UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

_____

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

_____

TRADESTATION GROUP, INC.;
TRADESTATION SECURITIES, INC.; IBG LLC; AND
INTERACTIVE BROKERS LLC;

Petitioners

v.

TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Patent Owner
_____

Case CBM2016-00051
U.S. Patent 7,904,374
_____

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

Contents

II.   RECENT § 101 CASES HAVE CLARIFIED THE TEST FOR
        PATENT ELIGIBILITY 3

        A.   The patent's specification is used to determine the nature of the
                invention 4

        B.   Claims should not be overgeneralized or simplified into their
                "gist" or core principles when identifying what the claims are
                "directed to" under prong I of the *Alice* test 8

        C.   Claims are eligible under *Alice* prong I when the claims are
                directed to a particular solution to achieve a result..............................8

        D.   Claims are eligible under *Alice* prong I if the claims are
                narrowly drawn to not preempt any and all generic
                enhancements 10

        E.   Claims are eligible under *Alice* prong II if there is a "non-
                conventional and non-generic arrangement of known,
                conventional pieces"..11

III.   TT'S CLAIMS ARE PATENT ELIGIBLE UNDER BOTH PRONGS
        OF THE *ALICE* TEST..12

        A.   The nature of the claimed invention is confirmed by the
                specification..13

        B.   Under *Alice* prong I, the claims are "directed to" a particular
                structure, makeup, and functionality of a GUI and cannot be
                overgeneralized to being "directed to" merely a fundamental
                economic activity or a generic GUI 23

                1.   The claims require constructing a GUI with a particular
                        structure, makeup, and functionality..23

        C.   The claims improve GUI technology...25

      TO ASSERT THAT THE CLAIMS ARE NOT PATENT ELIGIBLE........51

      A.   The claims are not directed to "trading based on displayed
            market information and user input" 51

      B.   Improving a computer component confers patent eligibility..............52

      C.   Inventions do not fail the patent-eligibility test because they can
            be practiced on a general-purpose computer......................................55

            1.   Use of a general-purpose computer does not doom the
                  claims 55

            2.   Software inventions are patent eligible....................................55

            3.   TT's claims are not directed to using a generic computer
                  to perform an "undisputedly well-known" practice that
                  "humans have always performed" 56

      D.   Inventions do not fail the patent-eligibility test because they
            benefit a human user...57

      E.   Inventions do not fail the patent-eligibility test because a person
            could perform the functions manually 58

      F.   *Ultramercial*'s degree of particularity referred to extra-solution
            activity 60

VI.   THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH THAT THE CLAIMS
      COVER SIGNALS...60

VII. THE '374 PATENT IS NOT A CBM PATENT..62

      A.   The '374 patent does not claim "data processing" or "other
            operations" (e.g., a business method)...64

            1.   The Petition is completely silent as to whether the '374
                  patent is directed to "data processing" or "other
                  operations" 64

            2.   The '374 patent does not claim "data processing" 66

DOCKET ALARM

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.

fastcase
Smarter legal research.