



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.
12/539,055	08/11/2009	Kiran Sakhare	58083-394854 (B1066)	8542
72058	7590	11/09/2016	EXAMINER	
Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton LLP Adobe Systems, Inc. 58083 Mailstop: IP Docketing - 22 1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800 Atlanta, GA 30309-4530			MAI, KEVIN S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2456	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/09/2016	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):

ipefiling@kilpatrickstockton.com  
jlhice@kilpatrick.foundationip.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

*Ex parte* KIRAN SAKHARE

---

Appeal 2016-002992  
Application 12/539,055  
Technology Center 2400

---

Before STEPHEN C. SIU, ERIC S. FRAHM, and LINZY T. McCARTNEY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

SIU, *Administrative Patent Judge*

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is a decision on appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Examiner's Final Rejection of claims 1–20. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

The disclosed invention relates generally to a server setting caching process. Spec 7:10–11. Independent claim 1 reads as follows:

1. A non-transitory computer readable medium having computer readable code thereon, the medium comprising instructions for:  
in a development platform during development of an application, identifying a requirement to access a remote server, the requirement indicating that server information be accessible to

the development platform regardless of an availability of at least one server;

connecting to the at least one server;

obtaining caching settings from the at least one server, the caching settings comprising information from the at least one server;

updating a user interface of the development platform based on the caching settings, the user interface configured to dynamically display at least a portion of the caching settings to assist development of the at least one application:

responsive to a user input, dynamically displaying the caching settings within the updated user interface of the development platform during development of the at least one application; and

using the caching settings, verifying successful interaction between the at least one application and the at least one server during operation of the at least one application.

The Examiner rejects claims 1–14, 16–18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hopkins (US 2003/0233404 A1, published December 18, 2003) and Jerrard-Dunne (US 2007/0016696 A1, published January 18, 2007) and claims 15 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hopkins, Jerrard-Dunne, and Balasubramanian (US 2010/0050154 A1, published February 25, 2010).

## ISSUE

Did the Examiner err in rejecting claims 1–20?

## ANALYSIS

Appellant argues that Hopkins only discloses “*the same local interface that is used in the online session is also used in the offline session*” and that Jerrard-Dunne only discloses information that “is unrelated to activity in the editor’s user interface.” App. Br. 6, 8. Hence, Appellant argues the combination of Hopkins and Jerrard-Dunne fails to disclose or suggest “updating a user interface,” as recited in claim 1. We are not persuaded by Appellant’s argument for at least the reasons set forth by the Examiner. Ans. 2–4.

For example, Hopkins discloses “a local interface that can communicate with the remote server” through which a “user transmits instructions . . . through the underlying network [and] are ultimately received at the remote server [during an online session].” Hopkins ¶ 6. Hopkins also discloses that “when the client is offline . . . the client imports . . . logic used to manipulate the data . . . that is capable of being interpreted and performed by the local interface.” Hopkins ¶ 7. In other words, when “online,” the local interface of Hopkins relays instructions from the user to the remote server but when “offline,” the local interface is “updated” in order to now interpret and perform functional logic and data itself (without the remote server). Appellant does not explain sufficiently how the local

interface of Hopkins is not “updated” when the function of local interface of Hopkins is modified when the user is “offline” (as opposed to when the user is “online”).

Appellant argues that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teachings of Hopkins and Jerrard-Dunne because “the Final Office Action was obligated to provide a rationale for the missing functionality, *i.e.*, developing a software application, but it did not” and that “Hopkins is entirely unrelated to software development” and “Jerrard-Dunne provides no teachings regarding how one might incorporate such functionality into a system like Hopkins.” App. Br. 9–10. We are not persuaded by Appellant’s argument for at least the reasons set forth by the Examiner. Ans. 4–7.

As the Examiner indicates, Hopkins discloses updating a user interface, displaying information within the updated user interface, and using the information to “access[] and manipul[at]e data residing on the remote server” by “simulating an online session while the user is offline” (*i.e.*, verify successful interaction between a local interface that is performing computer operations and a server during operation of the computer operations). Hopkins ¶ 5. As the Examiner also indicates, Jerrard-Dunne discloses that a computer operation known to those of ordinary skill in the art and known to be performed on a computer system includes “creating, editing, and emulating [an] . . . application” or “provisioning a client application.” Jerrard-Dunne ¶¶ 2, 9. As the Examiner states, “[o]ne of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine to use a known technique to improve similar devices in the same way.” Final Act. 6.

We agree with the Examiner that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have implemented the known process of updating a (local) user interface and performing computer processes through the updated interface for interaction with a remote server when online (as disclosed by Hopkins) to include the known computer process of developing an application, as disclosed by Jerrold-Dunne. Such a combination of known features performing their known functions would have resulted in the mere predictable result of using a (local) user interface to perform computer processes with a remote server (Hopkins) in which the computer process performed is the known computer process of developing an application. Such a combination would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. “The combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results.” *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 416 (2007).

Claim 14 recites “building at least one content assist proposal.” Claim 14 does not recite any additional features or characteristics of the “content assist proposal.” Appellant argues that Hopkins and Jerrard-Dunne disclose “data and functional logic” but fail to disclose or suggest “content assist proposals,” as recited in claim 14. App. Br. 10–11. We are not persuaded by Appellant’s argument for at least the reasons set forth by the Examiner. Ans. 7–9.

Appellant does not indicate that the Specification provides a definition of the term “content assist proposals.” We do not independently identify such a definition in the Specification. We note, however, that the Specification discloses one example of a “content assist proposal” that contains “mappings . . . created from server information.” Spec. 10, Fig. 5. The Specification discloses another example in which the “content assist proposal” contains “a menu listing the available data . . . sources on the server” (Spec. 15) and “a menu of available component options from which the user 108 may choose the correct component.” Spec. 17. Hence, one of skill in the art would have understood a “content assist proposal” to encompass a data component or structure that may contain information associated with a server (as disclosed as one example in the Specification).

As previously noted, Hopkins discloses that the client “imports at least a subset of the data that resides at the remote server [to the local interface].” ¶ 7. In other words, after importing data associated with the remote server, the local interface contains a data component that contains the imported data that is associated with the remote server (i.e., the local interface contains a “content assist proposal,” as would have been understood by one of ordinary skill in the art in light of the Specification). Appellant does not sufficiently explain why the data component containing information associated with a server as disclosed by Hopkins does not teach or suggest the data component containing information associated with a server (i.e., a “content assist proposal”) as recited in claim 14.

Claims 15 and 19 each recite “displaying the caching settings comprises displaying at least one of a content assist proposal or a code hint.” Appellant argues that Balasubramanian fails to disclose or suggest “code hinting.” App. Br. 12. We are not persuaded by Appellant’s argument for at least the reasons set forth by the Examiner. Ans. 8–9. Appellant does not indicate that the Specification provides a definition of the term “code hinting.” We do not independently identify such a definition in the Specification. We note, however, that the Specification discloses an example in which a user may access information using “code hinting,” another example in which code hinting may contain “mappings,” and another example in which a user accesses information “using features including . . . code hinting.” Spec. 7, 10, 11. We do not identify additional disclosure in the Specification pertaining to “code hinting.”

In view of the lack of a definition or explanation of the term “code hinting,” we determine that one of ordinary skill in the art would have broadly but reasonably understood the term “code hinting” in light of the Specification and based on a plain and customary understanding to include a suggestion (or “hint”) for use in providing information for a computer. The Examiner states that Balasubramanian discloses “suggestions are offered to the application developer to correct the semantic error.” Ans. 9. In other words, Balasubramanian discloses a suggestion for use in a computer (or “code hint”). Appellant does not adequately explain why the “code hint”

disclosed by Balasubramanian does not teach or suggest the “code hint” recited in claims 15 and 19.

Appellant argues that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teachings of Hopkins with that of Balasubramanian because such a combination “would require entirely changing the mode of operation of Hopkins CRM system.” App. Br. 13. We are not persuaded by Appellant for at least the reasons set forth by the Examiner. Final Act. 20. For example, Appellant does not sufficiently explain how modifying a system for providing data and functional logic from a remote server to a local interface for use in an offline session (Hopkins) by including a “code hint” in the data and functional logic that is provided to the local interface (Balasubramanian) would result in “entirely changing the mode of operation of the Hopkins CRM system.” See App. Br. 13. Indeed, the combination of the known system of providing information from a remote server to a local interface for use in a computer session with the known feature that information for use in a computer session includes “code hints” would have resulted in the mere predictable result of providing information from a remote server to a local interface for use in a computer session. Such an expected result would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *KSR Int’l Co.*, 550 U.S. at 416.

Appellant does not provide additional arguments in support of the other claims under appeal. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner did not err in rejecting claims 1–20.

Appeal 2016-002992  
Application 12/539,055

SUMMARY

We affirm the Examiner's rejection of claims 1–14, 16–18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hopkins and Jerrard-Dunne and claims 15 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hopkins, Jerrard-Dunne, and Balasubramanian.

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