



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.
Row 1: 13/909,312, 06/04/2013, Richard Bill Sim, 26295-23508, 4217
Row 2: 87851, 7590, 05/29/2018, Facebook/Fenwick, Silicon Valley Center, 801 California Street, Mountain View, CA 94041, EXAMINER UBALE, GAUTAM
Row 3: ART UNIT 3682, PAPER NUMBER
Row 4: NOTIFICATION DATE 05/29/2018, DELIVERY MODE 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):

ptoc@fenwick.com
fwfacebookpatents@fenwick.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte RICHARD BILL SIM, JUN YANG, MATHEW VARGHESE,
EITAN SHAY, FENG YAN, and SADIK GOKHAN COGLAR

Appeal 2017-003451
Application 13/909,312
Technology Center 3600

Before ST. JOHN COURTENAY III, JOHN P. PINKERTON, and
JOYCE CRAIG, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PINKERTON, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellants¹ appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Final Rejection of claims 1–19, 21, and 22, which are all of the claims pending in this application. Claim 20 is cancelled. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We affirm.

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Introduction

According to Appellants, the “invention relates to advertising, and in particular to monitoring conversion of advertisements and determining fees charged to advertisers.” Spec. ¶ 1.²

Claim 1 is representative and reproduced below:

1. A method comprising:

accessing, by an online system, an ad history associated with a user identifier of a user of the online system, the ad history identifying advertisements presented to the user;

selecting an ad for presentation to a client device of the user;

providing the selected ad for display to the client device;

storing, by the online system, a content identifier (ID) associated with the selected ad in the ad history associated with the user identifier of the user;

receiving, by the online system, the user identifier of the user and a content ID after a conversion event has occurred using a different device associated with the user;

retrieving, by the online system, the ad history associated with the received user identifier;

² Our Decision refers to the Final Office Action mailed Nov. 30, 2015 (“Final Act.”), Appellants’ Appeal Brief filed Apr. 28, 2016 (“App. Br.”) and Reply Brief filed Dec. 30, 2016 (“Reply Br.”), the Examiner’s Answer mailed Nov. 2, 2016 (“Ans.”), and the original Specification filed June 4, 2013 (“Spec.”).

matching, by the online system, the received content ID with the content ID associated with the selected ad stored in the ad history;

determining, by the online system, that the ad caused the conversion event based at least in part on whether a time between the conversion event and the providing of the selected ad to the client device is less than a threshold time period for conversion of the ad; and

determining, by the online system, a fee for presentation of the selected ad to the user, the fee determined based on the determination that the ad caused the conversion event.

App. Br. 20 (Claims App'x).

*Rejection on Appeal*³

Claims 1–19, 21, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to patent-ineligible subject matter.

ANALYSIS

We have reviewed the Examiner's rejection of claims 1–19, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 in light of Appellants' arguments in the Briefs (App. Br. 6–16; Reply Br. 2–8). For the reasons discussed *infra*, we are not persuaded by Appellants' arguments that the Examiner erred in rejecting the claims under § 101.

Applicable Law

³ The Examiner withdrew the rejection of claims 1–22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, which we understand is a withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112(b). Ans. 10. The Examiner also withdrew the rejections of claims 1–22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Ans. 10.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 101, an invention is patent-eligible if it claims a “new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter.” 35 U.S.C. § 101. The Supreme Court, however, has long interpreted § 101 to include an implicit exception: “Laws of nature, natural phenomena, and abstract ideas” are not patentable. *See, e.g., Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l*, 134 S. Ct. 2347, 2354 (2014) (citation omitted).

The Supreme Court, in *Alice*, reiterated the two-step framework previously set forth in *Mayo Collaborative Services v. Prometheus Laboratories, Inc.*, 566 U.S. 66, 75–77 (2012), “for distinguishing patents that claim laws of nature, natural phenomena, and abstract ideas from those that claim patent-eligible applications of those concepts.” *Alice*, 134 S. Ct. at 2355. The first step in the analysis is to “determine whether the claims at issue are directed to one of those patent-ineligible concepts.” *Id.* For example, abstract ideas include, but are not limited to, fundamental economic practices, methods of organizing human activities, an idea of itself, and mathematical formulas or relationships. *Id.* at 2355–57. The “directed to” inquiry asks not whether “the claims *involve* a patent-ineligible concept,” but instead whether, “considered in light of the specification, . . . ‘their character as a whole is directed to excluded subject matter.’” *Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.*, 822 F.3d 1327, 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (citations omitted). In that regard, we determine whether the claims “focus on a specific means or method that improves the relevant technology” or are “directed to a result or effect that itself is the abstract idea and merely invoke generic processes and machinery.” *McRO, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games Am. Inc.*, 837 F.3d 1299, 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (citation omitted).

If, at the first stage of the *Alice* analysis, we conclude that the claim is not directed to a patent-ineligible concept, it is considered patent eligible under § 101 and the inquiry ends. *Rapid Litig. Mgmt. Ltd. v. CellzDirect, Inc.*, 827 F.3d 1042, 1047 (Fed. Cir. 2016).

If 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 there are additional elements that “‘transform the nature of the claim’ into a patent-eligible application.” *Alice*, 134 S. Ct. at 2355 (quoting *Mayo*, 566 U.S. at 79, 78). 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.* (brackets in original) (quoting *Mayo*, 566 U.S. at 72–73). The prohibition against patenting an abstract idea “‘cannot be circumvented by attempting to limit the use of the formula to a particular technological environment’ or adding ‘insignificant postsolution activity.’” *Bilski v. Kappos*, 561 U.S. 593, 610–11 (2010) (internal citation omitted).

*Appellants’ Arguments*⁴

Appellants argue the Examiner’s conclusion that the claims are “directed to targeted advertisements based on [a] fee that caused ad conversion” is nonsensical and not possible because “the claimed ‘conversion’ occurs before the fee is determined.” App. Br. 7. Appellants

⁴ Appellants argue claims 1–19, 21, and 22 as a group. App. Br. 6–16; Reply Br. 2–8. We consider method claim 1 to be representative of the claimed subject matter on appeal and, therefore, we decide the § 101 rejection of claims 1–19, 21, and 22 on the basis of representative claim 1. See 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv).

also argue that the claims recite patent-eligible subject matter because “they, at best, merely relate to or involve . . . [an] abstract idea,” which is insufficient to meet the first step of the *Alice* test. *Id.* at 8. According to Appellants, the Examiner “improperly ignores the claim language and dissects the claims” in concluding they are directed to an abstract idea. *Id.* at 8–9. Appellants argue the Examiner fails to meet the burden under 35 U.S.C. § 132 to provide notice and reasons for the rejection. Reply Br. 3. Appellants also argue that, contrary to the Examiner’s finding the claims do not recite a particular way the idea is implemented or how it is performed, “[t]he claims clearly recite a particular way to attribute a conversion that occurs on one client device to an impression that occurs on a different client device associated with the same user.” App. Br. 9. Appellants further argue that, like the claims in certain examples provided in USPTO guidelines, the “claims are directed to a ‘business challenge that is particular to the Internet,’ namely processes for determining/tracking conversions whether an advertisement impression occurs on a client device associated with a user and a conversion occurs on a different client device associated with the user.” *Id.* at 10–11. Appellants also argue the claims recite patentable subject matter because “[t]he invention provides a solution specifically customized to address an *online* environment where ad impressions and ad conversions can occur on separate devices.” *Id.* at 11–12; Reply Br. 4. Appellants also contend the claimed invention is not directed to an abstract idea because the claims do not preempt all means of the abstract idea noted in the Answer. Reply Br. 3–4.

In regard to the second step of the *Alice* test, Appellants argue “[t]he claims of *DDR Holdings* and the claims of this application are similar in that

they both recite methods for detecting various forms of data and data objects, processing the data and data objects, and performing an action based on the processing” and consequently the claims ““overcome a problem specifically arising in the realm of computer networks.”” *Id.* at 13–14. Appellants further argue “[t]here is no traditional business analog for the claimed invention outside of interconnected computer networks, let alone outside of social networking systems.” *Id.* at 14. According to Appellants, “the communications with the client devices occur over a computer network and do not have a brick/[mortar] counterpart.” *Id.* at 15. Appellants further argue that, like the claims in *DDR Holdings*, the claims here “amount to more than simply stating ‘apply the abstract idea on the Internet.’” *Id.* Appellants further contend claim 1 is similar to Internet content filtering addressed in *Bascom* where the Federal Circuit “noted that an inventive concept can be found in non-conventional and non-generic arrangement of known, conventional pieces.” Reply Br. 7–8; see *Bascom Global Internet Servs., Inc. v. AT&T Mobility LLC*, 827 F. 3d 1341, 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2016).

Alice Step One

The Examiner concludes claims 1–19, 21, and 22 are directed to an abstract idea, specifically:

accessing an ad history associated with user . . . , selecting an ad for presentation . . . , storing content identifier associated with the selected ad . . . , receiving user identifying information associated with user . . . , retrieving the advertisement history . . . , determining that the ad caused the conversion . . . , determining a fee for presentation . . . , etc. is fundamental economic practices and a method of organizing human activities. That is, it is directed to targeted advertisements based on fee that caused ad conversion, which the Office finds to be analogous to both fundamental economic practices and the

claimed steps as a method of organizing human activities. For instance, the claims merely describe the abstract idea of doing something, they do not articulate a particular way the idea is implemented or how it is being performed.

Final Act. 3–4.

Considering the focus of claim 1 as a whole, we agree with the Examiner’s conclusion that claim 1 is directed to an abstract idea—the fundamental economic practice of distributing advertisements and determining a fee for presenting advertisements to users. We see no meaningful difference in claim 1 and similar or analogous claims in other cases that our reviewing court has concluded are directed to an abstract idea. *See OIP Techs., Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 788 F.3d 1359, 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (“automatic pricing method and apparatus for use in electronic commerce”); *Ultramercial, Inc. v. Hulu, LLC*, 772 F.3d 709, 715 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (“using advertising as an exchange or currency”); *Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, Nat’l Ass’n*, 776 F.3d 1343, 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (“The concept of data collection, recognition, and storage is undisputedly well-known.”).

We also agree with the Examiner that claim 1 is directed to a combination of concepts that “are identified by the courts as . . . abstract ideas.” Ans. 7. In that regard, we agree with the Examiner that the steps of “storing” a content identifier associated with the ad, “receiving” the user identification and content ID after a conversion event has occurred using a different device, “retrieving” the ad history associated with the user identifier, “matching” the received content ID with the content ID associated with the selected ad stored in ad history, and “determining” the ad caused the conversion event are analogous to the abstract idea of comparing new

and stored information and using rules to identify options. *Id.* (citing *SmartGene*). In *SmartGene, Inc. v. Advanced Biological Laboratories, SA*, 555 Fed. App'x 950, 954 (Fed. Cir. 2014), the Federal Circuit concluded the claims were patent ineligible because they did “no more than call on a ‘computing device,’ with basic functionality for comparing stored and input data and rules, to do what doctors do routinely.”

We note that the step of “determining” the ad caused the conversion event is based in part on whether the time between the conversion event and providing the selected ad to the client device is “less than a threshold time period for conversion of the ad.” Claim 1 also recites the step of “determining” a fee for presentation of the selected ad to the user. We conclude that both of these “determining” steps could be performed by a human with pen and paper and involve mathematical calculations. In that regard, our reviewing court has held that “analyzing information by steps people go through in their minds, or by mathematical algorithms, without more, [are] essentially mental processes within the abstract-idea category.” *See Elec. Power Grp., LLC v. Alstom S.A.*, 830 F.3d 1350, 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (claims focus on the abstract idea of collecting information, analyzing it, and displaying certain results of the collection and analysis); *Synopsys, Inc. v. Mentor Graphics Corp.*, 839 F.3d 1138, 1146 (Fed. Cir. 2016). “[T]he fact that the required calculations could be performed more efficiently via a computer does not materially alter the patent eligibility of the claimed subject matter.” *Bancorp Servs., L.L.C. v. Sun Life Assurance Co. of Can. (U.S.)*, 687 F.3d 1266, 1278 (Fed. Cir. 2012).

Merely combining several abstract ideas does not render the combination any less abstract. *RecogniCorp, LLC v. Nintendo Co., Ltd.*, 855

F.3d 1322, 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (“Adding one abstract idea . . . to another abstract idea . . . does not render the claim non-abstract.”); *see also FairWarning IP, LLC v. Iatric Sys., Inc.*, 839 F.3d 1089, 1094 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (determining the pending claims were directed to a combination of abstract ideas). Thus, the fact that claim 1 combines abstract ideas that are analogous to “comparing new and stored information and using rules to identify options” and “analyzing information by steps people go through in their minds, or by mathematical algorithms” does not render claim 1 any less abstract.

We are not persuaded by Appellants’ arguments that the Examiner erred in concluding claim 1 is directed to an abstract idea.⁵ App. Br. 7–12. First, Appellants’ argument criticizing the rejection because the Examiner concluded claim 1 is “directed to targeted advertisements based on [a] fee that caused ad conversion” (*see* App. Br. 7) is not persuasive because the Examiner’s statement is obviously misplaced when considered in context of the Examiner’s rejection as a whole. The Examiner’s recitation of the claim steps and overall analysis of claim 1 evidence that the Examiner was well aware that the claimed conversion occurs *before* the fee is determined. *See* Final Act. 3–4; Ans. 6–7. Second, contrary to Appellants’ argument, the Examiner did not improperly dissect the claim. App. Br. 8–9. Instead, as

⁵ Although Appellants argue that the Examiner failed to meet the burden under 35 U.S.C. § 132 to provide notice and reasons for the rejection (*see* Reply Br. 3), we disagree. The Examiner stated the statutory basis for the rejection and performed the two-part *Alice* test. *See* Final Act. 3–5; Ans. 6–10. Thus, we conclude the Examiner provided an adequate explanation of the rejection under § 101 and met the notice requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 132. *See In re Jung*, 637 F.3d 1356, 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2011).

discussed *supra*, the Examiner considered the different concepts in claim 1 and, in doing so, considered all of the limitations of claim 1.

Third, Appellants' argument that the Examiner is incorrect in concluding claim 1 does not recite a particular way the idea is implemented because claim 1 recites "a particular way to attribute a conversion that occurs on one client device to an impression that occurs on a different client device" is not persuasive. *See id.* at 9–10; Reply Br. 4. Contrary to Appellants' argument, the step of "determining the ad caused the conversion event" is directed to the results of the functions of "providing" the ad to one client device, "receiving" the user identifier and content ID after a conversion event occurred using a different device, "retrieving" the user's ad history, "matching" the received content ID with the content ID associated with the selected ad, and "determining" the ad caused the conversion event based on whether the time period between the conversion and the selected ad "is less than a threshold time period for conversion of the ad." Thus, the step of "determining the ad caused the conversion event" is directed to the results of storing, comparing, and manipulating data, rather than "any particular assertedly inventive technology for performing these functions" or "do[ing] so in a non-abstract way." *See Two-Way Media Ltd. v. Comcast Cable Commc'ns, LLC.*, 874 F.3d 1329, 1337–38 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (finding claims directed to the functional results of converting, routing, controlling, monitoring, and accumulating records manipulate data "but fail[] to do so in a non-abstract way" (*id.* at 1338)).

Fourth, we are not persuaded by Appellants' arguments that the claims are directed to a business challenge particular to the internet and provide a solution "customized to address an *online* environment." App. Br.

10–12. Although Appellants correctly argue that “ad impressions and ad conversions can occur on separate devices” in the method of claim 1, the claim does not recite any specific technical way to “provid[e] the selected advertisement to a client device” or “receiv[e information] . . . [that] a conversion event has occurred [on] a different [client] device.” App. Br. 12; Spec. ¶ 6; *see Accenture Global Servs., GmbH v. Guidewire Software, Inc.*, 728 F.3d 1336, 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2013) (admonishing that “the important inquiry for a § 101 analysis is to look to the claim”; “the complexity of the implementing software or the level of detail in the specification does not transform a claim reciting only an abstract concept into a patent-eligible system or method”). Appellants have also not identified any portion of the Specification, or provided any evidence or technical reasoning, demonstrating that claim 1 achieves a technical advance or improvement pertaining to the hardware or software used in the online environment of claim 1, including transmitting an advertisement, receiving information regarding a conversion event, or determining whether a time period is less than a threshold time period.

Fifth, we also are not persuaded by Appellants’ argument that “the claimed invention is not directed to an abstract idea because the claims do not preempt all means of the abstract idea noted in the Answer.” Reply Br. 3–4. “While preemption may signal patent ineligible subject matter, the absence of complete preemption does not demonstrate patent eligibility. . . . Where a patent’s claims are deemed only to disclose patent ineligible subject matter under the *Mayo* framework, as they are in this case, preemption concerns are fully addressed and made moot.” *Ariosa Diagnostics, Inc. v. Sequenom, Inc.*, 788 F.3d 1371, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2015); *see also OIP Techs.*,

Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc., 788 F.3d 1359, 1362–63 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (“that the claims do not preempt all price optimization or may be limited to price optimization in the e-commerce setting do[es] not make them any less abstract”).

Alice Step Two

Regarding step two of the *Alice* analysis, the Examiner finds the additional claim elements, considered individually and as an ordered combination, do not amount to significantly more than the abstract idea. Ans. 9–10. The Examiner finds the limitations of “an online system” and “a client device” are recited at a high level of generality and as performing generic computer functions routinely used in computer applications. *Id.* at 9; *see* Spec. ¶ 83. The Examiner also concludes the terms “apparatus” and “computing device,” as used in the claims, are construed as a general-purpose computing device, consistent with paragraph 83 of the Specification. *Id.* The Examiner further finds the “[g]eneric computer components recited as performing generic computer functions that are well-understood, routine and conventional activities amount to no more than implementing the abstract idea with a computerized system.” *Id.* at 9–10. Thus, the Examiner concludes “the claim does not amount to significantly more than the abstract idea.” *Id.* at 10. For the reasons stated by the Examiner, we agree with the Examiner’s findings and conclusions.

We are not persuaded by Appellants’ arguments regarding step two of the analysis. Initially, we are not persuaded by Appellants’ arguments that the claims here are similar to the claims in *DDR Holdings* and consequently the claims overcome a problem arising in the “realm of computer networks,” for which there is no traditional business analog. App. Br. 13–14. In *DDR*

Holdings, the Federal Circuit explained that the patent-eligible claims specified “how interactions with the Internet are manipulated to yield a desired result . . . that overrides the routine and conventional sequence of events ordinarily triggered by the click of a hyperlink.” *DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com L.P.*, 773 F.3d 1245, 1258 (Fed. Cir. 2014). The court reasoned that those claims recited a technological solution “necessarily rooted in computer technology in order to overcome a problem specifically arising in the realm of computer networks.” *Id.* at 1257. That is not the case here. The mere fact that the method of claim 1 is performed in an “online system” does not establish that claim 1 is directed to a “problem specifically arising in the realm of computer networks.”

Contrary to Appellants’ arguments, claim 1 does not “focus on a specific means or method that improves the relevant technology,” but is “directed to a result or effect that itself is the abstract idea and merely invoke[s] generic processes and machinery.” *McRO*, 837 F.3d at 1314 (citation omitted). This is not enough to transform an abstract idea into patent-eligible subject matter. *See, e.g., Alice*, 134 S. Ct. at 2360 (explaining that claims that “amount to ‘nothing significantly more’ than an instruction to apply the abstract idea . . . using some unspecified, generic computer” “is not ‘enough’ to transform an abstract idea into a patent-eligible invention” (quoting *Mayo*, 566 U.S. at 77, 79)); *Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Capital One Fin. Corp.*, 850 F.3d 1332, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (“[T]he claim language here provides only a result-oriented solution, with insufficient detail for how a computer accomplishes it. Our law demands more.”).

Second, are we not persuaded by Appellants’ argument that what is missing in the Examiner’s analysis “is any discussion of the points of

novelty that actually distinguish the claims from the prior art—i.e., the inventive concepts that provide ‘something more’ than the alleged abstract idea.” Reply Br. 5. A finding of novelty or non-obviousness does not automatically lead to the conclusion that the claimed subject matter is patent-eligible. Although the second step in the *Mayo/Alice* framework is termed a search for an “inventive concept,” the analysis is not an evaluation of novelty or non-obviousness, but rather, a search for “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.’” *Alice Corp.*, 134 S. Ct. at 2355 (quoting *Mayo*, 566 U.S. at 72–73). “Groundbreaking, innovative, or even brilliant discovery does not by itself satisfy the § 101 inquiry.” *Ass’n for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc.*, 569 U.S. 576, 591 (2013). A novel and non-obvious claim directed to a purely abstract idea is, nonetheless, patent-ineligible. *See Mayo*, 566 U.S. at 90; *see also Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 188–89 (1981) (“The ‘novelty’ of any element or steps in a process, or even of the process itself, is of no relevance in determining whether the subject matter of a claim falls within the § 101 categories of possibly patentable subject matter”).

Third, we are not persuaded by Appellants’ argument that “[c]laim 1 involves an ordered combination of steps that is significantly more than any abstract idea, similar to Internet content filtering addressed in *Bascom*.” Reply Br. 7. We agree with Appellants that the court in *Bascom* noted that an inventive concept can be found in a non-conventional and non-generic arrangement of known, conventional pieces. *See Bascom*, 827 F.3d at 1350. However, the claims here are distinguishable from those in *Bascom*. In

Bascom, the system claims were directed to a “content filtering system for filtering content retrieved from an Internet computer network,” which the court held were directed to an abstract idea. *Id.* at 1348–49. The court further held the claims included an inventive concept in the ordered combination of system components, including a local client computer and a remote ISP server connected to the client computer and Internet computer network providing for “the installation of a filtering tool at a specific location, remote from the end-users, with customizable filtering features specific to each end user.” *Id.* at 1350. Claim 1 here does not involve a similar or analogous arrangement or “ordered combination” of components.

Thus, we see nothing in the limitations of claim 1, considered “both individually and as an ordered combination,” that transforms the claimed abstract idea of claim 1 into patent-eligible subject matter. Ans. 5.

Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above, we sustain the Examiner’s rejection of claim 1, and of grouped claims 2–19, 21, and 22, under § 101. To the extent Appellants have not advanced separate, substantive arguments for particular claims, such arguments are waived. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv).

DECISION

We affirm the Examiner’s decision rejecting claims 1–19, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

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)(2016).

Appeal 2017-003451
Application 13/909,312

AFFIRMED