

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 CBM2016-00087
U.S. Patent 7,412,416

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	BACKGROUND	1
II.	THE CLAIMS OF THE ‘416 PATENT ARE PATENT ELIGIBLE UNDER THE TWO-PART ALICE TEST	6
A.	The Federal Circuit’s Recent CQG Decision Makes Clear that TT’s Claims Are Patentable	8
B.	TT’s Claims Are Not “Directed to” an Abstract Idea Under Alice Part I.....	12
1.	TT’s Claims Satisfy Alice Part I Because They Set Forth a Particular Way to Construct a Specific GUI, Petitioners’ Arguments Grossly Overgeneralize the Claimed Invention, and the Claimed Invention Does Not Preempt the Alleged Abstract Idea	12
a.	TT’s Claims Recite a Specific Way to Construct a Specific GUI Comprising Specific Structure, Makeup, and Functionality	12
b.	Petitioners’ Arguments Grossly Overgeneralize the Claimed Invention Claimed.....	15
c.	A Preemption Analysis Supports the Finding that TT’s Claims Are Not Directed to the Alleged Abstract Idea	21
2.	TT’s Claims Satisfy Alice Part I Because the Claimed Invention Is a Specific Implementation Solving a Problem with Prior Art GUIs.....	24
3.	TT’s Claims Satisfy Alice Part I Because the Claimed Invention Is a Technological Improvement Since It Improves Prior Art GUIs	27
a.	GUIs are Technology.....	28

b.	The Claims of the ‘416 Patent Recite an Improvement to the “Relevant Technology” – GUIs.....	31
4.	TT’s Claims Satisfy Alice Part I Because They Are Akin to Mechanical Devices, Which Are Undoubtedly Not Abstract	34
5.	TT’s Claims Are Not Directed to Fundamental Economic or Longstanding Commercial Practices, or Business Methods	35
C.	TT’s Claims Are Patent Eligible Under Alice Part II Because the Claims Set Forth an Inventive Concept	39
III.	THE CLAIMS OF THE ‘416 PATENT ARE ELIGIBLE UNDER FEDERAL CIRCUIT CASE LAW REGARDING USER INTERFACE INVENTIONS.....	43
A.	Cases Where the Interface Improvement was Patent Eligible	45
1.	CQG: Claims to an Interface Invention are Patent Eligible	45
2.	DDR: Claims to a Particular Way of Solving a Problem with Interface Functionality are Patent Eligible	46
B.	Cases Where the Invention was UnrelatedUnr to the Interface.....	48
1.	Ameranth: A Conventional Interface Was Added to a Well-Known Business Practice.....	48
2.	Mortgage Grader: The Purported Invention was a Process for Anonymous Loan Shopping, Not a Specific Interface	48
3.	Electric Power: Claimed Ancillary Displaying of Results, Rather than a New Technique or Tool for how Results are Displayed.....	50

4.	Affinity Labs v. DirecTV: Merely Claimed an Interface that “Allows” a Step of the Abstract Idea to be Performed	51
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 Result	53
1.	Capital One: Generic GUI Would Preempt Application of Pre-Internet Concepts on a Website	53
2.	Affinity Labs v. Amazon: Results-Focused Claim Covered any Form of Customizing an Interface.....	54
3.	Internet Patents: Claimed the Result of Maintaining State Rather than How it was Accomplished.....	56
IV.	PETITIONERS MISCONSTRUE THE CLAIMS AND THE LAW TO ASSERT THAT THE CLAIMS ARE NOT PATENT ELIGIBLE	57
A.	Improving a Computer Component Confers Patent Eligibility	57
1.	Specific GUI Improvements Improve “The Way Computers Operate”	58
2.	Use of a General-Purpose Computer Does Not Doom the Claims	58
3.	Software Inventions are Patent Eligible.....	60
4.	TT’s Claims Are Not Directed to Using a Generic Computer to Perform an “Undisputedly Well-Known” Practice that “Humans Have Always Performed”	60
B.	Inventions Do Not Fail the Patent-Eligibility Test Because They Benefit a Human User	61

1.	CQG Solved a Problem Realized by Traders	62
2.	DDR Solved a Problem Realized by a Website's Owner	62
3.	McRO Solved a Problem Realized by Human Animators	63
C.	Inventions do not Fail the Patent-Eligibility Test Because a Person Could Perform the Functions Manually	64
D.	Ultramercial's Degree of Particularity Referred to Extra- Solution Activity	65
V.	PETITIONERS FAIL TO ESTABLISH THAT THE CLAIMS COVER SIGNALS	66
VI.	THE '416 PATENT IS NOT A CBM PATENT	68
A.	The '416 Patent Does Not Claim "Data Processing" or "Other Operation" (e.g., a Business Method)	69
1.	The Petition is Completely Silent as to Whether the '416 Patent is Directed to "Data Processing" or "Other Operations"	69
2.	The '416 Patent does not Claim "Data Processing"	70
B.	The '416 Patent Falls Under the Technological Exception	72
1.	CQG Sheds Light on CBM Jurisdiction	75
C.	Legislative History Confirms that the Claimed Invention is Not a CBM	76
VII.	CONCLUSION	79

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.