

Paper No. _____
Filed: December 21, 2015

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
U.S. Patent 6,772,132

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Table of Contents

- I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT1
- II. THE CLAIMED INVENTION IS A GUI IMPROVEMENT3
- III. THE '132 PATENT IS NOT A CBM PATENT6
 - A. The Statutory Definition of CBM Requires More Than a Recitation of Financial Activity or a Financial Purpose7
 - 1. The Legislative History Should Not Be Ignored10
 - 2. GUI Design Is a Technology, Not a Business Method.....12
 - 3. Because the Claims Are Directed to a Combination of GUI Features and Functionality Rather than a Method of Doing Business, They Do Not Qualify for CBM Review13
 - B. Even If the '132 Patent Were a CBM, the Claimed GUI Improvements Fall within the Technological Invention Exception14
 - 1. Purported Novel and Nonobvious Improvements to GUIs Necessarily Claim Novel and Nonobvious Technology14
 - 2. Each of Petitioners' Arguments That the Claims Do Not Recite Novel and Nonobvious Technology Fails to Address the Technological Improvement—the Claimed Novel and Nonobvious Interaction between GUI Elements16
 - 3. Novel and Nonobvious Improvements to GUIs Necessarily Claim Technological Solutions to Technological Problems17
 - 4. None of Petitioners' Arguments Explain Why the Claimed GUI Improvement is Not a Technological Solution to a Technological Problem18
- IV. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT REPRESENTS A MISUSE OF THE CBMR PROCESS20
 - A. The Board Has the Discretionary Power to Deny This Petition20

B.	Petitioners Misuse CBMR by Purposefully Delaying Their Repetition of Arguments	22
1.	Petitioners Present Substantially the Same CBM, § 101, and Prior Art Arguments as TD Ameritrade in CBM2014-00135.....	22
2.	Petitioners Purposefully Delayed This Petition As Part of a Coordinated Litigation Strategy	25
V.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C § 322(A)(2) AND § 325(A)(1) BECAUSE PETITIONERS FAIL TO SHOW CQG IS NOT AN RPI, DESPITE ADMITTED COORDINATION.....	27
VI.	PETITIONERS FAIL TO SHOW MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT THE '132 PATENT CLAIMS ARE INELIGIBLE UNDER § 101	30
A.	Petitioners Improperly Dismiss a District Court Decision Finding the '132 Claims Eligible under 35 U.S.C. § 101	30
1.	Petitioners Make Similar Errors to CQG's when Applying § 101 to Conclude they Claim an Abstract Idea.....	33
2.	Petitioners Make Similar Errors to CQG's when Applying § 101 to Conclude they Lack an Inventive Concept	35
3.	Petitioners Ignore the Claim Language—Just Like CQG	36
B.	The Claims Are Not Directed to an Abstract Idea, Satisfying <i>Alice</i> Prong One.....	38
1.	The Alleged Abstract Idea Has Been Improperly Crafted to Ignore Structural and Functional Elements of a GUI Tool	38
2.	A User Cannot Perform the Claim with Pen and Paper or Mentally	39
C.	The Claims Recite an Inventive Concept, Satisfying <i>Alice</i> Prong Two	41

1.	The District Court Properly Recognized “an Inventive Concept Necessarily Rooted in Computer Technology” in the Claims	41
2.	That The Claimed Invention May Be Practiced On Conventional Computer Hardware Does Not Preclude Patent Eligibility	44
3.	Petitioners Improperly Rely on Their Flawed Prior Art Analysis And Fail to Analyze the Claimed Combination	45
4.	Petitioners Misconstrue Key Claim Elements As “Insignificant Post Solution Activity” or “Data Gathering”	47
D.	Petitioners’ Arguments Fail to Consider the PTO’s Most Recent Examination Guidance	49
E.	Claims 8-12 Are Not Outside the Four Permissible Statutory Classes of Patentable Subject Matter	51
VII.	TSE IS NOT PRIOR ART AND THE TRANSLATION OMITTS A DISPOSITIVE TRANSLATOR’S NOTE	52
A.	The TSE Grounds Should Not Be Instituted Because Petitioners Fail to Establish That TSE Is Prior Art	52
1.	Petitioners Lack Evidence Establishing TSE’s “Public Accessibility”	52
2.	Mr. Kawashima’s Testimony—Petitioners’ Only “Evidence”—is Not Only Insufficient but Also Biased and Uncorroborated.....	55
3.	A Jury Reviewing the Same Evidence Already Concluded That TSE Is Not Prior Art—Petitioners Provide Nothing More	57
B.	Petitioners’ TSE Translation Hides a Known Controversy Regarding the Disclosure of TSE That Demonstrates TSE Does Not Teach the Claimed “Dynamic Display”	57

VIII.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE ALL OF THE PROPOSED COMBINATIONS WERE PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED AND THE PETITION FAILS TO EXPLAIN WHY THE PTO ERRED IN ALLOWING THE CLAIMS	59
A.	Silverman and Gutterman Were Considered in Original Prosecution and Determined by the Examiner to Not Be the Closest Art	60
B.	Two Reexaminations Previously Considered TSE, Silverman, Gutterman, and Belden.....	62
C.	In CBM2014-00135, the Board Found the Claims Patentable Over Substantially the Same Combinations of Silverman, Gutterman, and TSE.....	65
D.	Petitioners Ask the Board to Consider the Same Previously-Considered, Second-Tier References Over Which the Claims Were Repeatedly Allowed and Confirmed and Should be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	65
E.	Petitioners Should Not Be Allowed to Gap Fill a Prior Denial That They Could Have Joined But Did Not.....	70
IX.	PETITIONERS’ PRIOR ART GROUNDS FAIL FOR MULTIPLE INDEPENDENT REASONS, EVEN IF THE BOARD CONSIDERS THE MERITS	71
A.	Silverman and Gutterman Do Not Teach a Static Price Axis	72
B.	TSE Fails to Show the Combined Static and Dynamic Displays	73
C.	Belden Fails to Cure the Reasons for Patentability over TSE, Silverman, and Gutterman.....	74
X.	THE THRESHOLD JURISDICTIONAL CBM ISSUE IMPACTS MANY PATENTS—WARRANTING AN EXPANDED PANEL.....	76
A.	The Jurisdictional Dispute Relates to All GUI Improvement Patents.....	76
B.	The CBM Issue Warrants Consideration by an Expanded Panel	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.