

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

_____)	
TRADING TECHNOLOGIES)	Case No. 10 C 715
INTERNATIONAL, INC.)	(Consolidated with:
)	10 C 716, 10 C 718,
Plaintiff,)	10 C 720, 10 C 721,
)	10 C 726, 10 C 882,
v.)	10 C 883, 10 C 884,
)	10 C 885, 10 C 929,
BCG PARTNERS, INC.)	10 C 931)
)	
Defendant.)	Judge Virginia M. Kendall
_____)	

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF THE TD AMERITRADE DEFENDANTS'
MOTION TO STAY PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT TO SECTION 18(b)
OF THE AMERICA INVENTS ACT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	1
A. Procedural Posture	1
B. Covered Business Method Patent Review	2
C. TD Ameritrade’s Petitions	4
III. LEGAL STANDARD.....	5
IV. ALL FOUR STATUTORY FACTORS STRONGLY FAVOR A STAY	7
A. CBM Review Will Greatly Simplify—And Possibly Even Eliminate—The Patents and Issues for Trial.	7
B. The Early Stage of Litigation Favors a Stay	10
C. A Stay Will Not Unduly Prejudice Trading Technologies or Present a Clear Tactical Advantage to Defendants	11
D. A Stay Will Reduce the Burden on the Parties and the Court	14
V. CONCLUSION.....	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

Bosch Healthcare Sys., Inc. v. ExpressMD Solutions, LLC, No. C 12-00068, 2013 WL 752474 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 27, 2013)10

Capital Dynamics AG v. Cambridge Assoc., LLC, No. 13 Civ. 7766, 2014 WL 1694710 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 1, 2014).....6, 10

Checkfree Corp. v. Metavante Corp., No. 3:12-cv-15-J-34JBT, 2014 WL 466023 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 17, 2014).....6, 10, 13

Chicago Mercantile Exchange, Inc. v. 5th Market, Inc., Case CBM2014-00114 (PTAB Apr. 15, 2014)7

Credit Acceptance Corp. v. Westlake Servs., LLC, No. CV 13-01523, 2013 WL 7144391 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 30, 2013)7, 8

CVI/Beta Ventures, Inc. v. Tura LP, 112 F.3d 1146 (Fed. Cir. 1997)8

Genzyme Corp. v. Cobrek Pharms., Inc., No. 10-CV-00112, 2011 WL 686807 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 17, 2011).....12, 13

Gould v. Control Laser Corp., 705 F.2d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....9

In re Ameranth Patent Litig. Cases, No. 11cv1810, 2013 WL 7144380 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 26, 2013)6

Intertainer, Inc. v. Hulu, LLC, No. CV 13-05499-CJC, 2014 WL 466034 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 24, 2014)6, 14

JAB Distribs., LLC v. London Luxury, LLC, No. 09 C 5831, 2010 WL 1882010 (N.D. Ill. May 11, 2010)8, 13, 14

Market-Alerts Pty. Ltd. v. Bloomberg Finance L.P., 922 F. Supp. 2d 486 (D. Del. 2013)6, 7, 10, 13

Microsoft Corp. v. Multi-Tech Sys., Inc., 357 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....9

Pegasus Dev. Corp. v. Directv, Inc., No. Civ.A. 00-1020-GMS, 2003 WL 21105073 (D. Del. May 14, 2003).....10

Pi-Net Int’l Inc. v. Citizens Fin. Grp. Inc., No. 12-355-RGA, 2013 WL 6094223 (D. Del. June 21, 2013).....7

Progressive Cas. Ins. Co. v. Safeco Ins. Co., Nos. 1:10CV01370, 1:11CV00082, 1:12CV01068, 1:12CV01070, 2013 WL 1662952 (N.D. Ohio Apr. 17, 2013)7

Sightsound Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc., No. 11-1292, 2013 WL 2457284 (W.D. Pa. June 6, 2013).....7, 12

Transunion Intelligence LLC v. Search Am., Inc., No. 11-CV-1075, 2014 WL 753781 (D. Minn. Feb. 26, 2014)6, 10

Unwired Planet LLC v. Google Inc., No. 3:12-cv-00504-MMD-VPC, 2014 WL 301002 (D. Nev. Jan. 27, 2014).....6

Versata Software, Inc. v. Dorado Software, Inc., No. 2:13-cv-00920-MCE-DAD, 2014 WL 1330652 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 28, 2014)6

Zillow, Inc. v. Trulia, Inc., No. C12-1549JLR, 2013 WL 5530573 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 7, 2013)7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13

STATUTES

35 C.F.R. § 42.301(a).....3

35 U.S.C. § 101.....4

35 U.S.C. § 102.....4

35 U.S.C. § 103.....4

35 U.S.C. § 112.....4

35 U.S.C. § 318(c)8

AIA § 183, 4

AIA § 18(a)(1)(B).....3

AIA § 18(a)(1)(D).....4

AIA § 18(b).....4, 5, 7, 14

AIA § 18(b)(1)6

AIA § 18(b)(2)6

AIA § 18(d)(1)3

AIA § 324

RULES

77 Fed. Reg. 48734 (Aug. 14, 2012).....4

77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48757 (Aug. 14, 2012).....3, 5

Fed. R. Civ. P. 1111

Fed. R. Civ. P. 3711

MISCELLANEOUS

H.R. REP. No. 112-98, pt. 1 (2011).....3
157 Cong. Rec. S1053 (daily ed. Mar. 1, 2011)3, 4
157 Cong. Rec. S1363 (daily ed. Mar. 8, 2011)4
157 Cong. Rec. S1363-64 (daily ed. Mar. 8, 2011)14
157 Cong. Rec. S1364 (daily ed. Mar. 8, 2011)6
157 Cong. Rec. S1379 (daily ed. Mar. 8, 2011)6

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.