. DirecTV, LLC</i> , 109 F. Supp. 3d 916, 942 (W.D. TEX.2015).....	21
<i>Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank Int’l</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Bancorp Servs., L.L.C. v. Sun Life Assurance Co. of Can. (U.S.)</i> , 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir.2012).....	17, 31
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 130 S.Ct. 3218 (2010).....	14, 30
<i>Cybersource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	17, 31
<i>DDR Holdings v. Hotels.com, L.P.</i> , 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , No. 2015-1244, 2016 WL 2756255 (Fed. Cir. May 122016).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Capital One Bank (USA)</i> , 792 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir.2015).....	11, 13, 18
<i>Internet Patents v. Active Network, Inc.</i> , 790 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	20, 24
<i>Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.</i> , 132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012).....	19, 22, 24, 26
<i>Ex parte Mewherter</i> (Appeal 2012-007692).....	44
<i>Mortg. Grader, Inc. v. First Choice Loan Servs., Inc.</i> , 811 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	10, 13, 18, 21
<i>SiRF Tech., Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 601 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	31
<i>Straight Path IP Grp., Inc. v. Sipnet EU S.R.O.</i> , 806 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	44
<i>Ultramercial, Inc. v. Hulu, LLC</i> , 772 F.3d 709 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	16

...

*Versata Dev. Grp., Inc. v. SAP Am., Inc.*,  
793 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... *passim*

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 101..... *passim*

35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103.....20, 22, 24

**Other Authorities**

37 CFR 42.301(b) .....36

AIA § 18 .....1, 32, 35, 36

# 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.