

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

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

v.

TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Patent Owner

Patent No. 7,412,416 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-interest2
 - B. Related Matters.....2
 - C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel.....3
- II. Grounds For Standing..... 3
 - A. Petitioners’ Certification3
 - B. The ’416 Patent is a Covered Business Method Patent.4
 - 1. The ’416 patent claims a covered business method..... 4
 - 2. The ’416 patent is not for a “technological invention.” 6
 - 3. AIA § 18 does not exempt GUIs from CBM review..... 11
- III. Overview of the ’416 patent 12
 - A. Prosecution history13
 - B. Level of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention16
 - C. Claim construction16
- IV. Identification of the Challenge 17
- V. Ground 1: Claims 1-24 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because they are directed to an ineligible abstract idea..... 20
 - A. The ’416 patent claims are directed to the abstract idea of graphing (or displaying) trading data to assist a trader to place an order (*Alice* step one).....21
 - 1. Graphing (or displaying) trading data to assist a trader to place an order is directed to a fundamental economic practice. 22
 - 2. Graphing (or displaying) trading data to assist a trader to place an order is directed to an idea of itself. 25
 - B. The ’416 patent claims do not recite an inventive concept (*Alice* step two).27
 - 1. Beyond the abstract idea, independent claims 1 and 14 recite only insignificant and conventional extra-solution activities. 28

2. The dependent claims merely recite well-understood, routine, conventional extra-solution activity. 32

C. The '416 patent claims are not rooted in computer technology.....35

D. The absence of complete preemption does not demonstrate patent eligibility.....40

E. TT v. CQG is not controlling precedent.....41

VI. Ground 2: Claims 14-22 are ineligible under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because they are not directed to a statutory class of subject matter..... 42

VII. Ground 3: TSE, Bay, and Subler render claims 1-24 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103..... 42

A. TSE, Bay, and Subler render obvious claims 1 and 14.....43

1. Preambles 43

2. “*displaying a chart on a graphical user interface . . .*” 48

3. “*displaying indicators representing historical trading data . . .*” 53

4. “*providing a plurality of locations . . .*” 54

5. “*placing an order icon for a particular quantity . . .*” 58

6. “*generating an order to buy or sell the particular quantity . . .*” 68

7. “*sending the order to an electronic trading system . . .*” 70

B. TSE, Bay, and Subler render obvious claims 2 and 15.....72

C. TSE, Bay, and Subler render obvious claims 3 and 16.....72

D. TSE, Bay, and Subler render obvious claims 4 and 17.....73

E. TSE, Bay, and Subler render obvious claims 5 and 18.....74

F. TSE, Bay, and Subler render obvious claims 6 and 19.....75

G. TSE, Bay, and Subler render obvious claims 7 and 20.....76

H. TSE, Bay, and Subler render obvious claims 8 and 21.....78

I. TSE, Bay, and Subler render obvious claim 9.80

J. TSE, Bay, and Subler render obvious claims 10 and 11.....81

K. TSE, Bay, and Subler render obvious claims 12 and 22.....82

L. TSE, Bay, and Subler render obvious claim 13.83

M. TSE, Bay, and Subler render obvious claims 23 and 24.....84

VIII. Ground 4: Claims 2 and 15 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶
4. 85

IX. Conclusion 86

Table of Authorities**Cases**

<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int'l</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	passim
<i>Ariosa Diags. v. DNA Diags. Ctr.</i> , 778 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	40
<i>Bancorp Servs., L.L.C. v. Sun Life Assur. Co. of Canada (U.S.)</i> , 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	31, 36, 37
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 561 U.S. 593 (2010).....	23
<i>Bloomberg Inc. v. Markets-Alert Pty Ltd.</i> , CBM2013-00005, Paper No. 18 (P.T.A.B., Mar. 29, 2013)	5
<i>Cooper Cameron Corp. v. Kvaerner Oilfield Products, Inc.</i> , 291 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	19
<i>CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions</i> , 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	25, 29, 31
<i>DDR Holdings v. Hotels.com</i> , 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	35, 36, 37
<i>Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , No. 2015-1244 (Fed. Cir. May 12, 2016).....	23
<i>Ex parte Mewherter</i> , 107 USPQ2d 1857 (B.P.A.I. 2013)	17
<i>Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Allapattah Servs., Inc.</i> , 545 U.S. 546 (2005).....	11
<i>Gottschalk v. Benson</i> , 409 US 63 (1972).....	34
<i>IBG LLC v. Trading Techs. Int'l, Inc.</i> , CBM2015-00182, Paper 19 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 3, 2016)	17
<i>In re Distefano, III</i> , 808 F.3d 845 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 17, 2015).....	33

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.