

No. 2016-1616

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

CQG, INC., CQG, LLC, fka CQGT, LLC,

Defendants-Appellants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois
in No. 1:05-cv-04811, Judge Sharon Johnson Coleman

OPENING BRIEF OF APPELLANTS

Adam G. Kelly
William J. Voller III
John A. Cotiguala
LOEB & LOEB LLP
321 North Clark Street
Suite 2300
Chicago, IL 60654
(312) 464-3100

Kenneth R. Adamo
Eugene Goryunov
Meredith Zinanni
Vishesh Narayen
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
300 North LaSalle
Chicago, IL 60654
(312) 862-2000

John C. O'Quinn
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
655 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 879-5000

April 25, 2016

Counsel for Defendants-Appellants

CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST

Counsel for Appellant certifies the following:

1. The full name of every party represented by me is:

CQG, Inc. and CQG, LLC (f/k/a CQGT, LLC)

2. The name of the real party in interest is:

CQG, Inc. and CQG, LLC (f/k/a CQGT, LLC) are the real parties in interest.

3. All parent corporations and any publicly held companies that own 10 percent or more of the stock of the party represented by me are:

CQG, Inc. does not have a parent company. CQG, LLC is a wholly-owned subsidiary of CQG, Inc. No publicly held company owns 10 percent or more of the stock of either CQG, Inc. or CQG, LLC.

4. The names of all law firms and the partners or associates that appeared for the party now represented by me in the trial court or are expected to appear in this Court are:

Kirkland & Ellis LLP

Kenneth R. Adamo

John O'Quinn

Eugene Goryunov

Meredith Zinanni

Vishesh Narayen

Loeb & Loeb LLP

Adam Glenn Kelly

Christopher M Swickhamer

John Anthony Cotiguala

Laura A Wytsma

Terry D Garnett
William J. Kramer
William Joshua Voller
Melaina D. Jobs
Johnnet Simone Jones

Chuhak & Tecson, P.C.

David Seth Argentar

Bell, Boyd & Lloyd, LLC (now K&L Gates)

Heather Ann Boice
Jeana R. Lervick
Kara Eve Foster Cenar

Faegre & Benson LLP (now Faegre Baker Daniels, LLP)

Jared B. Briant
Nina Y. Wang
Mark W. Fischer
Neal S. Cohen

Welsh & Katz, Ltd.

Joseph E. Cwik
Kara Eve Foster Cenar
Robert B. Breisblatt

Bryan Cave LLP

Kara Eve Foster Cenar
Mariangela M. Seale

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
STATEMENT OF RELATED CASES	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT	3
STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES.....	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	4
STATEMENT OF FACTS	5
I. Commodities Trading	5
II. The Patents-In-Suit	6
III. The District Court’s Ruling	14
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	15
STANDARD OF REVIEW	17
ARGUMENT	18
I. THE DISTRICT COURT ERRED IN FINDING THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS PATENT-ELIGIBLE UNDER § 101.	18
A. <i>Alice</i> Step One: The Claims Are Directed To An Abstract Commodity-Trading Idea.	20
1. The Challenged Claims Are Directed To Commodities Trading, A Fundamental Economic Practice And Abstract Idea.	21
2. The “Vintage” Of An Abstract Idea Or Fundamental Economic Practice Is Irrelevant.	23
3. The Details Of The Challenged Claims Are Similarly Abstract.	26
4. Claims Directed To An Abstract Idea Remain Abstract Even If They Purportedly Solve A Problem In The Art.	29

5.	Claims Directed to an Abstract Idea Remain Abstract Even Without Total Preemption.	31
B.	<i>Alice</i> Step Two: The Claim Elements, Individually And As An Ordered Combination, Add Nothing Inventive.....	33
1.	The “Static Price Index” Does Not Transform The Abstract Commodity-Trading Idea Into A Patent-Eligible Invention.	33
2.	The Other Claim Elements, Individually, Do Not Transform The Abstract Commodity-Trading Idea Into A Patent-Eligible Invention.	42
3.	The Claim Elements, Viewed As An Ordered Combination, Do Not Transform The Abstract Commodity-Trading Idea Into A Patent-Eligible Invention.	44
4.	<i>DDR Holdings</i> , On Which The District Court Heavily Relied, Does Not Save The Claims.	46
C.	The Challenged Claims Also Fail The Machine-or-Transformation Test, Confirming They Are Not Patent-Eligible.....	51
II.	THE DISTRICT COURT ERRED IN IMPOSING A CLEAR AND CONVINCING BURDEN OF PROOF ON CQG’S § 101 CHALLENGE.	54
	CONCLUSION.....	57

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.