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.
12/814,197	06/11/2010	Gary Stephen Shuster	6657-17003	8685

35690 7590 11/01/2016
MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.
P.O. BOX 398
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER
TRAN, ELLEN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2433	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/01/2016	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):

patent_docketing@intprop.com
ptomhkkg@gmail.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte GARY STEPHEN SHUSTER

Appeal 2015-006912
Application 12/814,197
Technology Center 2400

Before JASON V. MORGAN, NABEEL U. KHAN, and KAMRAN JIVANI, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

KHAN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is a decision on appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from a Final Rejection of claims 1–5, 7–9, 11–13, 15, and 17–20.[1] We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We affirm.

---

[1] Claims 6, 10, 14, 16, and 21 have been cancelled. Final Act. 2.

INVENTION

Appellant's invention is directed to "using a DNS server . . . to enable an authorized reception device to receive . . . restricted content data associated with a . . . network address and redefine the domain name associated with a . . . network address." Spec. ¶ 2.

1. A method, comprising:

storing, at a server computing system, one or more user-defined translations usable to translate a domain name defined by a user to a corresponding IP address;

receiving, at the server computing system, a domain name server (DNS) request from a remote computing system, wherein the DNS request specifies a domain name for translation, wherein the specified domain name is defined by a user of the remote computing system;

determining, by the server computing system, that the specified domain name is one that requires authorization before translation of the specified domain name is performed; and

using a stored user-defined translation to perform translation of the specified domain name in response to translation of the specified domain name being authorized.

REJECTIONS ON APPEAL

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 11–13, 17, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Strentzsch et al. (US 6,256,671, issued July 3, 2001) and Rangan et al. (US 2002/0032782, A1 March 14, 2002).

Claims 3, 5, 8, 15, 18, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Strentzsch, Rangan, and Sampson et al. (US 6,339,423, issued Jan. 15, 2002).

ANALYSIS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 11–13, 17, and 20 stand rejected as obvious over Strentzsch and Rangan. Claim 1 is representative.

We have reviewed Appellant's contentions in the Briefs, the Examiner's rejection, and the Examiner's response to Appellant's contentions. We are not persuaded by Appellant's arguments. We agree with, and adopt as our own, the findings and reasoning of the Examiner as set forth by the Answer's pages 2–3, 7–12 and Final Action's pages 2–6. We present the following for emphasis.

The Examiner maps claim 1's "storing" and "receiving" limitations to a user selecting Rangan's personalized domain such as "MyBank.com." Final Act. 2–3, 5–6; Ans. 2–3, 10–11. The Examiner finds that the user configures the personalized "MyBank.com" domain name to responsively send a DNS request specifying an associated domain name—"www.bankofamerica.com" in the Examiner's given example—as the domain name translated by the receiving DNS server to a corresponding IP address. *Id.* In support, the Examiner reasons that the configured response to the selection is a "user-defined translation" (claim 1) insofar as it is set by the user and translates MyBank.com to www.bankofamerica.com. *Id.* The Examiner further reasons that the configured response is "usable to translate a domain name defined by a user to a corresponding IP address" (claim 1) insofar: the response formulates and sends the DNS request for translating www.bankofamerica.com to an IP address; and the user sets (defines) www.bankofamerica.com as the domain name (by configuring the MyBank.com personalized domain). *Id.* Because Rangan does not explicitly mention a DNS request and DNS server, the Examiner cites

Strentzsch as teaching the process of sending a DNS request for a domain name to a DNS server that determines the corresponding IP address. Ans. 2; *see also* id. at 8 ("[A]s well known in the art[,] the Internet contains multiple DNS servers [that] translate a user requested domain name into an IP address."); Final Act. 2, 5.

Appellant contends the applied art does not "teach or suggest 'a DNS request [that] specifies a domain name . . . defined by a user of the remote computing system [sending the request],' as recited in claim 1." App. Br. 10, 11. Specifically, the Appellant argues that "Rangan does not teach or suggest that a 'DNS request [actually] specifies [MyBank.com] for translation,' as recited in claim 1." App. Br. 10–11. Instead, according to the Appellant, the customized hyperlink would "reference the domain name registered by the operator of the website (e.g. www.bankofamerica.com registered by Bank of America) when submitting a DNS request." App. Br. 12. Appellant further argues "[m]erely translating MyBank.com to www.bankofamerica.com cannot constitute the recited "translat[ing] as www.bankofamerica.com is not an IP address." App. Br. 12. The argument is not commensurate with the claimed invention's scope. Claim 1 does not require a user-defined translation of a domain name or URL to an IP address, but rather a "user-defined translation[] *usable* to translate a domain name defined by a user to a corresponding IP address" (emphasis added). For the reasons *supra*, claim 1's user-defined "translation[] usable to translate a domain name . . . to an IP address" is reasonably mapped to Rangan's user-defined translation of the personalized domain name "MyBank.com" to the domain name "www.bankofamerica.com," because this translation is then used to formulate the DNS request (i.e., "usable to")

that translates "www.bankofamerica.com" to an IP address (i.e., "translate a domain name . . . to a corresponding IP address"). Note also, claim 1's user-defined domain name is thus mapped to the domain name "www.bankofamerica.com," which the user configures and thus defines.

Appellant also contends the Examiner unreasonably interprets a domain name (claim 1) and hyperlink (Rangan) as equivalents. Reply Br. 3–4. The argument is not persuasive because rather, as discussed above, the Examiner maps the claimed domain name to Rangan's sending of the DNS request's included domain name (e.g., www.bankofamerica.com) in response to selecting of a personalized domain name. That is, the claimed domain name is mapped to "www.bankofamerica.com."

Appellant argues "Rangan never indicates the URLs in its personalized page . . . are defined by a user. At best, Rangan discloses that a user can change the URL's included in the list on the page." App. Br. 10; *see also* Reply Br. 4–5 ("Rangan indicates that 'a user may edit and update listings, including changing URLs adding and deleting listings, and the like.' Rangan never indicates that updating the listing in this manner actually includes the user defining a hyperlink."). The argument is not persuasive because teaching a user-built, -configured, and -editable list of URLs, hyperlinks, and pseudonyms plainly suggests a user's ability to create a hyperlink and define the corresponding URL (e.g., www.bankofamerica.com) and pseudo-domain name (e.g., MyBank.com).

Appellant also contends:

> [A]t best, the combination might include using a hyperlink that caused display of the customized name (e.g., MyBank.com), but, upon invocation, would reference the domain name registered by the operator of the website (e.g., www.bankofamerica.com

> registered by Bank of America) when submitting a DNS request. . . . Such a combination would be using a domain name defined by Bank of America in this example, not "a DNS request [that] specifies a domain name . . . defined by a user of the remote computing system [sending the request],'' as recited in claim 1.

Reply Br. 6 (citing and quoting App. Br. 12; corresponding citation and quotation syntax omitted).

The argument is not persuasive because, in the combination (*see supra*), the DNS request's specified domain name is defined by the user (i.e., set) insofar that the user configures and selects the hyperlink to send a DNS request for the particular domain name.

Appellant contends that, in Rangan, the translation of user-defined URLs to corresponding domain names is performed by the browser rather a "server computing system" as recited in claim 1. We are unpersuaded by Appellant's argument. We agree with the Examiner that Rangan teaches an Internet connected server on which the user-defined domains are stored and that this server is used in translating user-defined domains to the appropriate domain names. Ans. 12.

For the foregoing reasons, Appellant fails to persuade us of error in the rejection of representative claim 1. Accordingly, we sustain the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 11–13, 17, and 20 over Strentzsch and Rangan. Because claims 3, 5, 8, 15, 18, and 19 are not separately argued, we also sustain the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of these claims over Strentzsch, Rangan, and Sampson.

DECISION

The Examiner's rejections of claims 1–5, 7–9, 11–13, 15, and 17–20 are affirmed.

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. § 41.50(f).

AFFIRMED