

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

- - -
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.,
Petitioners,
v.
TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
Patent Owner.

- - -
CBM2015-00161 (Patent No. 6,766,304 B2)
CBM2015-00172 (Patent No. 7,783,556)
CBM2015-00179 (Patent No. 7,533,056 B2)
CBM2015-00181 (Patent No. 7,676,411 B2)
CBM2015-00182 (Patent No. 6,772,132 B1)

- - -
July 15, 2016 - 9:00 a.m.

- - -
TELECONFERENCE IN THE ABOVE MATTER
BEFORE: JEREMY M. PLENZLER
MEREDITH C. PETRAVICK
SALLY C. MEDLEY
Administrative Patent Judges

- - -
VERITEXT NATIONAL COURT REPORTING COMPANY
MID-ATLANTIC REGION
1250 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1201
Washington, DC 20005



1 APPEARANCES :

2 STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX, P.L.L.C.

3 BY: ROBERT E. SOKOHL, ESQUIRE

LORI A. GORDON, ESQUIRE

4 RICHARD M. BEMBEN, ESQUIRE

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.

5 Washington, D.C. 20005-3934

202-371-2600

6 rsokohl-ptab@skgf.com

lgordon-ptab@skgf.com

7 rbemben-ptab@skgf.com

and

8 FISH & RICHARDSON

9 BY: ADAM J. KESSEL, ESQUIRE

One Marina Park Drive

Boston, MA 02210-1878

10 617-368-2180

kessel@fr.com

11 Representing the Petitioners

12 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT &

13 DUNNER, LLP

14 BY: RACHEL L. EMSLEY, ESQUIRE

Two Seaport Lane

Boston, MA 02210-2001

15 617-646-1600

rachel.emsley@finnegan.com

and

16 BY: ERIKA HARMON ARNER, ESQUIRE

17 Two Freedom Square

11955 Freedom Drive

18 Reston, VA 20190-5675

571-203-2754

19 erika.arners@finnegan.com

Representing the Patent Owner

20
21 - - -
22
23
24
25

1 JUDGE PLENZLER: Good morning. This
2 is Judge Plenzler at the Patent Trial and Appeal
3 Board. This is the conference call for
4 CBM2015-00161, '172, '179, '181, and '182. I'm
5 joined on the call by Judges Medley and Petravick.

6 Do we have someone on the call for
7 Petitioner?

8 MR. SOKOHL: Yes, Your Honor. This
9 is Rob Sokohl and with me today is Lori Gordon,
10 Richard Bemben, and Adam Kessel.

11 JUDGE PLENZLER: All right. Thank
12 you.

13 And for Patent Owner?

14 MS. EMSLEY: For Patent Owner, this
15 is Rachel Emsley, and with me on the call is Erica
16 Arner.

17 JUDGE PLENZLER: All right. Thank
18 you.

19 And is there a court reporter?

20 THE COURT REPORTER: There is, Your
21 Honor.

22 JUDGE PLENZLER: All right.

23 And I assume that's Patent Owner's
24 court reporter?

25 MS. EMSLEY: That's correct.

1 JUDGE PLENZLER: All right. And I'm
2 sure by now you're familiar with the procedure for
3 getting that in the record, so I won't go over the
4 details.

5 Patent Owner requested this call, it
6 looks like, to discuss a request to file an offer of
7 proof, so we're going to hear from them first.

8 But before we do, I would just like a
9 little background information, just to clarify the
10 whole procedure for how this all came about,
11 primarily with respect to the request and the grant
12 of relief from the District Court for the protective
13 order.

14 If you could just explain, just very
15 briefly, the timeline as far as, you know, when you
16 received the information that the District Court has
17 now given you relief to use, when you requested
18 permission to use it, and then when the District
19 Court ultimately granted that relief, that would be
20 appreciated.

21 MS. EMSLEY: Yes, Your Honor. This
22 is Rachel Emsley. I need to look at the exact
23 filings in the District Court. But when the Board
24 denied TT's motion for additional discovery, the
25 Board noted that the District Court could authorize

1 the Patent Owner to use the District Court discovery
2 in these proceedings, that discovery being subject
3 to the District Court's protective order, as you
4 know.

5 So following that denial of
6 additional discovery, Trading Technologies filed a
7 motion with the District Court for relief from the
8 protective order so that we could submit the
9 documents themselves in an offer of proof, getting
10 relief from the protective order.

11 So on July 13th the District Court
12 entered an order that adopts the District Court's
13 ruling as stated in open court in a hearing on
14 July 7th. So both parties were represented at that
15 hearing.

16 The District Court therefore granted
17 permission for TT to submit the documents and
18 transcripts identified in the motion for additional
19 discovery, and that's the same discovery that the
20 District Court previously granted despite the stay
21 because of its potential relevance to this PTAB
22 proceeding. And this was specific for the offer of
23 proof in the PTAB.

24 So I'm not sure exactly the date that
25 that was filed. I need to look back at that for a

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.