

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

IBG LLC, INTERACTIVE BROKERS LLC,
TRADSTATION GROUP INC., and
TRADESTATION SECURITIES, INC.
Petitioners

v.

TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case CBM2016-00032
Patent 7,212,999 B2

PETITIONERS' REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-145

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....1

II. The '999 claims vs. the “conventional” Figure 2-type GUI.....1

III. The '999 patent claims a patent-ineligible abstract idea.4

 A. Collecting and displaying market information so that a user (i.e., a trader) can place an order is an abstract idea.5

 1. Recent Federal Circuit decisions confirm that the '999 claims are ineligible.9

 2. Petitioners are not required to prove that the claims preempt the abstract idea.....14

 B. The '999 claims lack an inventive concept.15

 C. Claim 35 is not patent-eligible because it covers signals.....18

IV. *CQG* does not control this CBM.18

 A. The '999 patent claims were not at issue in *CQG* and cannot be affected by its holding.19

 B. The PTO is not bound by the court’s denial of judgment as a matter of law based on a record devoid of evidence.20

 C. The CBMs’ records differ from the district court’s.21

 D. *CQG*’s abstract idea is different than those advanced in the CBMs...21

 E. The Board applies the preponderance of the evidence standard; Petitioners’ record satisfies this standard.22

V. The '999 patent is CBM eligible.22

VI. Thomas is not an objective expert; he is TT’s paid advocate.24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC v. DIRECTV, LLC,
2016 WL 5335501 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 12, 13

Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l,
134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014)..... passim

Amdocs v. Openet Telecom, Inc.,
Appeal No. 2015-1180 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 1, 2016)..... 17, 18

Apple, Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.,
Appeal Nos. 2015-1703, 2015-1704 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 29, 2016) 7, 9, 10, 23

Ariosa Diags. v. Sequenom, Inc.,
778 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2015)14

Ass’n for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc.,
133 S.Ct. 2107 (2013)17

Ballard Med. Prods. v. Wright,
821 F.2d 642 (Fed. Cir. 1987)20

DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.,
773 F.3d 1245 (Fed.Cir. 2014)10

Electric Power Group, LLC, v. Alstom S.A.,
830 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2016) passim

Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.,
822 F.3d 1327 (Fed.Cir. 2016) 11, 12

Ex parte Mewherter,
Appeal No. 2012-7692 (PTAB May 8, 2013)18

In re Trans Tex. Holdings Corp.,
498 F.3d 1290 (Fed.Cir. 2007)19

Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Capital One Bank (USA),
792 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 13, 14

Interthinx, Inc. v. Corelogic Solutions, LLC,
CBM2012-00007 (PTAB Jan. 30, 2014).....19

LendingTree LLC v. Zillow, Inc.,
Appeal Nos. 2014-1435, 2014-1531, 2015-1186 (Fed. Cir. July 25, 2016)6

McRO, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games America, Inc.
837 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2016)12

Mortgage Grader, Inc. v. First Choice Loan Servs.,
811 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 12, 13

Parker v. Flook,
437 U.S. 584 (1978)13

Pfizer, Inc. v. Lee,
811 F.3d 466 (Fed. Cir. 2016)23

Symbol Tech’s, Inc. v. Lemelson Medical,
277 F.3d 1361 (Fed.Cir. 2002)19

Trading Techs. Int’l, Inc. v. CQG, Inc.,
2015 WL 774655 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 24, 2015).....21

Trading Techs. Int’l, Inc. v. CQG, Inc.,
2017 WL 192716 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 18, 2017)..... passim

Ultramercial, Inc. v. Hulu LLC,
772 F.3d 709 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 13, 17, 20

Unwired Planet, LLC v. Google, Inc.,
841 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2016)22

WildTangent, Inc. v. Ultramercial, LLC,
573 U.S. —, 134 S.Ct. 2870 (2014)20

Statutes

35 U.S.C. §101 passim

Other Authorities

77 Fed. Reg. 48,756 (Aug. 14, 2012).....23

MPEP § 210618

Rules

Fed.Cir. Rule 32.1(d)19

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.1(d)22

37 C.F.R. 42.301(a).....23

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.