

Paper No. ____
Filed: December 30, 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.;
and IBFX, INC.

Petitioners

v.

TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Patent Owner

Case CBM2015-00181
U.S. Patent 7,676,411

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Table of Contents

- I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT1
- II. THE CLAIMED INVENTION IS A GUI IMPROVEMENT3
- III. THE '411 PATENT IS NOT A CBM PATENT8
 - A. The Statutory Definition of CBM Requires More Than a Recitation of Financial Activity or a Financial Purpose9
 - 1. The Legislative History Should Not Be Ignored11
 - 2. GUI Design Is a Technology, Not a Business Method.....13
 - 3. The Claims Do No Qualify for CBMR because they are directed to a Combination of GUI Features/Functionality, Not a Business Method14
 - B. Even If the '411 Patent Were a CBM, the Claimed GUI Improvements Fall within the Technological Invention Exception15
 - 1. Purported Novel and Nonobvious Improvements to GUIs Necessarily Claim Novel and Nonobvious Technology16
 - 2. Petitioners' Arguments That the Claims Do Not Recite Novel and Nonobvious Technology Fail to Address the Technological Improvement—the Claimed Novel/Nonobvious GUI Elements17
 - 3. Novel and Nonobvious Improvements to GUIs Necessarily Claim Technological Solutions to Technological Problems.....18
 - 4. Petitioners Fail to Explain Why the Claimed GUI Improvement is Not a Technological Solution to a Technological Problem19
- IV. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT REPRESENTS A MISUSE OF THE CBMR PROCESS20
 - A. The Board Has the Discretionary Power to Deny This Petition21

B.	Petitioners Misuse CBMR by Purposefully Delaying Their Repetition of Arguments	22
1.	Petitioners Present Substantially the Same CBM, § 101, and Prior Art Arguments as TD Ameritrade in CBM2014-00133.....	23
2.	Petitioners Purposefully Delayed This Petition As Part of a Coordinated Litigation Strategy	25
V.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C § 322(A)(2) BECAUSE PETITIONERS FAIL TO SHOW CQG IS NOT AN RPI, DESPITE ADMITTED COORDINATION	27
VI.	PETITIONERS FAIL TO SHOW MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT THE '411 PATENT CLAIMS ARE INELIGIBLE UNDER § 101	30
A.	Petitioners Improperly Dismiss a District Court Decision Finding the '132/'304 Claims Eligible under 35 U.S.C. § 101.....	31
1.	Petitioners Make Similar Errors to CQG's when Applying § 101 to Conclude the '411 Patent Claims an Abstract Idea	33
2.	Petitioners Make Similar Errors to CQG's when Applying § 101 to Conclude the '411 Claims Lack an Inventive Concept	35
3.	Petitioners Ignore the Claim Language—Just Like CQG	36
B.	Petitioners Fail To Show the Claims Are Directed to an Abstract Idea.....	39
1.	The Alleged Abstract Idea Has Been Improperly Crafted to Ignore Structural and Functional Elements of a GUI Tool	39
2.	A User Cannot Perform the Claim with Pen and Paper or Mentally	42
C.	The Claims Recite an Inventive Concept, Satisfying <i>Alice</i> Prong Two	43

1.	The Claims Recite “an Inventive Concept Necessarily Rooted in Computer Technology,” Similar to the ‘132/’304 Claims.....	43
2.	That The Claimed Invention May Be Practiced On Conventional Computer Hardware Does Not Preclude Patent Eligibility	46
3.	35 U.S.C. § 101 is Distinct From 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103.....	47
4.	Petitioners Misconstrue Key Claim Elements As “Insignificant Post Solution Activity” or “Data Gathering”	49
D.	Petitioners’ Arguments Fail to Consider the PTO’s Most Recent Examination Guidance	51
E.	Claims 26-28 Are Not Outside the Four Permissible Statutory Classes of Patentable Subject Matter	53
VII.	TSE IS NOT PRIOR ART AND THE TRANSLATION OMITTS A DISPOSITIVE TRANSLATOR’S NOTE	54
A.	The TSE Grounds Should Not Be Instituted Because Petitioners Fail to Establish That TSE Is Prior Art	54
1.	Petitioners Lack Evidence Establishing TSE’s “Public Accessibility”	54
2.	Mr. Kawashima’s Testimony—Petitioners’ Only “Evidence”—is Not Only Insufficient but Also Biased and Uncorroborated.....	57
3.	A Jury Reviewing the Same Evidence Already Concluded That TSE Is Not Prior Art—Petitioners Provide Nothing More	59
B.	Petitioners Omit a Material Part of the TSE Translation That Defeats Petitioners’ Allegation that TSE Teaches the Claimed Movement of Indicators Relative to The Price Axis.....	59

VIII.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE THE PROPOSED COMBINATIONS WERE PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED AND PETITIONERS FAIL TO EXPLAIN WHY THE PTO ERRED IN ALLOWING THE CLAIMS	62
A.	Silverman, Gutterman, TSE, and Aurora (Belden) Were Considered and Determined by the Examiner to Not Be the Closest Art in the '411 Prosecution or the Related Parent Patent.....	64
B.	Two Parent Reexaminations Previously Considered TSE, Silverman, Gutterman, and Belden	66
C.	In CBM2014-00133, the Board Found the Claims Patentable Over Substantially the Same Combinations of Silverman, Gutterman, Togher, and TSE	68
D.	Petitioners' Grounds are Based on Previously-Considered, Second-Tier References Over Which the Claims Were Repeatedly Allowed and Confirmed and Should be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	69
E.	Petitioners Should Not Be Allowed to Gap Fill a Prior Denial That They Could Have Joined But Did Not.....	73
IX.	PETITIONERS' PRIOR ART GROUNDS FAIL FOR MULTIPLE INDEPENDENT REASONS, EVEN IF THE BOARD CONSIDERS THE MERITS	75
A.	Silverman and Gutterman Do Not Teach the Relative Movement Limitations	75
B.	TSE Fails to Show the Movement of Indicators Relative to a Price Axis	76
C.	Belden Fails to Cure the Reasons for Patentability over TSE, Silverman, Gutterman, and Togher	77
X.	THE THRESHOLD JURISDICTIONAL CBM ISSUE IMPACTS MANY PATENTS—WARRANTING AN EXPANDED PANEL.....	80
XI.	CONCLUSION.....	80

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.