

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.,
Petitioner,

v.

TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case CBM2015-00182
Patent 6,772,132 B1

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, MEREDITH C. PETRAVICK, and
JEREMY M. PLENZLER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PLENZLER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Institution of Covered Business Method Patent Review
37 C.F.R. § 42.208

INTRODUCTION

A. Background

IBG LLC, TradeStation Group, Inc., TradeStation Securities, Inc., TradeStation Technologies, Inc., and IBFX, INC. (collectively, “Petitioner”) filed a Petition on September 11, 2015 requesting covered business method patent review of claims 1–56 (the “challenged claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 6,772,132 B1 (Ex. 1001, “the ’132 patent”). Paper 7 (“Pet.”). On December 21, 2015, Trading Technologies International, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 15 (“Prelim. Resp.”).

We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 324, which provides that a covered business method patent review may not be instituted “unless . . . it is more likely than not that at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition is unpatentable.”

Upon consideration of the Petition and Preliminary Response, we determine that Petitioner has demonstrated that it is more likely than not that the challenged claims are unpatentable. Accordingly, we institute a covered business method review of claims 1–56 of the ’132 patent.

B. Expanded Panel Request

Patent Owner suggests that the decision on institution be made by an expanded panel of administrative patent judges. Prelim. Resp. 77–78. Discretion to expand a panel rests with the Chief Judge, who, on behalf of the Director, may act to expand a panel on a suggestion from a judge or panel. *AOL Inc. v. Coho Licensing LLC*, Case IPR2014-00771, slip op. at 2 (PTAB Mar. 24, 2015) (Paper 12) (informative). Patent Owner’s suggestion was considered by the Acting Chief Administrative Patent Judge, who declined to expand the panel.

C. Related Proceedings

The parties indicate that the '132 patent is the subject of numerous related U.S. district court proceedings. Pet. 2; Paper 10, 2–6.

The '132 patent was the subject of petitions for covered business method patent review in *TD Ameritrade Holding Corp. v. Trading Technologies International, Inc.*, CBM2014-00135 (PTAB) and *CQG, Inc. v. Trading Technologies International, Inc.*, CBM2015-00058 (PTAB). Trial was instituted, but later terminated, for CBM2014-00135. Institution was denied for CBM2015-0058.

Numerous patents are related to the '132 patent and the related patents are or were the subject of numerous petitions for covered business method patent review and reexamination proceedings.

D. Asserted Grounds

Petitioner contends that the challenged claims are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 103 based on the following grounds (Pet. 14–80).

References	Basis	Claims Challenged
N/A	§ 101	1–56
Silverman ¹ , Gutterman ² , and Belden ³	§ 103	1–3, 5–10, 13–16, 18–23, 25–33, 35–43, and 45–56
Silverman, Gutterman, Belden, and May ⁴	§ 103	4, 11, and 17
Silverman, Gutterman, Belden, and Paal ⁵	§ 103	23, 34, and 44

¹ U.S. Pat. No. 5,077,665, iss. Dec. 31, 1991 (Ex. 1010, “Silverman”).

² U.S. Pat. No. 5,297,031, iss. Mar. 22, 1994 (Ex. 1011, “Gutterman”).

³ PCT Pub. No. WO 90/11571, pub. Oct. 4, 1990 (Ex. 1012, “Belden”).

⁴ CA 2 305 736 A1, pub. Apr. 22, 1999 (Ex. 1013, “May”).

⁵ U.S. Pat. No. 5,263,134, iss. Nov. 16, 1993 (Ex. 1014, “Paal”).

References	Basis	Claims Challenged
TSE ⁶ and Belden	§ 103	1–3, 7–10, 14–16, 20–28, 30–38, 40–48, and 50–56
TSE, Belden, and May	§ 103	4, 11, and 17
TSE, Belden, and Gutterman	§ 103	5, 6, 12, 13, 18, 19, 29, 39, and 49

Petitioner provides testimony from David Rho (Ex. 1006; “the Rho Declaration) and Kendyl A. Román (Ex. 1007; “the Román Declaration”) to support its challenges.

E. The '132 Patent

The '132 patent is titled “Click Based Trading with Intuitive Grid Display of Market Depth.” Ex. 1001, (54). The '132 patent describes a display, named the “Mercury” display, and method of using the display to trade a commodity. *Id.* at Abstract, 3:5–10. The '132 patent explains that the Mercury display is a graphic user interface (“GUI”) that dynamically displays the market depth of a commodity traded in a market and allows a trader to place an order efficiently. *Id.* at 3:11–24. The Mercury display is depicted in Figure 3, which is reproduced below.

⁶ Tokyo Stock Exchange Operation System Division, Futures/Option Purchasing System Trading Terminal Operation Guide (1998) (Ex. 1016). Citations to this reference refer to its English translation (Ex. 1017).

FIG. 3

	E/W	10:48:44	BidQ	AskQ	Prc	LTQ
1009	L	3		104	99	
1010	R	5		24	98	
1011		720		33	97	
1012	X	10		115	96	
1013		0		32	95	
1014		10 1H		27	94	
		50 3H		63	93	
1007	S 0 W 24	1K 5H		45	92	
	S 0 W 7	CLR		28	91	
1015	X	10		20	90	10
1016		17		18	89	
1008	B 0 W 15	CXL		97	88	
	B 0 W 13	+ -		30	87	
1017		NET 0		43	86	
1018	B 0 W 17	NET REAL		110	85	
1019				23	84	
				31	83	
1021				125	82	
				21	81	

Figure 3 of the '132 patent illustrates an example of the Mercury display with example values for trading a commodity including prices, bid and ask quantities relative to price, and trade quantities.

The Mercury display includes a plurality of columns. Column 1005 is a static price axis, which includes a plurality of price values for the commodity. *See id.* at 7:36–48. The '132 patent explains that “[t]he column does not list the whole prices (e.g. 95.89), but rather, just the last two digits (e.g. 89).” *Id.* at 7:38–40. Columns 1003 and 1004 are aligned with the static price axis and dynamically display bid and ask quantities, respectively, for the corresponding price values of the static price axis. *See id.* at 7:35–51. The '132 patent explains that “[t]he exchange sends the price, order and fill information to each trader on the exchange” and that “[t]he physical

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.