

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 CBM2015-00182
Patent No. 6,772,132

**PETITIONERS' OPPOSITION TO PATENT OWNER'S
MOTION TO SUBMIT SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
AND BRIEFING UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.223(b)**

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. TT could have approached the district court at any time to seek relief from the protective order, but it chose to wait.3

A. TT does not explain why it delayed until June 2016 when it had much of the material since late in 2015.3

B. TT’s ability to get relief from the protective order never depended on Petitioners’ waiver, or the Board granting TT any discovery.5

C. TT should have promptly sought relief from the district court once it knew of a need to use discovery subject to the protective order.....5

II. It is not in the interests of justice to allow TT to submit new arguments and evidence less than three weeks before Petitioners’ Reply is due.7

A. TT fails to establish the relevance of this evidence under the applicable legal standards for patentability.....8

B. Petitioners would be further prejudiced if TT’s motion is granted.14

III. Conclusion15

The Board should deny Trading Technologies International, Inc.'s (TT) motion to submit supplemental information and briefing in this case. (Paper 87.)

TT seeks to introduce over 1,000 pages of additional evidence and 10 pages of new argument to an already enormous record. But TT has not demonstrated why the interests of justice merit a supplementation of its 85 page Patent Owner Response and thousands of pages of evidence submitted in support thereof. Rather, TT expends most of its motion attempting to shift the blame to Petitioners for its own failure to seek appropriate relief under the district court's protective order.

In the district court, the parties agreed long ago in 2011 to the terms of the protective order, and the parties produced confidential discovery in reliance thereon. The terms of that protective order preclude any party—Petitioners and TT—from using confidential information in proceedings before the Office without either the consent of the disclosing party or a further order from the district court. That restriction makes sense because this proceeding concerns different issues and is supposed to be a streamlined, cost-effective procedure with very limited discovery. Because TT has had at least some of the documents it now seeks to submit since 2015, it could have sought relief from the district court sooner but elected to wait until June 13, 2016. TT has nobody but itself to blame for its own delay.

TT also offers no reasonable explanation for its delay. Instead, TT casts blame on Petitioners for not consenting to TT's unrestricted use of their confiden-

tial information. (Paper 87 at 5.) But Petitioners have consented to limited uses of their information, while objecting to TT's demand for a wholesale abrogation of the protective order. For example, Petitioners agreed that TT could submit a subset of confidential documents to the Board so that TT could refer to them when asking for additional discovery. And for purposes of this motion, Petitioners agreed that TT could summarize and refer to Petitioners' confidential information. Petitioners have been reasonable; TT has not.

TT has also not shown that the interests of justice warrant the submission of supplemental information. Among other things, TT is attempting to shift its theory of commercial success from its own product to TS and IBG products. TT acknowledges that its Patent Owner Response does not address whether Matrix and Book-Trader windows embody the challenged claims, promising to cover this issue in supplemental briefing. But Rule 42.223(b) is not a vehicle for changing theories. Even if the Board authorizes TT to file supplemental evidence, TT should not be permitted to argue new theories of patentability midstream.

Finally, TT's request for 10 additional pages of briefing would be unduly prejudicial to Petitioners. Petitioners' Reply is due in 15 business days. The burden of responding to any brief submitted by TT accompanied by these numerous, voluminous exhibits would be a significant hardship. While the number of documents at issue has been narrowed from almost 100 to the present 10, that is still 10 docu-

ments too many two months too late.

I. TT could have approached the district court at any time to seek relief from the protective order, but it chose to wait.

Under Rule 42.223(b), TT bears the burden of establishing that it “reasonably could not have” obtained the information earlier and submitted it with its Patent Owner Response. TT cannot establish that it reasonably could not have gone to the district court for relief from the protective order earlier than it did.

TT has had many of the documents it now seeks to introduce in its possession since 2015. Thus, TT had reason to know that it needed relief from the protective order last year. TT attempts to excuse its delay by accusing Petitioners of obstruction. That characterization is false. TT’s ability to get relief from the protective order never depended on Petitioners’ waiving any objection. Nor did it depend on the Board granting TT any discovery. TT had the obligation to seek relief from the district court once it knew that it wanted to use Petitioners’ confidential information in this proceeding. TT offers no explanation for what it did, if anything, to approach the district court before June, when it filed its emergency motion.

A. TT does not explain why it delayed until June 2016 when it had much of the material since late in 2015.

TT obscures how long it has had many of these documents, claiming that it “did not receive all of the documents, testimony, or authentication of the evidence until the second week of June” and thus could not have submitted it sooner. (Paper

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.