

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

---

Case CBM2015-00179  
Patent 7,533,056

---

**PETITIONERS' REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

***Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"***  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. The '056 patent claims a patent-ineligible abstract idea.....2

    A. Graphically displaying bids and offers to assist traders in placing orders is abstract.....3

    B. The claims of the '056 do not transform the abstract concept into an inventive concept.....8

II. Claim construction.....11

    A. “price axis” .....11

    B. “order icon” .....12

    C. No other terms need to be construed.....12

III. The '056 claims are obvious over the TSE combination. ....12

    A. TSE is a prior art printed publication.....13

        1. Unrebutted evidence establishes that TSE was actually disseminated to the interested public in August 1998. ....13

        2. TSE was otherwise publicly available based on its wide, unrestricted distribution to the interested public. ....16

    B. TT’s attempt to swear behind TSE fails because TT fails to establish conception, diligence, and actual reduction to practice. ....17

        1. TT’s “Trading Game Design” fails to establish a conception because it doesn’t teach “displaying...indicators representing quantity.” .....17

        2. TT fails to establish that the invention was diligently reduced to practice because it fails to account for multiple, significant gaps during the critical period.....18

        3. TT fails to establish actual reduction to practice. ....20

    C. The TSE combination renders claims 1-15 obvious. ....23

1.	TT creates a conventional wisdom straw-man just to knock it down in an attempt to avoid the undisputed teachings of TSE.....	23
2.	TSE teaches or suggests the claimed “order icon” of claims 5-7. ....	24
3.	The combination of TSE, Togher, and Schott teaches or suggests claims 6.....	25
IV.	The ’056 patent claims are obvious over the Silverman combination. ....	26
A.	Silverman teaches or suggests a GUI to a POSA.....	26
B.	Silverman discloses a price axis.....	27
C.	The combination of Silverman, Togher, Cooper, and Hogan discloses an order icon as recited in claims 5-7. ....	28
V.	TT hints at but fails to demonstrate secondary considerations. ....	28
VI.	The ’056 patent is eligible for CBM review.....	29

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

*Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l*,  
134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....1, 3, 7, 8, 9

*Ass’n for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc.*,  
133 S.Ct. 2107 (2013).....10

*BASCOM Global Internet v. AT&T Mobility LLC*,  
Appeal No. 15-1763 (Fed.Cir. June 27, 2016).....5, 9

*Burns v. Curtis*,  
172 F.2d 588 (CCPA 1949) .....19

*CLS Bank Intl. v. Alice Corp*,  
717 F.3d 1269 (Fed.Cir. 2013).....6

*Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc.*,  
848 F.2d 1560 (Fed.Cir. 1988).....16

*Cooper Cameron Corp. v. Kvaerner Oilfield Products, Inc.*,  
291 F.3d 1317 (Fed.Cir. 2002).....14

*Cooper v. Goldfarb*,  
154 F.3d 1321 (Fed.Cir. 1998).....20

*CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.*,  
654 F.3d 1366 (Fed.Cir. 2011).....4, 6

*DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.*,  
773 F.3d 1245 (Fed.Cir. 2014).....5

*Digitech Image Tech. LLC v. Elec. for Imaging, Inc.*,  
758 F.3d 1344 (Fed.Cir. 2014).....10

*Electric Power Group, LLC, v. Alstom S.A.*,  
Appeal No. 2015-1778 (Fed.Cir. Aug. 1, 2016).....4, 6, 10

*Enfish ,LLC v. Microsoft Corp.*,  
822 F.3d 1327 (Fed.Cir. 2016).....3, 5, 6

<i>Gould v. Schawlow</i> , 363 F.2d 908 (CCPA 1966) .....	4, 18
<i>Griffith v. Kanamuru</i> , 816 F.2d 624 (Fed.Cir. 1987).....	18
<i>In re Acad. Sci. Tech. Center</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed.Cir. 2004).....	11
<i>In re Cortright</i> , 165 F.3d 1353 (Fed.Cir. 1999).....	11
<i>In re McIntosh</i> , 230 F.2d 615 (CCPA 1956) .....	19
<i>In re Mulder</i> , 716 F.2d 1542 (Fed.Cir. 1983).....	19
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed.Cir. 2011).....	11
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Capital One Bank (USA)</i> , 792 F.3d 1363 (Fed.Cir. 2015).....	7, 8
<i>Kridl v. McCormick</i> , 105 F.3d 1446 (Fed.Cir. 1997).....	18
<i>KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 127 S.Ct. 1727 (2007).....	2, 26
<i>Kyocera Wireless Corp. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 545 F.3d 1340 (Fed.Cir. 2008).....	16
<i>LendingTree LLC v. Zillow, Inc.</i> , --F.3d-- (Fed.Cir. 2016) .....	5
<i>Microsoft Corporation v. Surfacst, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00292, Paper 23 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 14, 2014).....	18

# 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.