

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GAIN CAPITAL HOLDINGS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

OANDA CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

Case No. CBM2020-00021
Patent No. 8,392,311

PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD REVIEW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8.....	2
III.	IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE; STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	4
IV.	THE '311 PATENT.....	4
	A. Claims.....	10
	B. Prosecution History	12
V.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL.....	17
VI.	THE STATE OF THE ART	18
	A. History of Currency Trading.....	18
	B. Currency Trading Markets and Practices.....	18
	1. Currency Trading Roles and Parties	20
	2. Communications Between Parties	23
	3. Placing Orders and Executing Trades.....	24
	C. Electronic Trading Systems	26
VII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	33
VIII.	PETITIONER HAS STANDING TO FILE THIS CBM PETITION.....	33
	A. Petitioner Has Been Charged with and Sued for Infringement, and Is Not Estopped	33
	B. The '311 Patent Is a CBM Patent.....	35
	1. The '311 Claims are Fundamentally Financial in Nature.....	36
	2. The '311 Claims Are Not Directed to a Technological Invention	37
IX.	CLAIMS 1-7 ARE NOT PATENT-ELIGIBLE UNDER §101.....	49
	A. The Claims Are Directed to the Abstract Idea of Currency Trading.	50
	1. The Claims Describe the Fundamental Economic Practice of Currency Trading.....	50

2.	The Claims Do Not Improve the Operation of a Computer or Solve a Problem Unique to Computers or the Internet	55
B.	The Claims' Recitation of a Conventional Computer Implementation of Currency Trading Does Not Transform the Abstract Idea into a Patent-Eligible Application	59
1.	Independent Claim 1 Does Not Include an Inventive Concept	60
2.	Independent Claim 7 Does Not Include an Inventive Concept	73
3.	Dependent Claims 2-6 Do Not Include an Inventive Concept	74
X.	CONCLUSION.....	81

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner, GAIN Capital Holdings, Inc. (“GAIN”), seeks covered business method (“CBM”) review of claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent 8,392,311 (“the ’311 patent”; EX1001), owned by OANDA Corporation (“OANDA”).

Currency trading is an age-old business practice stretching back generations. While the platform for currency trading has shifted over time—from physical markets, to phones, to computers—the fundamental aspects of the trading process have endured. Regardless of the underlying platform, traders have long been able to interact with currency dealers to receive price quotes, negotiate rates, and make trades, much like any other financial transaction.

The claims of the ’311 patent merely describe a standard currency trade being performed by computers. A generic server sets and maintains exchange rates and then communicates those rates to a client, just as currency dealers and brokers have done for generations. The trader then submits a standard order—identifying the currency, the amount to be traded, and a requested price—using a generic client system. The server then accepts or rejects the order, checking the request price against the currently available price, and informs the trader if the trade is accepted.

The claims thus broadly describe a conventional order-based currency trade performed on a computer. Yet the mere use of a generic computer to replicate a longstanding business practice does not render an abstract idea eligible for a patent.

Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Intern., 573 U.S. 208, 218-24 (2014); *see also Bilski v. Kappos*, 561 U.S. 593, 609-12 (2010) (fundamental economic practices are patent-ineligible abstract ideas). Notably, these claims issued before the Supreme Court issued its landmark *Alice* decision. Evaluating the claims with the benefit of the Supreme Court’s decision, as well as subsequent Federal Circuit decisions addressing strikingly similar trading practices, the abstract nature of the ’311 claims is unmistakable.

Accordingly, this petition demonstrates a reasonable likelihood that claims 1-7 are not directed to patent-eligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101, and GAIN respectfully requests institution of CBM review and cancellation of the challenged claims.

II. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8

Real Party-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)): Petitioner GAIN Capital Holdings, Inc. and GAIN Capital Group, LLC are the real parties-in-interest. StoneX Group Inc. is the ultimate parent of GAIN Capital Holdings, Inc. and GAIN Capital Group, LLC.

Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)): The ’311 patent is currently involved in *OANDA Corp. v. GAIN Capital Holdings, Inc.*, et al., No. 2:20-cv-5784 (D.N.J. May 11, 2020). EX1006. Petitioner is also concurrently filing a petition for CBM review in CBM2020-00022 against related U.S. Patent No.

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.