

Paper No. ____
Filed: November 15, 2016

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

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. RECENT § 101 CASES HAVE CLARIFIED THE TEST FOR PATENT ELIGIBILITY3

 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* test8

 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 enhancements10

 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* TEST12

 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 GUI23

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

 C. The claims improve GUI technology25

D. The '374 claims are eligible under *Alice* prong I because the '374 claims are directed to a particular solution to achieve a result27

E. The '374 claims are patent eligible because the combination of elements in the claims does not preempt the alleged abstract idea31

F. The '374 claims are eligible under *Alice* prong II because the claims set forth an inventive concept34

IV. TT'S CLAIMS ARE ELIGIBLE UNDER FEDERAL CIRCUIT CASE LAW REGARDING USER INTERFACE INVENTIONS.....36

A. Case where the interface improvement was patent eligible38

1. *DDR*: Claims to a particular way of solving a problem with interface functionality are patent eligible38

B. Cases where the invention was not related to the interface41

1. *Mortgage Grader*: The purported invention was a process for anonymous loan shopping, not a specific interface41

2. *Electric Power*: Claimed ancillary displaying of results, rather than a new technique or tool for how results are displayed43

3. *Affinity Labs v. DirectTV*: Merely claimed an interface that “allows” a step of the abstract idea to be performed45

C. Cases where the claims preempted the result of applying an abstract idea to an interface rather than being limited to a particular solution to achieve the result46

1. *Capital One*: Attempted to preempt application of pre-Internet concepts on a website46

2. *Affinity Labs v. Amazon*: Results-focused claim covered any form of customizing an interface48

3. *Internet Patents*: Claimed the result of maintaining state rather than how it was accomplished50

V.	PETITIONERS MISCONSTRUE THE CLAIMS AND THE LAW 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.	<i>Ultramercial</i> ’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

a. Under the USPTO’s own definition of “data processing,” the ’374 patent is not directed to “data processing”66

b. TT is not advocating a narrow interpretation of the statute that requires “data processing to be business data processing”68

c. The PTAB relied upon incorrect interpretations of statements from the specification to conclude that the claim was directed to “data processing”69

B. The ’374 patent falls under the technological exception71

C. Legislative history confirms that the claimed invention is not a CBM74

VIII. CONCLUSION.....77

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.