



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.
12/647,965	12/28/2009	Brian C. Schimpf	CAM920090027US1/1174-021	2911

44185 7590 12/29/2015
BAINWOOD HUANG & ASSOCIATES LLC
c/o LOTUS AND RATIONAL SOFTWARE
2 Connector Road
Westborough, MA 01581

EXAMINER

TORGRIMSON, TYLER J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2165

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/29/2015

PAPER

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.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte BRIAN C. SCHIMPF, SREEDHAR RELLA, and
VAUGHN T. ROKOSZ

Appeal 2013-010348
Application 12/647,965¹
Technology Center 2100

Before DEBRA K. STEPHENS, KEVIN C. TROCK, and
JESSICA C. KAISER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

TROCK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Introduction

Appellants seek review under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from the Final Rejection of claims 1–11 and 23. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b). Claims 12–22 are cancelled.²

We affirm.

¹ According to Appellants, the real party in interest is International Business Machines Corporation. App. Br. 2.

² App. Br. 2.

Invention

The claimed invention relates generally to database systems, and more specifically, to a method and system for dynamically creating queries to find related records in a database. Spec. 2.

Exemplary Claim

Exemplary claim 1 is reproduced below with disputed limitations emphasized:

1. A system comprising:

at least one processor and at least one computer readable memory, said computer readable memory having stored thereon program code for dynamically creating queries to find related records in a database, said program code including

program code for displaying a currently active database record, wherein said displaying is responsive to a user selecting said currently active database record from a previously generated result set of database records retrieved from said database, and wherein fields in said currently active database record contain values retrieved from said database,

program code for receiving indication from a user of at least one user selected field in said currently active database record,

program code for generating a user interface object enabling said user to indicate a user selected relational requirement to be applied when determining matching records in said database, and

program code for generating a search query requesting all records having values in said at least one user selected field that satisfy said user selected relational requirement with respect to said value in said at least one user selected field in said currently active database record.

Applied Prior Art

The prior art relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims on appeal is:

Zigon	US 2010/0070459 A1	Mar. 18, 2010
Crim	US 2010/0161644 A1	June 24, 2010

Rejections

The Examiner made the following rejections:

Claims 1–6, 11, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crim. Final Act. 2–7.

Claims 7–10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crim and Zigon. Final Act. 7–10.

ANALYSIS

We have reviewed the Examiner’s rejections and the evidence of record in light of Appellants’ arguments that the Examiner has erred. We disagree with Appellants’ arguments and conclusions. We adopt as our own (1) the findings and reasons set forth by the Examiner in the Office Action from which this appeal is taken (Final Act. 2–11), and (2) the findings and the reasons set forth in the Examiner’s Answer (Ans. 2–6). We concur with the conclusions reached by the Examiner and further highlight specific findings and arguments for emphasis as follows.

Appellants argue Crim does not teach “fields in said currently active database record contain values retrieved from said database” and “generating a search query requesting all records having values in said at least one user selected field,” as recited in claims 1 and 23. Specifically, Appellants argue Crim requires that a user must “manually enter desired values” into fields to

generate a search query, rather than using currently active database record fields “populated with values . . . for purposes of generating a search query.” App. Br. 11–12; Reply Br. 5–6. That is, Appellants argue, Crim does not teach search query field values are provided from database record field values. App. Br. 11–12; Reply Br. 5–6.

We are not persuaded because Appellants’ arguments are not commensurate with the scope of claims 1 and 23. Those claims recite a database record contains field values (“fields in said currently active database record contain values retrieved from said database”) and a search query uses field values (“a search query requesting all records having values in said at least one user selected field”), but the claims do not recite, and therefore do not require, using database record field values as search query field values. Moreover, the claims do not restrict the source of search query field values or the manner by which search query field values are obtained.

Here, the Examiner finds, and we agree, that Crim’s browse function, where a user views a selected database record from information stored in a database, teaches “fields in said currently active database record contain values retrieved from said database,” as recited by the claims. Ans. 3–5 (citing Crim ¶¶ 32–33, 35–37, Fig. 1). The Examiner also finds, and we agree, that Crim’s search function, where a user enters values into fields to create search queries, teaches “generating a search query requesting all records having values in said at least one user selected field,” as recited by the claims. Ans. 5–6 (citing Crim ¶ 51, Figs. 4a–4b). Crim’s manual entry of field values for search queries (Crim ¶ 51, Figs. 4a–4b) is not precluded from the scope of the claims because the claims do not restrict the manner—automatic, manual, or otherwise—in which search query field values are

Appeal 2013-010348
Application 12/647,965

entered. Accordingly, we are not persuaded the Examiner erred and, therefore, sustain the Examiner's rejection of independent claims 1 and 23.

Appellants have not presented separate arguments with respect to dependent claims 2–11. *See* App. Br. 12–13. As such, we are not persuaded the Examiner erred in rejecting these claims. Accordingly, we sustain the Examiner's rejections of claims 2–11. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv) (2012).

DECISION

We affirm the Examiner's rejections of claims 1–11 and 23.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv) (2009).

AFFIRMED

gvw