



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.
13/155,271	06/07/2011	Mohan Parthasarathy	APL-P10448US1	2660

63975 7590 11/22/2016
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

LIN, SHEW FEN

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

2166

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

11/22/2016

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 MOHAN PARTHASARATHY and JOSHUA V. GRAESSLEY

Appeal 2015-004642
Application 13/155,271
Technology Center 2100

Before KRISTEN L. DROESCH, KAMRAN JIVANI, and
SCOTT E. BAIN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

JIVANI, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellants¹ seek our review under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) of the Examiner's final decisions rejecting claims 1–23, which are all the claims pending in the present application. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We AFFIRM.

¹ Appellants identify Apple, Inc. as the real party in interest. Br. 1.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The present application relates to caching responses for scoped and non-scoped domain name system (DNS) queries. Spec. 1:19–20.

Claims 1 and 8 are illustrative of the claimed invention and are reproduced below.

1. A method for domain name resolution in an electronic device with a plurality of network interfaces, comprising:

in the electronic device,

receiving a scoped request from an application to determine an IP address for a domain name, wherein the scoped request is a function call that comprises an argument specifying that a DNS query generated from the scoped request is to be transmitted only on network interfaces specified in the scoped request, and wherein a non-scoped request is a function call that comprises an argument specifying that a DNS query generated from the non-scoped request can be transmitted on any of the network interfaces;

generating a DNS query from the scoped request and transmitting the DNS query only on the network interfaces specified in the scoped request; and

upon receiving a response to the DNS query,

forwarding the response to the application; and

storing a record of the response in a scoped portion of a DNS resolution cache that is used only for storing responses to scoped requests, wherein a non-scoped portion of the DNS resolution cache is used only for storing responses to non-scoped requests.

8. An apparatus, comprising:

a DNS resolution cache, wherein the DNS resolution cache comprises a memory with memory circuits for caching records of responses to DNS queries;

a scoped portion in the DNS resolution cache, wherein the scoped portion is a first portion of memory circuits used for caching records of responses to scoped DNS queries; and

a non-scoped portion in the DNS resolution cache, wherein the non-scoped portion is a second portion of memory circuits used for caching records of responses to non-scoped DNS queries, wherein the first portion of the memory circuits and the second portion of the memory circuits are different portions of the memory circuits.

The Rejections

Claims 8 and 12–14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Rao (US 2006/0242227 A1; Oct. 26, 2006).

Claims 1–7 and 15–23 stand rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Shribman (US 2012/0124239 A1; May 17, 2012), van Megen (US 2007/0211690 A1; Sept. 13, 2007), and Mukker (US 2005/0188156 A1; Aug. 25, 2005).

Claims 9–11 stand rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Rao and Atkisson (US 2012/0221774 A1; Aug. 30, 2012).

ANALYSIS

Anticipation

Appellants argue the Examiner errs in rejecting claim 8 because: “Rao is limited to caching information about resolved relay nodes gathered

using PNRP resolution queries in separate caches based on the communication protocol that the relay node. Rao does not describe or suggest scoped and non-scoped DNS queries and/or caching such DNS queries.” Br. 11.

We are not persuaded by Appellants’ argument because it is not responsive to the Examiner’s findings. The Examiner finds, and we agree, Rao describes a DNS query specifying SSL protocol (i.e., a “scoped DNS query”) and a “DNS query other than SSL, such as UDP type query” (i.e., a “non-scoped DNS query”). Final Act. 3; Ans. 3. The DNS queries are resolved by promoter 210, which includes a domain name service (DNS) front end 300 and a server-less resolution protocol (e.g., PNRP) back end 310 for peer-to-peer based communications. Rao, ¶ 30. As the Examiner correctly finds, Rao describes, “promoter 210 may function as a name server for standard domain name service and may maintain a database of cached results. As such, the DNS interface 320 may receive standard DNS requests and return results that are cached in its database.” Ans. 3 (citing Rao, ¶ 51) (emphasis omitted). Finally, contrary to Appellants’ argument, claim 8 recites caching responses to scoped and non-scoped DNS queries, not caching the queries themselves.

Accordingly, we sustain the Examiner’s rejection of claim 8 as anticipated by Rao. Appellants advance no further arguments regarding dependent claims 12–14. Br. 11. Accordingly, we further sustain the Examiner’s rejection of claims 12–14 as anticipated by Rao.

Obviousness of Claims 1–7 and 15–23

Appellants argue the Examiner errs in rejecting claim 1 because neither van Megan nor Shribman addresses “any form of scope relating to DNS queries and certainly does not describe a scoped DNS query.” Br. 12–13 (emphasis omitted). We are not persuaded by Appellants’ conclusory argument. The Examiner details at length findings in the applied references and a motivation to combine the teachings of the references. Appellants fail to address substantively these findings and motivation. A mere recitation of the claim elements and a naked assertion that the corresponding elements are not found in the prior art is insufficient to show error. 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(iv)(2012); *In re Lovin*, 652 F.3d 1349, 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2011).

Accordingly, we sustain the Examiner’s rejection of claim 1 as rendered obvious. Appellants advance no further arguments regarding claims 2–7 and 15–23. *See* Br. 12–14. Accordingly, we sustain the Examiner’s rejection of claims 2–7 and 15–23 as rendered obvious.

Obviousness of Claims 9–11

Appellants fail to address claims 9–11. *See* Br. 10–14. Accordingly, we sustain the Examiner’s rejection of claims 9–11 as rendered obvious.

DECISION

We affirm the Examiner’s decisions rejecting claims 1–23.

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).

AFFIRMED