

Paper No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Filed: March 6, 2015

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

TD AMERITRADE HOLDING CORPORATION, TD AMERITRADE, INC.,  
and TD AMERITRADE ONLINE HOLDINGS CORP.  
Petitioners

v.

TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case CBM2014-00131  
Patent 7,533,056

---

**Patent Owner's Response**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. THE CLAIMS ARE DIRECTED TO STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER IN SATISFACTION OF 35 U.S.C. § 101. .... 2

A. The Claims Are Directed To Patentable Technology—A GUI Tool..... 2

1. The Patented Invention Solved Technical Problems with Prior GUIs. .... 3

    a) The Problem with Conventional Trading GUIs: Failed to Effectively Visualize Information. .... 3

    b) The Claimed Solution to the Problem: A New GUI That Improved Speed and Accuracy..... 4

2. The Claimed Features and Functionality of the Improved GUI Are An Inventive Concept, Not Conventional..... 7

    a) The Claimed GUI Features Were the Inventive Contribution..... 9

3. A New GUI Is New Technology. .... 10

B. The Current 101 Framework. .... 11

C. The Claims Are Patent Eligible Because There Is No Preemption Concern. .... 13

    1. The Claims Fail to Impermissibly Preempt Because There Is Evidence that Other Ways to Practice the Abstract Idea Using a Computer Exist..... 13

        1. Non-Infringing TD Product that Allows Presenting Graphed Data to a Trader and Accepting His or Her Orders. .... 14

        2. Non-Infringing TT Product that Presents Graphed Data to A Trader and Accepts His or Her Orders..... 16

- D. Under a Proper Application of the *Alice* Test, the Claims are Patent-Eligible under 35 U.S.C. 101. ....18
  - 1. The Claims Are Not Directed To the Abstract Idea Adopted In the Institution Decision.....18
  - 2. The Claims Recite An Inventive Concept Other Than An Abstract Idea.....20
  - 3. New Case Law Confirms That the Claims are Patent Eligible. ....22
  
- III. THE PRIOR ART GROUND SHOULD BE DISMISSED BECAUSE THE TSE TRANSLATION FILED BY TD (EXHIBIT 1004) SHOULD BE EXCLUDED OR GIVEN NO WEIGHT. ....25
  - A. The TSE Translation in Exhibit 1004 Is Unreliable.....26
  - B. At Least Pages 101-140 Should Be Excluded For Failing to Comply With 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(b).....28
  - C. TD Failed to Show That the TSE Document Is Prior Art. ....32
  - D. Because the TSE Translation Should be Excluded or Given No Weight, the Board Should Dismiss the Prior Art Ground and Hold that the '056 Patent Is Not Unpatentable Based on the Instituted Ground. ....34
  
- IV. THE COMBINATION OF TSE, TOGHER, AND SCHOTT CANNOT RENDER CLAIMS 1-15 OBVIOUS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103.....36
  - A. *Togher* Does Not Disclose Or Suggest “receiving a user input indicating a default quantity,” As Recited In Claim 1. ....36
  - B. It Would Not Have Been Obvious To Modify *Togher* to Use “a user’s last-entered quantity.” .....40
    - 1. Retaining a User’s Last-Entered Quantity in the Dialog (Fig. 2) Does Not Cure the Deficiency of *Togher*. ....40
    - 2. A POSITA Would Not Modify *Togher* to Use a “user’s last-entered quantity” as *Togher*’s Normal Trade Size. ....41

C. TSE Does Not Disclose or Suggest “an order icon” as Recited in Claim 5.....43

V. THE PTAB SHOULD DISMISS THE PROCEEDING BECAUSE IT LACKS JURISDICTION.....45

A. The Decision Misapplied the Technological Invention Test.....49

B. The Record Supports Finding that the Claims Recite Novel and Non-Obvious Technology. ....49

C. The Decision Improperly Failed to Address Whether the Claims Solve a Technical Problem Using a Technical Solution. ....51

D. The Panel Improperly Concluded That the Claims Lack Specific Hardware or Software. ....52

VI. CONCLUSION.....54

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Federal Cases</b>	
<i>A.R.M., Inc. v. Cottingham Agencies Ltd.</i> , IPR2014-00671, Paper 10 (Oct. 3, 2014) .....	33
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. v. CLS Bank Int'l</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Ass'n for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc.</i> , 133 S. Ct. 2107 (2013) .....	13
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 130 S. Ct. 3218 (2010) .....	13
<i>Bruckelmyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc.</i> , 453 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	34
<i>DDR Holdings v. Hotels.com, L.P.</i> , 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Diamond v. Chakrabarty</i> , 447 U.S. 303 (1980) .....	11
<i>Diamond v. Diehr</i> , 450 U.S. 175 (1981) .....	50
<i>Funk Bros. Seed Co. v. Kalo Inoculant Co.</i> , 333 U.S. 127 (1948) .....	12
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Mfrs. &amp; Traders Trust Co.</i> , 2014 WL 7215193 (D. Del. Dec. 18, 2014) .....	23
<i>Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs.</i> , 132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012) .....	12, 13, 18, 20
<i>McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.</i> , 262 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	41
<i>MCM Portfolio LLC v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , No. 15-1091 (Fed. Cir.) .....	46

# 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.