

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

IBG LLC, INTERACTIVE BROKERS LLC,
TRADESTATION GROUP, INC., TRADESTATION SECURITIES, INC.,
TRADESTATION TECHNOLOGIES, INC., and IBFX, INC.,
Patent Owner,

v.

TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
Patent Owner.

CBM 2015-00179
Patent 7,533,056 B2

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, MEREDITH C. PETRAVICK, and
JEREMY M. PLENZLER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MEDLEY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Denying Patent Owner's Request for Rehearing
37 C.F.R. § 42.71

Introduction

Trading Technologies International, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) filed a Request for Rehearing (Paper 144, “Req. Reh’g”) of our Final Decision (Paper 143, “Dec.”) determining that claims 1–15 of U.S. Patent No. 7,533,056 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’056 patent”) are unpatentable. Patent Owner requests rehearing only with respect to our decision that dependent claims 5–7 are (1) unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over TSE, Togher, Schott, and Cooper, and (2) are not directed to patent eligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Req. Reh’g 1–2. For the reasons that follow, the Request for Rehearing is *denied*.

Analysis

A party requesting rehearing bears the burden of showing that the decision should be modified. 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d). The party must identify specifically all matters we misapprehended or overlooked, and the place where each matter was previously addressed in a motion, an opposition, or a reply. *Id.*

Patent Owner requests rehearing of our determination that dependent claims 5–7 are not patent eligible under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Req. Reh’g 2, 8–9. Patent Owner argues that we (1) overlooked that dependent claims 5–7 recite an inventive concept, (2) failed to take into account guidance from *Trading Technologies International, Inc., v. CQG, INC.*, No. 2016-1616, 2017 WL 192716 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 18, 2017), and (3) failed to consider the claimed combination as a whole. *Id.* Patent Owner’s arguments are not persuasive.

First, the rehearing request never points to any language in any of claims 5–7 as allegedly claiming an inventive concept. Rather, Patent Owner quotes language from independent claim 1. Req. Reh’g 8. In addition, Patent Owner has not directed us to a place where it previously argued that claims 5–7 recite an inventive concept.¹ Thus, we could not have overlooked something that was never presented. In any event, we considered whether all of the claims, including dependent claims 5–7, constitute an inventive concept. Dec. 26–29. Patent Owner provides no persuasive reason for us to modify our Decision.

We also disagree with Patent Owner that we “failed to take into account the Federal Circuit’s guidance in assessing that these claims [5–7] are directed to an inventive concept.” Req. Reh’g 9. We considered and discussed both Supreme Court and Federal Circuit guidance emanating from several decisions relevant to the facts of this case. Dec. 18–29. Patent Owner presents no sufficient reason for us to modify the Decision in that regard, as mere disagreement with a decision is not a sufficient basis for requesting rehearing.

Patent Owner argues that claim 1 “as a whole provide[s] an unconventional combination of ‘receiving a user input indicating a desired

¹ Patent Owner’s arguments made in the Patent Owner Response (Paper 81) regarding 35 U.S.C. § 101 eligibility of claims 5–7 were directed to whether those claims added significantly more to claim 1 rendering them less abstract. PO Resp. 20–21. We considered such arguments and determined, even under Patent Owner’s proposed narrow interpretation of claims 5–7 discussed in our Decision and here, *supra*, that claims 5–7 added nothing to render them less abstract. Dec. 25–26.

price for an order to be placed by the user, the desired price being specified by selection of one of a plurality of locations corresponding to price levels along the price axis’ along with displaying bid and offer indicators corresponding to the same price axis,” and, thus, recites an inventive concept. Req. Reh’g 8 (citing PO Resp. 26). We are not persuaded by this argument. We already considered Patent Owner’s arguments that the claims include an inventive concept, but determined that those arguments were not persuasive. Dec. 26–29. For example, we explained with respect to the quoted language from claim 1:

[T]o the extent that the claims require a GUI, a mere recitation of a GUI does not make the claim patent eligible. *See Affinity Labs*, 838 F.3d at 1257–58, *Ameranth*, 842 F.3d at 1236–1242, *Internet Patent Corp.*, 790 F.3d at 1348–1349. A recitation of a generic GUI merely limits the use of the abstract idea to a particular technological environment. “Limiting the field of use of the abstract idea to a particular existing technological environment does not render any claims less abstract.” *Affinity Labs*, 838 F.3d at 1258 (citing *Alice*, 134 S. Ct. at 2358; *Mayo*, 132 S. Ct. at 1294).

Dec. 27.

In rendering our Decision, we did not focus on individual claim elements and overlook the claimed combination as a whole as Patent Owner asserts. Req. Reh’g 8–9. Rather, we applied the Supreme Court’s guidance that to be patent eligible, a claim to an otherwise abstract idea must recite additional elements that constitute an inventive concept and that one looks to elements of each claim individually and as an ordered combination. Dec. 26 (citing *Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l*, 134 S. Ct. 2347, 2357 (2014))

and *Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.*, 132 S. Ct. 1289, 1297–98 (2012). We considered elements of each claim individually and as an ordered combination. Dec. 26–29. And with respect to considering the claimed combination as a whole, we specifically held that “considering all of the elements *as an ordered combination*, we determine that the combined elements also do not transform the nature of the claims into a patent-eligible application.” *Id.* at 29 (emphasis added). Thus, Patent Owner’s argument is not persuasive.

Patent Owner also seeks rehearing of our decision that claims 5–7 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over TSE², Togher³, Schott⁴, and Cooper⁵. Req. Reh’g 2–8. Essentially, Patent Owner disagrees with our interpretation of claim 5. *Id.* Claim 5 depends directly from claim 1 and recites “displaying an order icon at a location that corresponds to the desired price level along the price axis, the order icon *indicating the user’s order* at the electronic exchange.” We did not adopt Patent Owner’s proposed interpretation such that the phrase means “an icon indicating to the user that the user has an order at a particular level along the price axis, distinct from other orders at the same level.” Dec. 16. Rather, we explained that claim 5 was broad enough to also cover that when an order is placed by a user,

²TOKYO STOCK EXCHANGE OPERATION SYSTEM DIVISION, FUTURES/OPTION PURCHASING SYSTEM TRADING TERMINAL OPERATION GUIDE (1998) (Ex. 1004) (“TSE”).

³ U.S. Patent No. 5,375,055, issued Dec. 20, 1994 (Ex. 1008) (“Togher”).

⁴ U.S. Patent No. 5,619,631, issued Apr. 8, 1997 (Ex. 1009) (“Schott”).

⁵Alan Cooper, ABOUT FACE: THE ESSENTIALS OF USER INTERFACE DESIGN, First Edition (1995) (Ex. 1015) (“Cooper”).

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.