

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

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

v.

TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case CBM2016-00054
Patent 7,693,768 B1

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 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Claim construction.....1

 A. “single action” and “computer readable medium ...”.....1

 B. “order entry region” and “setting a plurality of parameters ...”1

 C. “entered order indicator”2

 D. “centering instruction”2

II. The ’768 claims a patent-ineligible abstract idea.....3

 A. Placing an order based on observed (plotted) market information,
 as well as updating market information is abstract.....3

 B. The claims do not transform the abstract concept into inventive
 concept.....7

 C. CQG is not controlling.9

III. Claim 23 is patent-ineligible because it covers signals.....11

IV. The challenged claims are obvious over the TSE combinations.....12

 A. TSE is a prior art printed publication.....12

 1. TSE was disseminated to the interested public in August
 1998.....12

 2. TSE was otherwise publicly available based on its wide,
 unrestricted distribution to the interested public.13

 3. *GoPro* is not controlling.15

 B. The ’768 claims are obvious.15

 1. Claims 1 and 23.....15

 2. Claim 6-9.....17

3.	Claim 11	18
V.	TT's alleged secondary considerations fail to demonstrate nonobvious.....	19
A.	TT's evidence doesn't overcome the Petition's strong <i>prima facie</i> obviousness showing.....	19
B.	TT fails to establish the requisite nexus.....	19
C.	TT's evidence doesn't support the alleged secondary considerations.....	22
1.	TT's global revenue and units sold fails to establish that MD Trader was commercially successful.	22
2.	TT conflates copying with competing products that allegedly fall within the claims.....	24
3.	TT's proffered praise for MD Trader isn't from a competitor and is directed to unclaimed features.....	25
4.	TT's licenses resulted from litigation.	26
5.	TT admits that there was no long-felt need.	26
6.	TT presents no evidence that others <i>tried</i> and failed to make the claimed invention.....	26
7.	TT's other alleged secondary considerations are either unsupported or simply not relevant.	27
VI.	The '768 is CBM-eligible.....	28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l,
134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....5

Apple Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.,
842 F.3d 1229 (Fed.Cir. 2016)8, 9

Ariosa Diags. v. Sequenom, Inc.,
778 F.3d 1371 (Fed.Cir. 2015)6

Ballard Med. Prods. v. Wright,
821 F.2d 642 (Fed.Cir. 1987)10

BASCOM Global Internet v. AT&T Mobility LLC,
827 F.3d 1341 (Fed.Cir. 2016)7

Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.,
815 F.3d 1331 (Fed.Cir. 2016) 14, 15

CLS Bank Intl. v. Alice Corp,
717 F.3d 1269 (Fed.Cir. 2013)4

Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc.,
848 F.2d 1560 (Fed.Cir. 1988)14

Cooper Cameron Corp. v. Kvaerner Oilfield Products, Inc.,
291 F.3d 1317 (Fed.Cir. 2002)12

DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.,
773 F.3d 1245 (Fed.Cir. 2014)6

Digitech Image Tech. LLC v. Elec. for Imaging, Inc.,
758 F.3d 1344 (Fed.Cir. 2014)8

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

<i>Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 822 F.3d 1327 (Fed.Cir. 2016)	3, 6
<i>Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc. v. Covidien LP</i> , 812 F.3d 1023 (Fed.Cir. 2016)	23
<i>EWP Corp. v. Reliance Universal Inc.</i> , 755 F.2d 898 (Fed.Cir. 1985)	26
<i>Ex Parte Mewherter</i> , Appeal No. 2012-007692 (P.T.A.B. May 8, 2013)	11
<i>GoPro, Inc. v. Contour IP Holding, LLC</i> , IPR2015-01078 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 26, 2016)	15
<i>Graftech Int’l Holdings, Inc. v. Laird Tech’s Inc.</i> , 2016 WL 3357427 (Fed.Cir. Jun. 17, 2016)	21
<i>Huang</i> , 100 F.3d at 139	28
<i>IBG LLC et al. v. Trading Technologies International, Inc.</i> CBM2015-00181 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 3, 2017)	15, 17, 18
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litigation</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed.Cir. 2012)	26
<i>In re Huang</i> , 100 F.3d 135 (Fed.Cir. 1996)	22
<i>In re Merck & Co., Inc.</i> , 800 F.2d 1091 (Fed.Cir. 1986)	15, 20
<i>In re Trans Tex. Holdings Corp.</i> , 498 F.3d 1290 (Fed.Cir. 2007)	9
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LL v. Capital One Bank (USA)</i> , 792 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	6

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.