Trials@uspto.gov Paper 44
Tel: 571-272-7822 Entered: August 7 2017

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.,
Petitioner,

v.

TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC., Patent Owner.

Case CBM2016-00051 Patent 7,904,374 B2

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, MEREDITH C. PETRAVICK, and JEREMY M. PLENZLER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PLENZLER, Administrative Patent Judge.

FINAL WRITTEN DECISION Covered Business Method Patent Review 35 U.S.C. § 328(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73



INTRODUCTION

A. Background

IBG LLC, Interactive Brokers LLC, TradeStation Group, Inc., and TradeStation Securities, Inc. (collectively, "Petitioner") filed a Petition on March 29, 2016 requesting covered business method patent review of claims 1–36 (the "challenged claims") of U.S. Patent No. 7,904,374 B2 (Ex. 1001, "the '374 patent"). Paper 3 ("Pet."). On July 5, 2016, Trading Technologies International, Inc. ("Patent Owner") filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 8 ("Prelim. Resp."). On August 17, 2016, we instituted a covered business method patent review (Paper 11, "Institution Decision" or "Inst. Dec.") based upon Petitioner's assertion that claims 1–36 are directed to patent ineligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Inst. Dec. 22. Subsequent to institution, Patent Owner filed a Patent Owner Response (Paper 18, "PO Resp.") and Petitioner filed a Reply (Paper 23, "Pet. Reply") to Patent Owner's Response. Pursuant to our authorization, Patent Owner filed an additional submission addressing the Federal Circuit's holding in Technologies International, Inc., v. CQG, Inc., No. 2016-1616, 2017 WL 192716 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 18, 2017) ("CQG") (Paper 29, "PO Add'l Sub."), and Petitioner filed a reply to that submission (Paper 30). Petitioner filed a Motion to Exclude Evidence (Paper 31), and Patent Owner also filed a Motion to Exclude Evidence (Paper 34).

We held a joint hearing of this case and several other related cases on May 3, 2017. Paper 43 ("Tr.").

We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6. This Final Written Decision is issued pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 328(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73. For the reasons that follow, we determine that Petitioner has shown



CBM2016-00051 Patent 7,904,374 B2

sufficiently that claims 1–36 of the '374 patent are directed to patent ineligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

B. Related Proceedings

The parties indicate numerous related U.S. district court proceedings, including at least one proceeding specifically directed to the '374 patent. Pet. 2; Paper 6, 1–5.

Numerous patents are related to the '374 patent and the related patents are or were the subject of numerous petitions for covered business method patent review and reexamination proceedings. As noted above, the Federal Circuit has issued a non-precedential decision, *CQG*, which addresses whether claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,766,304 ("the '304 patent") and 6,772,132 ("the '132 patent") are patent eligible under § 101. The '374 patent at issue in this case is related to the '132 and '304 patents via continuation and divisional filings.

C. Asserted Grounds

Petitioner contends that the challenged claims are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Pet. 27–50.

D. The '374 Patent

The '374 patent is titled "Click Based Trading with Intuitive Grid Display of Market Depth." Ex. 1001, (54). The '374 patent describes a display, named the "Mercury" display, and method of using the display to trade a commodity. *Id.* at Abstract, 3:5–10. The '374 patent explains that the Mercury display is a graphic user interface ("GUI") that dynamically displays the market depth of a commodity traded in a market and allows a trader to place an order efficiently. *Id.* at 3:11–20. The Mercury display is depicted in Figure 3, which is reproduced below.



FIG. 3

Γ	SYCOM FGBL DEC99					Ξ		
	E/W	10:48:44		BidQ	AskQ	Prc	LTQ	
1009		L	3		104	99		
1010		R	5		24	98		
1011		720			33	97	\Box	
1012		×	10		115	96	\dashv	
1013			0			-	-	
1014		10	1H		32	95		
j	\square	50	3H		27	94		
1007 <	S 0 W 24	1K	5H		63	93		
	S 0 W 7	CLR			45	92		
1015		×	10		28	91		
1016		-17	4		20	90	10	1000
1	B 0 W 15	CXL		18		89		≻1020
1008 ≺	B 0 W 13	+	-	97		88		ĺ
1017		NET 0		30		87		
1018	B 0 W 17	NET REAL		43		86		
				110		85		
1019		1		23		84		
		ł		31		83		
1021				125		82		
				21		81		
	1001	1	002	1003	1004	1005	1006	,

Figure 3 of the '374 patent illustrates an example of the Mercury display with example values for trading a commodity, including prices, bid and ask quantities relative to price, and trade quantities.

The Mercury display includes a plurality of columns. Column 1005 is a static price axis, which includes a plurality of price values for the commodity. *See id.* at 7:23–25. The '374 patent explains that "[t]he column does not list the whole prices (e.g. 95.89), but rather, just the last two digits (e.g. 89)." *Id.* at 7:25–26. Columns 1003 and 1004 are aligned with the static price axis and dynamically display bid and ask quantities, respectively, for the corresponding price values of the static price axis. *See id.* at 7:23–37. The '374 patent explains that "[t]he exchange sends the price, order and fill information to each trader on the exchange" and that "[t]he physical



mapping of such information to a screen grid can be done by any technique known to those skilled in the art." *Id.* at 4:59–66.

Column 1002 contains various parameters and information used to execute trades, such as the default quantity displayed in cell 1016. *See id.* at 7:55–8:23. A trader executes trades using the Mercury display by first setting the desired commodity and default parameters, such as default quantity. *See id.* at 8:56–9:3; Fig. 6, step 1302. Then, a trader can send a buy order or sell order to the market with a single action, such as clicking on the appropriate cell in column 1003 or 1004. *See id.* at 8:60–9:48; Fig. 6, steps 1306–1315.

E. Illustrative Claim

As noted above, Petitioner challenges claims 1–36. Claims 1 and 36 are independent, with claims 2–35 depending from claim 1. Claim 1 is representative, and is reproduced below:

- 1. A method for facilitating trade order entry, the method comprising:
 - receiving, by a computing device, market data for a commodity, the market data comprising a current highest bid price and a current lowest ask price available for the commodity;
 - identifying, by the computing device, a plurality of sequential price levels for the commodity based on the market data, where the plurality of sequential price levels includes the current highest bid price and the current lowest ask price;
 - displaying, by the computing device, a plurality of graphical locations aligned along an axis, where each graphical location is configured to be selected by a single action of a user input device to send a trade order to the electronic exchange, where a price of the trade order is based on the selected graphical location;



DOCKET

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.

