

Paper No. _____
Filed: December 15, 2015

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.;
IBFX, INC.; CQG, INC.; and CQGT, LLC

Petitioners

v.

TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Patent Owner

Case CBM2015-00179
U.S. Patent 7,533,056

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Contents

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT1

II. OVERVIEW OF THE CLAIMED INVENTION.....2

 A. Independent Claim 13

 B. Dependent Claims 5-75

III. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE THE
 ’056 PATENT IS NOT A CBM PATENT.....6

 A. The Statutory Definition of CBM Requires More Than a
 Recitation of Financial Activity or a Financial Purpose8

 1. Petitioners’ Argument That the Legislative History
 Should Be Ignored Is Meritless11

 B. GUI Design Is a Technology, Not a Business Method13

 C. Because the Claims Are Directed to a Combination of GUI
 Features and Functionality Rather than a Method of Doing
 Business, They Do Not Qualify for CBM Review15

 D. Even If the ’056 Patent Were a CBM, Improvements to GUIs
 Necessarily Fall Within the Technological Invention Exception15

 1. Purported Novel and Nonobvious Improvements to GUIs
 Necessarily Claim Novel and Nonobvious Technology.....16

 2. Each of Petitioners’ Arguments That the Claims Do Not
 Recite Novel and Nonobvious Technology Fails to
 Address the Technological Improvement—the Claimed
 Novel and Nonobvious Interaction between GUI
 Elements.....17

 3. Novel and Nonobvious Improvements to GUIs
 Necessarily Claim Technological Solutions to
 Technological Problems.....18

 4. None of Petitioners’ Arguments Explain Why a New
 GUI Design is Not a Technological Solution to a
 Technological Problem19

IV.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT REPRESENTS A MISUSE OF THE CBMR PROCESS	23
A.	The Board Has the Discretionary Power to Deny This Petition	23
B.	Petitioners Misused CBMR By Purposefully Delaying Their Repetition of Arguments	25
1.	Petitioners Present Substantially the Same CBM, § 101, and Prior Art Arguments as TD Ameritrade in CBM2014-00131	25
2.	Petitioners Have Delayed Filing Purposefully As Part of a Coordinated Litigation Strategy	29
V.	THE PETITION FAILS TO SHOW THE '056 PATENT CLAIMS ARE MORE LIKELY THAN NOT INELIGIBLE UNDER § 101.....	31
A.	The '056 Patent Claims Satisfy Prong One of <i>Alice</i>	32
1.	The Claims Are Directed to the Structure and Functionality of a Specific GUI Tool, Not an Abstract Idea	33
2.	The Alleged Abstract Idea Has No Support in § 101 Jurisprudence	37
3.	Even Using Petitioners' Fabricated "Abstract Idea," The '056 Claims Are Not Directed To That Abstract Idea.....	39
4.	It Is Undisputed That The '056 Claims Do Not Preempt The Alleged Abstract Idea, Or Any Abstract Idea	40
5.	The '056 Claims Cannot Be Performed With Pen and Paper or In A User's Mind.....	43
6.	Petitioners' § 101 Arguments Are Further Deficient for the Dependent Claims	44
B.	The '056 Claims Recite an Inventive Concept, Satisfying Prong Two of <i>Alice</i>	46

1.	The '056 Claims' Inventive Concept Improves Technology.....	46
2.	The Claimed Inventive Concept Is “Necessarily Rooted in Computer Technology”.....	48
3.	The Petition Is Fundamentally Flawed Because It Fails to Disprove the PTO’s Original Conclusion Finding an Inventive Concept	49
4.	Petitioners Misconstrue Key Claim Elements As “Routine and Conventional”	51
5.	The Fact That The Claimed Invention May Be Practiced On A Conventional Computer Does Not Preclude Patent Eligibility	55
6.	Petitioners’ Inventive Concept Arguments Are Even Further Deficient With Respect To At Least Dependent Claims 5-7	57
VI.	THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE THE PRIOR ART GROUNDS BECAUSE PETITIONERS’ ARGUMENTS FAIL FOR MULTIPLE INDEPENDENT REASONS	57
A.	The TSE Grounds Should Not Be Instituted Because Petitioners Fail to Establish That TSE Is Prior Art	58
1.	Petitioners Present No Evidence Showing TSE Was “Publically Accessible”	58
2.	Mr. Kawashima’s Testimony—Petitioners’ Only “Evidence”—is Uncorroborated and Biased	61
3.	A Jury Has Already Concluded That TSE Is Not Prior Art, Using the Same Evidence—Mr. Kawashima’s Testimony.....	62
4.	The Board Should Deny the TSE Grounds on Claims 5-7 Because TSE Does Not Disclose or Suggest the Claimed “order icon”	62

B.	The Board Should Deny the Silverman-based Grounds Because Silverman Does Not Teach a GUI or the Claimed Price Axis.....	64
1.	Figures 4 and 5 of Silverman do not show a display or a GUI.....	64
2.	Even if improperly read as teaching a GUI, Silverman does not disclose the claimed “price axis”	67
C.	Silverman Does Not Disclose or Teach the Claimed “Order Icon”; Therefore, the Board Should Deny the Silverman-based Grounds For Claims 5-7	71
D.	Both Proposed Obviousness Grounds Are the Same as, or Merely Cumulative of, Art and Arguments Already Considered by the Office, and Petitioners Do Not Attempt to Prove Otherwise.....	72
VII.	THE THRESHOLD JURISDICTIONAL CBM ISSUE IMPACTS MANY PATENTS—WARRANTING AN EXPANDED PANEL.....	75
A.	The Jurisdictional Dispute Relates to All GUI Improvement Patents.....	75
B.	The CBM Issue Warrants Consideration By an Expanded Panel	76
VIII.	ALL PETITIONS ON PATENTS IN THE RELATED LITIGATIONS SHOULD BE DISMISSED.....	77
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	78

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.