

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

CBM2015–00181
Patent 7,676,411

PETITIONERS' MOTION TO EXCLUDE

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.	INTRODUCTION.....	2
II.	ARGUMENT	4
A.	The <i>eSpeed/CQG</i> Transcripts	4
B.	The 32 Electronic Trader Declarants	5
C.	Third Party Emails	7
D.	Brumfield Sketch and Animations.....	9
E.	<i>eSpeed/CQG</i> Jury Verdict Forms & Docket Entry.....	10
F.	Confidential Declaration of Christopher Thomas.....	12
III.	CONCLUSION	16

I. INTRODUCTION

TT's Patent Owner Response ("TT's POR") dumps into the record and buries the Board with hundreds of pages of documents without regard to their admissibility. But this proceeding is governed by the Federal Rules of Evidence and those Rules set fair boundaries on the admissibility of evidence. TT's ignores those rules.

TT knows that its evidence suffers from significant admissibility problems. Indeed, it preemptively sought a blanket waiver from the Board so that TT could rely on a "large volume of documents produced in previous district court cases" without regard to the Board's Rules and Federal Rules of Evidence 802 and 901. (*See* Paper 38, 2–3 in CBM2015-00182.) The Board denied TT's request. *See id.* Having been denied permission to do so, TT proceeded to file a tremendous number of documents from the district court cases without regard to the Board's order and the rules governing this proceeding. That evidence should be stricken.

A significant number of the documents submitted by TT violate the prohibition on hearsay. *See* FRE 802. Absent one of the well-established exceptions to hearsay, such as the unavailability of a declarant, hearsay is inadmissible. TT disregards this Rule entirely by introducing hearsay statements from dozens of individuals in an effort to defend the patentability of its claims.

A significant number of TT's documents also fail to meet the basic requirements of authenticity required by Federal Rule of Evidence 901. Despite Petitioners' timely objection, TT offered no competent evidence that cures this objection leaving the Board and Petitioners with no basis to gauge whether the documents are genuine.

TT's evidence also ignores the proper boundaries of expert witness testimony in contravention of Federal Rule of Evidence 702. Rule 702 permits an expert to offer opinions based on his specialized knowledge in the field. But significant portions of Mr. Thomas' declaration are not opinions of Mr. Thomas. Rather, Mr. Thomas purports to offer factual testimony that is not based on his own perception but is instead based upon his review of district court depositions and trial transcripts. That underlying evidence should not be admitted in this proceeding as TT may not use Mr. Thomas "simply as a conduit for introducing hearsay under the guise that the testifying expert used the hearsay as the basis of his testimony." *Marvel Characters, Inc. v. Kirby*, 726 F.3d 119, 136 (2d Cir. 2013) (citation omitted). This testimony is improper and, therefore, should be excluded. *See, e.g., United States v. Dukagjini*, 326 F.3d 45, 58 (2d Cir. 2003).

Accordingly, Petitioners file this motion pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c) and in accordance with the Board's May 12, 2016 Order modifying Due Date 4. (Paper 38 at 8.)

II. ARGUMENT

A. The *eSpeed/CQG* Transcripts: Exhibits 2033, 2211, 2220, 2222, 2224, 2225, 2228, 2232, 2247, 2251, 2273–2276, 2286–2288, and 2292–2296

The Board should exclude Exhibits 2033, 2211, 2220, 2222, 2224, 2225, 2228, 2232, 2247, 2251, 2273–2276, 2286–2288, 2292–2296 (“*eSpeed/CQG* Transcripts”) because they are hearsay to which no valid exception applies. Most of these exhibits are cited in TT’s Response. (See Paper 76 at 12, 19, 31, 32, 36, 37, 39–44, 46, 48–51, 55, and 68; see also Paper 79 (providing limited citations to the record for TT exhibits).) In addition, as discussed further in section II.E *infra*, TT’s technical expert Mr. Thomas relies upon these transcripts to support the assertions in his declaration (Ex. 2169) regarding, for example, the background of the claimed invention and alleged secondary considerations, including “commercial success,” “initial skepticism followed by acceptance,” “widespread copying,” “failure of others,” “praise and accolades,” and “unexpected results.” Petitioners timely objected to each of the *eSpeed/CQG* Transcripts on the basis of, among other things, hearsay. See Paper 29 at 20; Paper 78 at 5–13.

The *eSpeed/CQG* Transcripts purport to be *excerpts* of a trial or deposition transcript from district court proceedings involving third parties. The *eSpeed/CQG* Transcripts are hearsay as none were made while testifying for the current proceeding and all are being offered for the truth of the matters asserted. FRE 801. None of these statements fall under any proper hearsay exception. For example, TT

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.