



# 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.
13/526,114	06/18/2012	Ingo Pfitzner	22135-0633001/2012P00057	8345
32864	7590	11/25/2016	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. (SAP) PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			ARIOMANDI, NOOSHA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2167	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/25/2016	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):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

*Ex parte* INGO PFITZNER

---

Appeal 2015-007362  
Application 13/526,114  
Technology Center 2100

---

Before JASON V. MORGAN, SHARON FENICK, and  
AARON W. MOORE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MOORE, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

### STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant<sup>1</sup> appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from a Final Rejection of claims 1, 2, 4–12, and 14–20, which are all of the pending claims. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We reverse.

### THE INVENTION

The application is directed to “[s]ystems and methods for using a semantic search to address business entities that fulfill certain criteria.”

(Abstract.) Claim 1, reproduced below, is representative:

1. A computer implemented method comprising:

receiving a search request from a user, the search request including one or more free search terms about a business entity;

revising the one or more free search terms to consider related terms to the one or more free search terms;

executing a search using an ontology, wherein terminological components of the ontology are generated, at least in part, from metadata of business objects associated with the business entity, the search based on the revised one or more free search terms and semantically facilitated by the terminological components of the ontology associated with the business entity; and

identifying at least one search result associated with the revised one or more free search terms.

---

<sup>1</sup> Appellant identifies SAP SE as the real party in interest. (*See* App. Br. 1.)

### THE REFERENCES

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

Hilton et al.	US 2010/0318929 A1	Dec. 16, 2010
Leitersdorf et al.	US 2011/0004588 A1	Jan. 6, 2011
Wang et al.	US 2011/0231385 A1	Sept. 22, 2011
Breiter et al.	US 2012/0215733 A1	Aug. 23, 2012
Vadlamani et al.	US 2012/0246155 A1	Sept. 27, 2012

### THE REJECTIONS

1. Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 10–12, 16, 18, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Vadlamani and Leitersdorf. (*See* Final Act. 2–6.)

2. Claims 4, 5, 14, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Vadlamani, Leitersdorf, and Hilton. (*See* Final Act. 6–8.)

3. Claims 7 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Vadlamani, Leitersdorf, and Wang. (*See* Final Act. 8–9.)

4. Claims 9 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Vadlamani, Leitersdorf, and Breiter. (*See* Final Act. 9–10.)

## ANALYSIS

The Examiner found that Vadlamani teaches or suggests the limitations of claim 1, except that it “does not disclose revising the one or more free search terms to consider related terms to the one or more free search terms.” (Final Act. 3.) The Examiner further found, however, that “Leitersdorf discloses revising the one or more free search terms to consider related terms to the one or more free search terms,” and that “it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the references cited,” as a “[s]killed artisan would have been motivated to use a semantic analysis of the search query of the user and user feedback.” (Final Act. 2–4.)

Appellant argues that Vadlamani does not teach or suggest the following limitation of claim 1:

executing a search using an ontology, wherein terminological components of the ontology are generated, at least in part, from metadata of business objects associated with the business entity, the search based on the revised one or more free search terms and semantically facilitated by the terminological components of the ontology associated with the business entity.

(App. Br. 6.)

The Examiner found this limitation met in Vadlamani because “[t]he ontology storage component 224 may store one or more ontologies, which are used by the ontology topic identification component 212 to identify semantic concepts as topics for received search queries” where “[e]ach ontology includes a collection of words and phrases defining concepts and relationships between the concepts.” (Final Act. 3 (emphasis omitted), citing Vadlamani ¶ 32.) The Examiner further found that Vadlamani’s “ontology includes a collection of words and phrases defining concepts and

relationships between the concepts, which would be analogous to ‘metadata of business objects associated with a business entity’ as cited in the claim.” (Ans. 4.)

We agree with Appellant that “the cited portions of *Vadlamani* have not been shown to teach or suggest generating ‘terminological components of the ontology . . . from metadata of business objects associated with a business entity.” (App. Br. 8.) The Examiner does not show a teaching or suggestion in *Vadlamani* of how the ontology in the ontology storage component 224 is generated or whether the concepts in the ontology have any relationship with the search queries. Thus, even assuming that *Vadlamani*’s ontology is “analogous” to the claimed ontology, the record fails to show that the components of the ontology are “generated, at least in part, from metadata of business objects associated with the business entity,” or that it would have been obvious to generate the ontology that way.

We accordingly reverse the rejection of claim 1 and, for the same reason, the rejections of independent claim 11 and dependent claims 2, 4–10, 12, and 14–20, all of which include the same limitation.

#### DECISION

The rejections of claims 1, 2, 4–12, and 14–20 are reversed.

REVERSED