

Paper No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Filed: July 14, 2020

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 No. 7,693,768

---

**PATENT OWNER'S REVISED MOTION TO EXPUNGE**

## **I. Statement of Relief Requested**

Pursuant to this Board's authorization on July 8, 2020, Trading Technologies International, Inc. ("TT" or "Patent Owner"), respectfully requests that the following confidential information be expunged from the record pursuant to Rule 42.56 and not be made public: Paper 20; the confidential versions of Exhibits 2172, 2169, 2359, 1063, and 1064; and Exhibits 2143, 2144, 2154, 2224, 2225, 2232, 2247, 2270, 2286, 2294, 2295, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2529, 2530, 2403, 2404, and 2406.

Patent Owner has conferred with Petitioners on this request and Petitioners do not oppose.

## **II. Reasons Why Requested Relief Should Be Granted**

### **A. The Board Found Good Cause to Seal the Confidential Information**

In connection with its Patent Owner's Response, TT filed a Motion to Seal. (Paper 23). This motion covered the confidential version of the Patent Owner's Response (Paper 20), confidential versions of Exhibits 2172 (Declaration of J. Knobloch) and 2169 (Declaration of C. Thomas), and thirty-seven exhibits to the Declaration of C. Thomas (Exhibits 2143, 2144, 2154, 2224, 2225, 2232, 2247, 2270, 2286, 2294, 2295, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2524, 2525,

2526, 2527, 2529, and 2530). TT identified that the sealed papers contain sensitive business information that would not otherwise be published or made available to the public. Additionally, TT made all of the non-confidential information publicly available in non-confidential versions. (Paper 23, at 6-7).

In connection with their Reply, Petitioners also filed a Motion to Seal (Paper 39). This motion covered two exhibits (1063 and 1064)—the deposition transcripts of Christopher H. Thomas—which were marked confidential by TT pursuant to the Protective Order. (Paper 39, at 1). Petitioners represented that, to the best of their knowledge, the documents had not been made publicly available. (*Id.*). On November 7, 2017, the Board denied Petitioners' motion to seal, but authorized the parties to jointly file a revised motion to seal along with redacted exhibits. On November 16, 2017, the parties filed a Joint Motion to Seal (Paper 63) requesting that the Board maintain as confidential and under seal portions of Exhibits 1063 and 1064.

Finally, Patent Owner filed a Motion to Seal in connection with its Demonstratives. (Paper 56). Specifically, TT requested that its Demonstratives (Exhibit 2359) be sealed because they contained sensitive business information that would not otherwise be published or made available to the public. TT filed a public version of its Demonstratives. (Paper 56, at 1).

On November 21, 2017, the Board granted the motions to seal (Paper 64, at 2-3), finding that “good cause exists.” It also found, however, that Patent Owner’s request “that the information filed under seal in these proceedings be expunged from the record within ten days of the disposition of all appeals” was “premature.” (Paper 64, at 4). The Board instructed Patent Owner to request authorization to file a renewed motion to expunge at the conclusion of appeal. (*Id.*). Because the appeals in this case have now been concluded, with the Supreme Court denying Patent Owner’s petition for a writ of certiorari, this motion to expunge is now ripe for decision. Because the Board already found good cause to seal these materials, the motion to expunge should be granted.

Additionally, Exhibits 2403-2404 and 2406 were confidentially filed on the docket and should be expunged for the same reasons as above. Namely, these exhibits consist of deposition transcripts of TradeStation’s employee, John Bartleman, and an exhibit used in such depositions. These confidential exhibits contain sensitive business information that would not otherwise be published or made available to the public. Accordingly, these materials should also be expunged from the record.

**B. The Sealed Documents Contain Confidential and Sensitive Business Information that was not Relied on by the Board in the Final Written Decision**

For the same reasons set forth in the parties' motions to seal, namely that the sealed information "contain[s] information identified . . . as sensitive, non-public information, that a business would not make public," (*E.g.*, Paper 56, at 1), all the documents listed above should be expunged from the record. Expunging this information will avoid the prejudice to the parties that would be caused by public disclosure of their sealed information.

In particular, the confidential materials covered by Patent Owner's first motion to seal (Paper 23) include TT's internal financial information relating to the amount of money derived from royalty and settlement payments, third-party business strategy information and third-party admissions/statements, and discussions of Petitioners' own confidential information obtained in a related district court proceeding. (Paper 23, at 3-6). The materials covered by Petitioner's motion to seal (Paper 39), and later the parties' joint motion to seal (Paper 63), include the deposition transcripts of Christopher H. Thomas, which include confidential licensing information and information regarding compensation. (Paper 39, at 1; Paper 63, at 1-2). Finally, the confidential materials covered by Patent Owner's second motion to seal (Paper 56) include information related to internal technical specifications that TT obtained in a related district court proceeding pursuant to a protective order. (Paper 56, at 3-4). None of the sealed information was relied on in the Final Written Decision (Paper 64, at 3).

# 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.