

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

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

v.

TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Patent No. 7,693,768 B2

---

**PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD REVIEW UNDER 35  
U.S.C. § 321 and § 18 of the LEAHY-SMITH AMERICA INVENTS ACT**

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	Mandatory Notices .....	2
A.	Real parties-in-interest .....	2
B.	Related Matters.....	2
C.	Lead and Back-Up Counsel.....	2
II.	Grounds For Standing.....	3
A.	Petitioners’ certification .....	3
B.	The ’768 Patent is a Covered Business Method Patent .....	3
1.	The ’768 patent claims a covered business method.....	4
2.	The ’768 patent is not for a “technological invention” .....	5
3.	AIA § 18 does not exempt GUIs from CBM review.....	9
III.	Identification of the Challenge .....	11
A.	Grounds of Unpatentability .....	11
B.	Prior Art.....	11
IV.	The ’768 Patent.....	13
A.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art (“POSA”).....	13
B.	Claim construction .....	14
V.	Ground 1 – Claims 1-23 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 101 .....	15
A.	Current state of § 101 jurisprudence .....	16
B.	The claims are directed to the abstract idea of placing an order based on observed (plotted) market information, as well as updating market information ( <i>Alice</i> Step 1).....	17
C.	Beyond the abstract idea, the claims recite only insignificant post-solution activity and data gathering ( <i>Alice</i> Step 2) .....	20
D.	The claims are not rooted in computer technology.....	29
E.	<i>TT v. CQG</i> is not controlling precedent .....	30
F.	Claim 23 is not directed to a statutory class of subject matter.....	31
VI.	Ground 2 – TSE and Belden render claims 1-13, 15, 16, 18, and 21-23 obvious.....	31
A.	Overview of TSE.....	32

B.	Overview of Belden .....	34
C.	Rationale for combining TSE and Belden .....	36
D.	TSE and Belden render independent claims 1 and 23 obvious.....	37
1.	TSE teaches the Preambles of claims 1 and 23. ....	37
2.	TSE teaches the “ <i>receiving data . . .</i> ” limitation. ....	39
3.	TSE teaches the “ <i>dynamically displaying . . .</i> ” limitations.....	40
4.	The combination of TSE and Belden teaches the “ <i>displaying an order entry region . . .</i> ” limitation. ....	41
5.	TSE teaches the first and second “ <i>fixed location</i> ” limitations.....	46
6.	TSE teaches the “ <i>updating the display . . .</i> ” limitations. ....	48
7.	The combination of TSE and Belden teaches “ <i>setting a     plurality of parameters for a trade order . . . and sending     the trade order . . .</i> ” limitation. ....	50
E.	Claims 2 and 3 are obvious over TSE and Belden.....	53
F.	Claim 4 is obvious over TSE and Belden. ....	54
G.	Claim 5 is obvious over TSE and Belden. ....	55
H.	Claim 6 is obvious over TSE and Belden. ....	55
I.	Claim 7 is obvious over TSE and Belden. ....	56
J.	Claims 8 and 9 are obvious over TSE and Belden.....	57
K.	Claim 10 is obvious over TSE and Belden. ....	58
L.	Claim 11 is obvious over TSE and Belden. ....	58
M.	Claim 12 is obvious over TSE and Belden. ....	60
N.	Claims 13 and 16 are obvious over TSE and Belden.....	60
O.	Claims 15 and 18 are obvious over TSE and Belden.....	63
P.	Claims 21 and 22 are obvious over TSE and Belden.....	66
VII.	Ground 3 – TSE, Belden, and Cooper render claims 14, 17, 19 and 20 obvious.....	67
A.	Claims 14 and 17 are obvious over TSE, Belden, and Cooper.....	67
B.	Claims 19 and 20 are obvious over TSE, Belden, and Cooper.....	70

VIII. Conclusion ..... 71

**Table of Authorities****Cases**

<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int'l</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	passim
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics, Inc. v. Sequenom, Inc.</i> 788 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	17
<i>Bancorp Servs., LLC v. Sun Life Assurance Co.</i> , 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	9, 24, 30
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 130 S. Ct. 3218 (2010).....	19
<i>CLS Bank Int'l v. Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd.</i> , 717 F.3d 1269 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	19
<i>Cooper Cameron Corp. v. Kvaerner Oilfield Products, Inc.</i> , 291 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	12
<i>CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions</i> , 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	passim
<i>DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.Com LP</i> , 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	29, 30
<i>Ex Parte Mewherter</i> 107 USPQ2d 1857 (B.P.A.I. 2013) .....	15
<i>Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Allapattah Servs., Inc.</i> , 545 U.S. 546 (2005).....	9
<i>In re Nuijten</i> , 550 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	15, 31
<i>Int'l Sec. Exch. v. Chicago Bd. Options Exch.</i> , CBM2013-00049 (Paper 53, Mar. 2, 2015).....	20
<i>Internet Patents Corp. v. Active Network, Inc.</i> , 790 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	20, 24
<i>Mayo Collab.Servs. v. Prometheus Labs.</i> , 132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012).....	16, 19, 25
<i>Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs.</i> ,	

# 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.