UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,604	12/08/2003	Srikanth Karimisetty	021756-002100US	4746

51206 7590 02/13/2013
Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton LLP/Oracle
Two Embarcadero Center
8th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER
MORRISON, JAY A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2168	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/13/2013	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ipefiling@kilpatricktownsend.com
jlhice@kilpatrick.foundationip.com
oraclepatentmail@kilpatricktownsend.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte SRIKANTH KARIMISETTY, SRINIVASULU PURI, CHARANJEET SINGH, RAVINDRA AKELLA, and SAVITA DURGADA

Appeal 2010-008876
Application 10/731,604
Technology Center 2100

Before DEBRA K. STEPHENS, HUNG H. BUI, and BARBARA A. PARVIS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PARVIS, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Examiner's decision finally rejecting claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19 and 20[1]. We have jurisdiction over the appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We AFFIRM.

---

[1] Claims 4, 13 and 18 have been cancelled and are not on appeal.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellants' invention relates to a method and system for searching unstructured data stored in a database. (Spec. ¶ 12, Abstract).

CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 1, 9, 11 and 16 are the independent claims on appeal. Claim 1 is representative of the subject matter on appeal and recites:

> 1. A method of searching unstructured data stored in a database, the method comprising:
>
> storing unstructured data in a column of a database table in character large object (CLOB) format;
>
> generating a first graphical user interface and displaying the first graphical user interface on a display device, the first graphical user interface configured to enable users to designate elements in the unstructured data as query elements;
>
> receiving user input via the first graphical user interface identifying one or more elements in the unstructured data stored in CLOB format as query elements;
>
> generating a plurality of database tables representing an intermediate index between each query element and at least one of the one or more elements identified as query elements in the unstructured data stored in CLOB format;
>
> generating one or more queries on the unstructured data stored in CLOB format using the query elements;
>
> translating a query element associated with a query on the unstructured data based on the plurality of tables to a corresponding element in the unstructured data stored in CLOB format; and
>
> obtaining information from the unstructured data stored in CLOB format for the corresponding element.

REJECTIONS

Claims 1-3, 5, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Bertino et al. (*Integrating XML and Databases*, IEEE Internet Computing, Jul.-Aug. 2001, at 84-88; "Bertino") in view of Pal et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0091188 A1, Apr. 28, 2005; "Pal") and B. Adelberg (*NoDoSE—a tool for semi-automatically extracting semistructured data from text documents*, Proceedings of 1998 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, 283-294 (1998); "Adelberg"). (Answer 4-8).[2]

Claims 6, 7, 9, 10, 15 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Bertino in view of Pal, Adelberg and Arora et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,346,598 B2, Mar. 18, 2008; "Arora"). (Answer 9-16).

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Bertino in view of Pal, Adelberg and Campbell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,856,970 B1, Feb. 15, 2005; "Campbell"). (Answer 16-17).

ISSUES

Appellants argue on pages 10 through 14 of the Appeal Brief that the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is in error.[3] These arguments present us with the issues:

a) Did the Examiner err in finding that Adelberg teaches "the first graphical user interface configured to enable users to designate elements in the unstructured data as query elements" of claim 1;

---

[2] Throughout this opinion we refer to the Examiner's Answer mailed on April 12, 2010.

[3] Throughout this opinion were refer to Appellants' Appeal Brief of December 21, 2009.

b) Did the Examiner err in finding that Adelberg teaches "receiving user input via the first graphical user interface identifying one or more elements in the unstructured data stored in CLOB format as query elements" of claim 1?

c) Did the Examiner err in finding that a skilled artisan would be motivated to combine the teachings of Bertino, Pal and Adelberg?

ANALYSIS

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Bertino, Pal and Adelberg

We have reviewed the Examiner's rejection in light of Appellants' arguments that the Examiner has erred. We disagree with Appellants' conclusion. We adopt as our own the findings and reasons set forth by the Examiner in the action from which this appeal is taken and the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the Examiner's Answer in response to Appellants' Appeal Brief. However, we highlight and address specific findings and arguments regarding claim 1 for emphasis as follows.

(a) Did the Examiner err in finding that Adelberg teaches "the first graphical user interface configured to enable users to designate elements in the unstructured data as query elements" of claim 1?

Appellants acknowledge that Adelberg discloses a tool having a GUI that enables a user to create a structure for otherwise unstructured data but argue that this disclosure is insufficient because the GUI does not enable a user to designate data as query elements. (Appeal Br. 12).

> Thus, Adelberg merely discloses a tool having a GUI that enables a user to create a structure for otherwise unstructured data using the GUI. However, Adelberg fails to disclose or suggest designating one or more of the newly created structural elements as query elements as recited in claim 1.

(Appeal Br. 12). However, Appellants acknowledge, "[a]s can be see[n] in FIG. 4 of Adelberg, the GUI allows the user to add/delete nodes or elements in a data model and indicate to which portion of raw data an element refers to provide such mappings." (Appeal Br. 12).

We agree with the detailed findings provided by the Examiner showing that this element of claim 1 is taught by Adelberg. (Answer 7, 18-19). For example, regarding the designation of newly created structural elements as query elements, as correctly noted by the Examiner, "the GUI in Adelberg is used to define the nodes or elements which are then loaded into the DBMS." (Answer 19). Accordingly, we are not persuaded by Appellants' arguments and agree with the Examiner that this limitation is disclosed by Adelberg.

(b) Did the Examiner err in finding that Adelberg teaches "receiving user input via the first graphical user interface identifying one or more elements in the unstructured data stored in CLOB format as query elements" of claim 1?

Appellants contend that "Adelberg stops short of any disclosure or suggestion of a GUI that enables users to identify 'one or more elements in the unstructured data stored in CLOB format as query elements' as recited in claim 1." (App. Br. 14). However, Appellants accept that Adelberg discloses that decomposed portions of the unstructured data "could then be extracted as disclosed in section 2.3 on page 6 of Adelberg and stored as

traditionally expected in their respective columns of database tables to be 'within the reach of general query tools.'" (Appeal Br. 13).

We agree with the detailed findings provided by the Examiner showing that this element of claim 1 is taught by Adelberg. (Answer 7, 18-19). For example, as correctly explained by the Examiner, Adelberg discloses receiving user input as recited by claim 1 and "that structure which is built by the user during the decomposition process is used to pull the text from the user-selected portions of the document into a database management system such as a relational database." (Answer 18-19). Accordingly, we are not persuaded by Appellants' arguments and agree with the Examiner that this limitation is disclosed by Adelberg.

(c) Did the Examiner err in finding that a skilled artisan would be motivated to combine the teachings of Bertino, Pal and Adelberg?

Appellants contend that the Examiner's line of reasoning regarding obviousness "is insufficiently convincing to establish that the tool in Adelberg is applicable as alleged to 'identifying one or more elements in the unstructured data stored in CLOB format as query elements' as recited in claim 1." (Appeal Br. 13-14). However, Appellants have not provided sufficient analysis or rationale to persuade us that Adelberg is not applicable.

In the Reply Brief, Appellants argue that the proposed combination "removes" the limitation of "storing unstructured data in a column of a database table in character large object (CLOB) format" from claim 1. (Reply Br. 7). Appellants further argue:

> The combination with Adelberg fails to disclose or suggest designating elements of unstructured data <u>stored in CLOB format</u> as query elements as recited in claim 1 because the

> suggested output of Adelberg from the GUI is to be used before storing the data in a database rather than on data already stored in CLOB format as recited.

(Reply Br. 7).

The Examiner correctly pointed to Bertino for disclosing "storing unstructured data in a column of a database table in character large object (CLOB format)." (Answer 5). The Examiner has articulated a reason with rationale underpinning (Answer 7) and Appellants have not presented sufficient analysis or argument to persuade us of error. Accordingly, we sustain the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The rejection of claims 2-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable

With respect to the rejection of claims 2-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19 and 20, Appellants allow those claims to fall with claim 1 by relying on the same reasons presented for the patentability of claim 1. (App. Br. 14-15). Accordingly, we agree with the Examiner's findings and stated conclusions with respect to the remaining claims and sustain the rejection.

CONCLUSION

Based on the record before us, we conclude that the Examiner did not err in rejecting claim 1 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Therefore, we sustain the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 1 and of claims 2-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19 and 20 falling therewith.

DECISION

We affirm the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19 and 20.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). *See* 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

AFFIRMED

peb