



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

Table with 5 columns: APPLICATION NO., FILING DATE, FIRST NAMED INVENTOR, ATTORNEY DOCKET NO., CONFIRMATION NO. Includes details for application 12/853,241 filed 08/09/2010 by Timothy A. Kendall, attorney docket no. 26295-17242/US, confirmation no. 5473. Also includes examiner name SITTNER, MATTHEW T, art unit 3682, and notification date 04/21/2017 via electronic mode.

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):

ptoc@fenwick.com
fwfacebookpatents@fenwick.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

*Ex parte* TIMOTHY A. KENDALL, MATTHEW R. COHLER,  
MARK E. ZUCKERBERG, YUN-FANG JUAN,  
ROBERT KANG-XING JIN, JUSTIN M. ROSENSTEIN,  
ANDREW G. BOSWORTH, YISHAN WONG, ADAM D'ANGELO, and  
CHAMATH M. PALIHAPITIYA

---

Appeal 2015-008182  
Application 12/853,241<sup>1</sup>  
Technology Center 3600

---

Before ANTON W. FETTING, SHEILA F. McSHANE, and  
MATTHEW S. MEYERS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

McSHANE, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

The Appellants seek our review under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) of the Examiner's final decision to reject claims 1–3, 5, 6, 8–11, and 13–20. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We AFFIRM.

---

<sup>1</sup> According to the Appellants, the real party in interest is Facebook, Inc. Appeal Brief filed April 28, 2015, hereafter "Appeal Br.," 1.

## BACKGROUND

The invention relates to social networking websites and using connections amongst users to generate and communicate social advertisements. Specification, hereafter “Spec.,” ¶ 2.<sup>2</sup> Embodiments of the invention may “communicate information about actions taken by others in the member’s network” that “may inform a member that a friend . . . has purchased a particular item made by an advertiser, will attend an event sponsored by an advertiser, or has added a connection to a profile for a business or other entity.” *Id.* ¶ 6.

Representative method claim 1 is reproduced from pages 18 and 19 of the Appeal Brief (Claims App.) as follows:

1. A method comprising:
  - receiving, by a social networking computer system, an advertisement request from an advertiser to advertise to a viewing user in a social networking system;
  - identifying an indication in the advertisement request of:
    - a type of action by another user with whom a viewing user has a connection, the type of action selectable by an advertiser from a plurality of types of actions provided to the advertiser by the social networking computer system, and
    - an instruction to provide a message to a viewing user that a user connected to the viewing user in the social networking system has performed an action of the indicated type of action;
  - logging, by the social networking computer system, information related to actions taken by users of the social networking system who have a connection to the viewing user;

---

<sup>2</sup> Herein, we refer to the version of the Specification published on February 3, 2011, as US Publication No. 2011/0029388 A1, which is the same as the originally-filed Specification filed on August 9, 2010, except for some paragraph numbering variations.

generating, by the social networking computer system, a plurality of stories for the viewing user, each story comprising information about at least one of the actions taken by a user of the social networking system who has a connection to the viewing user;

using the logged information and the indicated type of action in the received advertisement request to match the advertisement request to one or more of the plurality of stories generated based on the story comprising:

an action that corresponds to the type of action indicated in the advertisement request;

computing, by the social networking computer system, an affinity score between the viewing user and at least some of the plurality of stories, the affinity score for each of the stories based on the viewing user's affinity for the user connected to the viewing user and associated with the action communicated in the story;

receiving, by the social networking computer system, a bid amount associated with at least some of the plurality of stories;

selecting for display, by the social networking computer system, to the viewing user one or more of the stories generated, wherein:

the selected stories are accelerated in a display of a user device relative to others of the plurality of stories generated based on the match to the advertisement request and based on the affinity score and the bid amount; and

providing for display to the viewing user a plurality of the stories generated including the one or more selected stories.

In a Final Rejection, the Examiner rejects claims 1–3, 5, 6, 8–11, and 13–20 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Final Action, hereafter “Final Act.,” 2–6, mailed November 20, 2014;

Answer, hereafter “Ans.,” 2–15, mailed August 31, 2015.

## DISCUSSION

The Appellants argue the rejections under § 101 using independent claims 1 and 9 as representative. *See* App. Br. 6–13. We select claim 1 as representative.

The Examiner finds that claims 1–3, 5, 6, 8–11, and 13–20 are directed to non-statutory subject matter that does not amount to significantly more than an abstract idea because the claims are directed to communicating actions within a social network for the purpose of advertising a product and/or for the purpose of selling advertising which is a fundamental economic practice (advertising) and “employ[] methods of organizing human activities (sending and receiving information, recording or logging information, organizing and matching information, performing calculations, and displaying information) to achieve this outcome.” Final Act. 4–5. Additional claim elements are found to not be significantly more than an abstract idea because the “claims are a mere instruction to apply the abstract idea;” require no more than a generic computer to perform generic computer functions that are well-understood, routine and conventional and there is no improvement to another technology or to the functioning of the computer itself; and “no meaningful limitations beyond generally linking the use of an abstract idea to a particular technical environment.” *Id.* at 5–6. The Examiner refers to the Specification, which states “[a]ny computer-based system that provides social networking functionality can be used in accordance with the present invention even if it relies, for example, on e-mail, instant messaging, or other form of electronic communications” and is “not limited to any particular type of communication system, network, protocol, format or application.” *Id.* at 5 (citing Spec. ¶ 102).

The Appellants argue that the claims at issue do not represent an abstract idea because they are not directed to the idea of “communicating ideas,” but rather are to “providing stories to a viewing user is the product of a computer-based analysis of an advertisement request, connections between users of the social networking system, and actions taken on the social networking system recorded in corresponding user profiles.” App. Br. 8. The Appellants refer to the “U.S. Patent Office Examples of Abstract Ideas,” and its Example 2 that describes an “e-commerce outsourcing system” that is alleged to be analogous to the instant claims, where Example 2 was found to patent eligible. *Id.* at 8.<sup>3</sup> It is further contended that the instant claims are similar to those of Example 2 because “they both recite methods for storing various forms of data and data objects, processing the data and data objects, and providing a product of the processing to computer users.” Reply Brief, hereafter “Reply Br.,” 5, mailed September 15, 2015. The Appellants also argue that the claims are directed to specific methods “tied to an online social networking environment,” and, therefore, “overcome a problem specifically arising in the realm of computer networks.” *Id.* at 6. The Appellants further contend that “the pending claims are directed to a ‘business challenge . . . that is particular to the Internet,’ namely the management and distribution of electronic advertising to users based on specific criteria known only to a social networking system.” App. Br. 10. It is argued that the invention addresses problems with providing effective

---

<sup>3</sup> Example 2 articulates the decision in *DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.*, 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (“*DDR*”). U.S. Patent Office Examples of Abstract Ideas (January 2014), issued in conjunction with Interim Eligibility Guidance on Patent Subject Matter Eligibility, 79 Fed. Reg. 74,618 (Dec. 16, 2014), available at [https://www.uspto.gov/patents/law/exam/abstract\\_idea\\_examples.pdf](https://www.uspto.gov/patents/law/exam/abstract_idea_examples.pdf).

Appeal 2015-008182  
Application 12/853,241

online advertise, that draws attention “by providing an online ad to a user that includes a message about an action of the user’s social networking connection (e.g., your friend John likes Nike), making it more likely that the advertiser will entice the user to read the ad.” *Id.* at 10–11.

The Appellants additionally contend that the claims are not drawn to all applications of the alleged abstract idea, and therefore do not preempt “communicating actions” or “selling advertising,” such that others cannot use those ideas. App. Br. 9–10. It is further argued that the claims have to be considered as a whole, with all limitations considered, but the Examiner instead dissects the claim limitations. *Id.* at 7–8. The Appellants also allege that the claims are not directed to an idea itself, but rather the elements have a concrete and tangible form such as the plurality of stories with each story comprising “information about at least one of the actions taken by a user of the social networking system who has a connection to the viewing user.” Reply Br. 2–3.

The Appellants allege that the claims are not directed to “fundamental business practices” or to “certain methods of organizing human activity” because they are distinguishable from the types of practices described in the USPTO’s Interim Guidance on Patent Subject Matter Eligibility (July 2015). Reply Br. 3–4.

The Appellants further argue that, even if the Examiner’s findings regarding an abstract idea are adopted, the claims represent significantly more than an abstract idea. App. Br. 11–14. In support, the Appellants compare the claims at issue with those in *DDR*, arguing that they “are similar in that they both recite methods for storing various forms of data and data objects, processing the data and data objects, and providing a product of the processing to computer users.” *Id.* at 13. The Appellants further

Appeal 2015-008182  
Application 12/853,241

contend that there is no traditional analog for the claimed invention, “that would include all of these steps specifically designed to address problems with providing effective online advertising by providing social advertisements for which it is possible to leverage one user[’]s actions to promote specific content to the user’s connections who might be interested in that information.” *Id.* (citing Spec. ¶ 7). The Appellants argue that an example of these steps using a non-online environment, such as advertising in a paper magazine, would be “a nonsensical example” based on the knowledge of the instant claims. *Id.*

Finally, the Appellants argue that the rejection under § 101 is improper because the Examiner fails to provide factual support for the allegation that providing social endorsements within a social network and sending information is a method of organizing human activity and an abstract idea. App. Br. 14–17.

After considering the Appellants’ arguments and the evidence presented in this appeal for the § 101 rejection, we are not persuaded that the Appellants identify reversible error. To provide context, 35 U.S.C. § 101 provides that a new and useful “process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter” is eligible for patent protection. The Supreme Court has made clear that the test for patent eligibility under Section 101 is not amenable to bright-line categorical rules. *See Bilski v. Kappos*, 130 S. Ct. 3218, 3229–30. There are, however, three limited, judicially-created exceptions to the broad categories of patent-eligible subject matter in § 101: laws of nature; natural phenomena; and abstract ideas. *See Mayo Collaborative Services v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.*, 132 S. Ct. 1289, 1293 (2012).

In *Alice Corporation Party, Ltd. v. CLS Bank International*, 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014) (“*Alice*”), the Supreme Court reiterated the framework set forth previously in *Mayo*, “for distinguishing patents that claim laws of nature, natural phenomena, and abstract ideas from those that claim patent-eligible applications of these concepts.” *Alice*, 134 S. Ct. at 2355. Under *Alice*, the first step of such analysis is to “determine whether the claims at issue are directed to one of those patent-ineligible concepts.” *Id.* If determined that the claims are directed to a patent-ineligible concept, the second step in the analysis is to consider the elements of the claims “individually and ‘as an ordered combination’” to determine whether the additional elements “‘transform the nature of the claim’ into a patent-eligible application.” *Id.* (citing *Mayo*, 132 S. Ct. at 1291, 1297). In other words, the second step is to “search for an ‘inventive concept’—i.e., an element or combination of elements that is ‘sufficient to ensure that the patent in practice amounts to significantly more than a patent upon the [ineligible concept] itself.’” *Id.* (citing *Mayo*, 132 S. Ct. at 1294).

With this context in mind, we evaluate the Examiner’s rejection of representative claim 1.

Claim 1 requires receiving advertising requests, logging information relating to actions performed by users of a social networking system, generating stories related to those actions, using the logged information to match the advertising request to the stories, computing an affinity score between the viewing user and some of the stories, receiving a bid amount for the stories, selecting stories based on affinity scores and bids, and providing them for display. *See* Claims App. 18–19. We agree with the Examiner that the claim as a whole is directed to the purpose of advertising a product and/or for the purpose of selling advertising, which is the fundamental

economic practice of advertising. More specifically, we agree with the Examiner that “[s]ocial endorsements are a type of advertisement.”<sup>4</sup> Ans. 4. We also agree that the ancillary steps, such as bidding stories, are basic commerce practices (*id.* at 4–5), but, in any event, those steps are directed to the furtherance of advertising. Additionally, all of the steps of the claim that the Appellants allege are specific to the internet and the use of social media, including promoting products by the use of a “story,” are directed to the overall purpose of advertising. As such, the representative claim is directed to a fundamental business purpose, which is distinguishable from claims of *DDR*. See *DDR*, 773 F.3d at 1257 (“the . . . asserted claims do not recite a mathematical algorithm. Nor do they recite a fundamental economic or longstanding commercial practice.”). As discussed further below, we also determine that, unlike *DDR*, the claim at issue does not address a business issue that arises from and is specific to the Internet. See *id.*

We are also not persuaded by the Appellants’ allegation on patentability based on the argument that the claims will not preempt other types of advertising that do not employ the specific claimed steps. Although it may be true that there are other methods of advertising, that issue is not dispositive as to whether the claims are patent eligible. See *Ariosa Diagnostics, Inc. v. Sequenom, Inc.*, 788 F.3d 1371, 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (“While preemption may signal patent ineligible subject matter, the absence of complete preemption does not demonstrate patent eligibility.”). We also

---

<sup>4</sup> On this issue, the Specification explains the alleged advantage of social advertisements: “[s]ocial ads thus allow advertisers to enjoy the credibility that consumers naturally give to their friends through word of mouth advertising. Beyond simple targeting of ads that merely chase demand, therefore, this approach is better able to create or generate demand . . .”. Spec. ¶ 7.

Appeal 2015-008182  
Application 12/853,241

do not agree that the rejection under § 101 is improper because the Examiner fails to provide factual support for the allegation that providing social endorsements within a social network and sending information is a method of organizing human activity and an abstract idea. Contrary to the Appellants' assertion, we find that the Examiner was not required to proffer additional extrinsic evidence in support of the finding of an abstract idea. *See, e.g., Mortgage Grader, Inc. v. First Choice Loan Servs. Inc.*, 811 F.3d 1314, 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2016).

Finally, as to the first step of the *Alice* analysis, we are not persuaded by the Appellants' argument that the claims are not directed to an idea itself, but rather the elements have a concrete and tangible form. Our reviewing court has found that if a method can be performed by human thought, these processes remain unpatentable even when automated to reduce burden to the user. *CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.*, 654 F.3d 1366, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2011) ("That purely mental processes can be unpatentable, even when performed by a computer, was precisely the holding of the Supreme Court in *Gottschalk v. Benson*, [409 U.S. 63 (1972)].").

As to the second step of the *Alice* analysis, we are not persuaded by the Appellants' arguments that the claims represent "significantly more" than the abstract idea exception. On this issue, we agree that the Examiner's finding that the claim has no meaningful limitations beyond linking the use of an abstract idea to a technical environment. *See* Final Act. 5–6. The Examiner acknowledges that claim 1 is related to actions performed on a social network, but finds that "the appealed claims are simply reciting steps to solve the problem of communicating actions of one party to one or more socially connected users." Ans. 13. Further, the Examiner analogizes the social endorsements objectives of the claims to known non-computer-based

social endorsements, such as celebrity endorsements. *Id.* at 14–15. Here, we agree with the Examiner that advertising products by the use of social endorsements was known, and contrary to the allegations of the Appellants, the objectives of this type of non-Internet advertising would be the same as that of the claims—that is, to draw attention to the ad and to entice the user to read it. Further, considering the steps of the claims, the claims can be analogized to pre-Internet advertising practices. For instance, for a social network such as a school alumni organization, actions logged could be the positive responses of other connected alumni to, say, a print ad for an alumni trip, and that information could then be used in an insert of a newsletter to other alumni, to include information on the trip and a discussion of the alumni in the organization who already booked, with the objective to attract others to read the insert and entice them to consider signing up for the trip. This is similar to the Appellants’ view of the invention as providing an ad to a user “that includes a message about an action of the user’s social networking connection (e.g., your friend John likes Nike).” App. Br. 11.

The claims at issue are also distinguishable from those in *DDR*. In *DDR*, the Federal Circuit found that the challenged patent was valid because it “specif[ied] how interactions with the Internet are manipulated to yield a desired result—a result that overrides the routine and conventional” aspects of the technology. *DDR*, 773 F.3d at 1258–59. However, as the Federal Circuit also stated: “after *Alice*, there can remain no doubt: recitation of generic computer limitations does not make an otherwise ineligible claim patent-eligible.” *Id.* at 1256 (citing *Alice*, 134 S. Ct. at 2358). The bare fact that a computer exists in the physical rather than purely conceptual realm “is beside the point.” *Id.* Here, we do not discern that these claims “stand apart,” as those of *DDR* did, because they merely recite the performance of

Appeal 2015-008182  
Application 12/853,241

some business practice known from the pre-Internet world, along with the requirement to perform it on the Internet. *See id.* at 1257. Nor are the instant claims “necessarily rooted in computer technology in order to overcome a problem specifically arising in the realm of computer networks.” *Id.*

We therefore sustain the Examiner’s rejection of claims 1–3, 5, 6, 8–11, and 13–20 under § 101.

#### SUMMARY

The rejection of claims 1–3, 5, 6, 8–11, and 13–20 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is 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)(1). *See* 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

AFFIRMED