



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.
11/247,006	10/07/2005	Narender Reddy	0297-0002	6836
33297	7590	01/22/2020	EXAMINER	
Beem Patent Law Firm 53 W. JACKSON BLVD. SUITE # 1352 Chicago, IL 60604			MORGAN, ROBERT W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3626	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/22/2020	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):

USPTO@dockettrak.com
patents@beemlaw.com
uspto@beemlaw.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte NARENDER REDDY

Appeal 2017-008036
Application 11/247,006
Technology Center 3600

Before ANTON W. FETTING, NINA L. MEDLOCK, and
MATTHEW S. MEYERS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

FETTING, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE¹

Narender Reddy (Appellant²) seeks review under 35 U.S.C. § 134 of a
final rejection of claims 1–28 and 30, the only claims pending in the

¹ Our decision will make reference to the Appellant’s Appeal Brief (“Appeal Br.,” filed August 30, 2016) and Reply Brief (“Reply Br.,” filed May 8, 2017), and the Examiner’s Answer (“Ans.,” mailed March 6, 2017), and Final Action (“Final Act.,” mailed May 13, 2016).

application on appeal.³ We have jurisdiction over the appeal pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

The Appellant invented a way of managing patient medical records and billing data. Specification para. 1.

An understanding of the invention can be derived from a reading of exemplary claim 13, which is reproduced below (bracketed matter and some paragraphing added).

13. A method for managing medical records and billing data comprising:

[1] storing one or more medical forms on a first computer;

[2] converting, using said first computer, each of said forms to a sequence of screen displays in a form displayable on a handheld device;

[3] transmitting, by the first computer, said sequence of screen displays to the handheld device;

[4] receiving, by the handheld device, information in each of said screen displays as a sequence of selections from one or more display menus comprising a portion of said screen displays;

and

[5] uploading, by the handheld device, the information entered via said screens to the first computer.

² We use the word “Appellant” to refer to “applicant” as defined in 37 C.F.R. § 1.42. Appellant identifies the real party in interest as Narender Reddy (Appeal Br. 1).

³ Appellant presented oral hearing arguments December 5, 2019.

The Examiner relies upon the following prior art:

Name	Reference	Date
Jones	US 2003/0014284 A1	Jan. 16, 2003
Adolph	US 2003/0212581 A1	Nov. 13, 2003
Metzger	US 2005/0182667 A1	Aug. 18, 2005

Claims 1–28 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to a judicial exception without significantly more.

Claims 13–16 and 18–23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Jones, Metzger, and Adolph.

ISSUES

The issues of eligible subject matter turn primarily on whether the claims recite more than abstract conceptual advice of results desired.

The issues of obviousness turn primarily on whether the prior art describes downloading screens that are used for entering data.

FACTS PERTINENT TO THE ISSUES

The following enumerated Findings of Fact (FF) are believed to be supported by a preponderance of the evidence.

Facts Related to the Prior Art

Jones

01. Jones is directed to receiving and formatting medical information and facilitating medical treatment and related billing that enables a health care provider to take a comprehensive and accurate physical examination and medical history of a patient that is compliant with substantially all third party billing requirements. Jones para. 4.

Metzger

02. Metzger is directed to performing data collection of insurance related submitted data, provided by an applicant for insurance, on a submitted form. Metzger uses a data input portion that inputs the submitted form so that the submitted data on the submitted form are available to a data entry operator; and a data collector tool, which processes entered data that are entered by the data entry operator, onto an internal electronic form, based on the submitted data submitted by the applicant. The data collector includes a form flow portion that presents the data entry operator with a series of form flows for collection of the submitted data, the form flows progressing through various user interface screens in collection of the submitted data, the form flows using content sensitive logic; and a metadata portion that generates metadata, the metadata containing information about the entered data, the metadata being progressively generated during progression of the form flows through the various user interface screens. Metzger para. 4.

Adolph

03. Adolph is directed to data capture and more specifically to capturing medical information. Adolph para. 2.

ANALYSIS

Claims 1–28 and 30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to a judicial exception without significantly more

STEP 1⁴

Claim 13, as a method claim, nominally recites one of the enumerated categories of eligible subject matter in 35 U.S.C. § 101. The issue before us is whether it is directed to a judicial exception without significantly more.

STEP 2

The Supreme Court

set forth a framework for distinguishing patents that claim laws of nature, natural phenomena, and abstract ideas from those that claim patent-eligible applications of those concepts. First, . . . determine whether the claims at issue are directed to one of those patent-ineligible concepts. If so, we then ask, “[w]hat else is there in the claims before us? To answer that question, . . . consider the elements of each claim both individually and “as an ordered combination” to determine whether the additional elements “transform the nature of the claim” into a patent-eligible application. [The Court] described step two of this analysis as a 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.”

Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank Int’l, 573 U.S. 208, 217–18 (2014) (citations omitted) (citing *Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs, Inc.*, 566 U.S. 66 (2012)). To perform this test, we must first determine what the claims are directed to. This begins by determining whether the claims recite one of the judicial exceptions (a law of nature, a natural phenomenon, or an

⁴ For continuity of analysis, we adopt the steps nomenclature from the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance, 84 Fed. Reg. 50 (Jan. 7, 2019) (“Revised Guidance”).

abstract idea). Then, if the claims recite a judicial exception, determining whether the claims at issue are directed to the recited judicial exception, or whether the recited judicial exception is integrated into a practical application of that exception, i.e., that the claims “apply, rely on, or use the judicial exception in a manner that imposes a meaningful limit on the judicial exception, such that the claim is more than a drafting effort designed to monopolize the judicial exception.” Revised Guidance, 84 Fed. Reg. at 54. If the claims are directed to a judicial exception, then finally determining whether the claims provide an inventive concept because the additional elements recited in the claims provide significantly more than the recited judicial exception.

STEP 2A Prong 1

At a high level, and for our preliminary analysis, we note that method claim 13 recites storing form data, converting form data to screen data, transmitting screen data, receiving selection data, and uploading data. Converting form to screen data is data analysis and modification. Uploading data is transmitting data. Thus, claim 13 recites storing, analyzing, modifying, receiving, and transmitting data. None of the limitations recites technological implementation details for any of these steps, but instead recite only results desired by any and all possible means.

From this we see that claim 13 does not recite the judicial exceptions of either natural phenomena or laws of nature.

Under Supreme Court precedent, claims directed purely to an abstract idea are patent ineligible. As set forth in the Revised Guidance, which extracts and synthesizes key concepts identified by the courts, abstract ideas

include (1) mathematical concepts⁵, (2) certain methods of organizing human activity⁶, and (3) mental processes⁷. Among those certain methods of organizing human activity listed in the Revised Guidance are managing interactions between people. Like those concepts, claim 13 recites the concept of medical information management. Specifically, claim 13 recites operations that would ordinarily take place in advising one to cut up medical forms into smaller pieces to aid in gathering and managing medical information. The advice to cut up medical forms into smaller pieces involves managing medical records and billing data, which is a managerial act, and converting medical data, which is an act ordinarily performed in the stream of medical management. For example, claim 13 recites “managing medical records and billing data,” which is an activity that would take place whenever one is managing medical data. Similarly, claim 1 recites “converting . . . [the medical] forms to a sequence of screen displays,” which is also characteristic of managing medical data.

The Examiner determines the claims to be directed to organizing human activity. Final Act. 2.

⁵ See, e.g., *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 71–72 (1972); *Bilski v. Kappos*, 561 U.S. 593, 611 (2010); *Mackay Radio & Telegraph Co. v. Radio Corp. of Am.*, 306 U.S. 86, 94 (1939); *SAP America, Inc. v. InvestPic, LLC*, 898 F.3d 1161, 1163 (Fed. Cir. 2018).

⁶ See, e.g., *Bilski*, 561 U.S. at 628; *Alice*, 573 U.S. at 219-20; *Ultramercial, Inc. v. Hulu, LLC*, 772 F.3d 709, 715 (Fed. Cir. 2014); *Smart Sys. Innovations, LLC v. Chicago Transit Auth.*, 873 F.3d 1364, 1383 (Fed. Cir. 2017); *In re Marco Guldenaar Holding B.V.*, 911 F.3d 1157, 1160–61 (Fed. Cir. 2018).

⁷ See, e.g., *Benson*, 409 U.S. at 67; *CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.*, 654 F.3d 1366, 1371–72 (Fed. Cir. 2011); *Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Symantec Corp.*, 838 F.3d 1307, 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2016).

The preamble to claim 13 recites that it is a method for managing medical records and billing data. The steps in claim 13 result in receiving and uploading medical form data absent any technological mechanism other than a conventional computer for doing so.

As to the specific limitations, limitations 1–5 recite generic and conventional storing, analyzing, modifying, receiving, and transmitting of medical form data to convert the data into smaller amounts for more screens, which advise one to apply generic functions to get to these results. The limitations thus recite advice for cutting up medical forms into smaller pieces. To advocate cutting up medical forms into smaller pieces is conceptual advice for results desired and not technological operations.

The Specification at paragraph 1 describes the invention as relating to managing patient medical records and billing data. Thus, all this intrinsic evidence shows that claim 13 recites medical information management. This is consistent with the Examiner's determination.

This, in turn, is an example of managing interactions between people as a certain method of organizing human activity because managing medical information is the way to communicate medical information to coordinate medical practice between practitioner and patient. The concept of medical information management by cutting up medical forms into smaller pieces is one idea for managing the accumulation of such information. The steps recited in claim 13 are part of how this might conceptually be premised.

Our reviewing court has found claims to be directed to abstract ideas when they recited similar subject matter. *Digitech Image Technologies, LLC v. Electronics for Imaging, Inc.*, 758 F.3d 1344, 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (process of taking plural data sets and combining them into a single data

set); *Content Extraction and Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank*, 776 F.3d 1343, 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (data collection, recognition, and storage); *OIP Technologies, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 788 F.3d 1359, 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (data optimization); *Trading Techs. Int’l, Inc. v. IBG LLC*, 921 F.3d 1084, 1093 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (claimed steps on “routing data gathering, and displaying information” not eligible, despite “recit[ing] a purportedly new arrangement of generic information that assists traders in processing information more quickly”).

From this we conclude that at least to this degree, claim 13 recites medical information management by cutting up medical forms into smaller pieces, which is managing interactions between people, one of certain methods of organizing human activity identified in the Revised Guidance, and, thus, an abstract idea.

STEP 2A Prong 2

The next issue is whether claim 13 not only recites, but is more precisely directed to this concept itself or whether it is instead directed to some technological implementation or application of, or improvement to, this concept, i.e., integrated into a practical application.⁸

At the same time, we tread carefully in construing this exclusionary principle lest it swallow all of patent law. At some level, “all inventions ... embody, use, reflect, rest upon, or apply laws of nature, natural phenomena, or abstract ideas.” Thus, an invention is not rendered ineligible for patent simply because it involves an abstract concept. “[A]pplication[s]” of such concepts “ ‘to a new and useful end,’ ” we have said, remain eligible for patent protection. Accordingly, in applying the § 101 exception, we must distinguish between patents that

⁸ See, e.g., *Alice*, 573 U.S. at 223, discussing *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175 (1981).

claim the “ ‘buildin[g] block[s]’ ” of human ingenuity and those that integrate the building blocks into something more.

Alice, 573 U.S. at 217 (citations omitted).

Taking the claim elements separately, the operation performed by the computer at each step of the process is expressed purely in terms of results, devoid of implementation details. Steps 1 and 4 are pure data gathering steps. Limitations describing the nature of the data do not alter this. Steps 2 and 3 recite basic conventional data operations such as generating, updating, and storing data. Step 5 is insignificant post solution activity, such as storing, transmitting, or displaying the results. Step 2 recites generic computer processing expressed in terms of results desired by any and all possible means and so present no more than conceptual advice. All purported inventive aspects reside in how the data are interpreted and the results desired, and not in how the process physically enforces such a data interpretation or in how the processing technologically achieves those results.

Viewed as a whole, Appellant’s claim 13 simply recites the concept of medical information management by cutting up medical forms into smaller pieces as performed by a generic computer. This is no more than conceptual advice on the parameters for this concept and the generic computer processes necessary to process those parameters, and do not recite any particular implementation.

Claim 13 does not, for example, purport to improve the functioning of the computer itself. Nor does it effect an improvement in any other technology or technical field. The 21 pages of specification do not bulge

with disclosure, but only spell out different generic equipment⁹ and parameters that might be applied using this concept and the particular steps such conventional processing would entail based on the concept of medical information management by cutting up medical forms into smaller pieces under different scenarios. They do not describe any particular improvement in the manner a computer functions. Instead, claim 13 at issue amounts to nothing significantly more than an instruction to apply medical information management by cutting up medical forms into smaller pieces using some unspecified, generic computer. Under our precedents, that is not enough to transform an abstract idea into a patent-eligible invention. *See Alice*, 573 U.S. at 225–26.

None of the limitations reflects an improvement in the functioning of a computer, or an improvement to other technology or technical field, applies or uses a judicial exception to effect a particular treatment or prophylaxis for a disease or medical condition, implements a judicial exception with, or uses a judicial exception in conjunction with, a particular machine or manufacture that is integral to the claim, effects a transformation or reduction of a particular article to a different state or thing, or applies or uses the judicial exception in some other meaningful way beyond generally linking the use of the judicial exception to a particular technological environment, such that the claim as a whole is more than a drafting effort designed to monopolize the exception.

We conclude that claim 13 is directed to achieving the result of medical information management by advising one to cut up medical forms

⁹ The Specification describes a hand held or laptop computer. Spec. para. 13.

into smaller pieces for communicating medical information among medical parties, as distinguished from a technological improvement for achieving or applying that result. This amounts to managing interactions between people, which falls within certain methods of organizing human activity that constitute abstract ideas. The claim does not integrate the judicial exception into a practical application.

STEP 2B

The next issue is whether claim 13 provides an inventive concept because the additional elements recited in the claim provide significantly more than the recited judicial exception.

The introduction of a computer into the claims does not generally alter the analysis at *Mayo* step two.

the mere recitation of a generic computer cannot transform a patent-ineligible abstract idea into a patent-eligible invention. Stating an abstract idea “while adding the words ‘apply it’” is not enough for patent eligibility. Nor is limiting the use of an abstract idea “to a particular technological environment.” Stating an abstract idea while adding the words “apply it with a computer” simply combines those two steps, with the same deficient result. Thus, if a patent’s recitation of a computer amounts to a mere instruction to “implement[t]” an abstract idea “on . . . a computer,” that addition cannot impart patent eligibility. This conclusion accords with the preemption concern that undergirds our § 101 jurisprudence. Given the ubiquity of computers, wholly generic computer implementation is not generally the sort of “additional feature[e]” that provides any “practical assurance that the process is more than a drafting effort designed to monopolize the [abstract idea] itself.”

Alice, 573 U.S. at 223–24 (citations omitted).

“[T]he relevant question is whether the claims here do more than simply instruct the practitioner to implement the abstract idea [] on a generic computer.” *Alice*, 573 U.S. at 225. They do not.

Taking the claim elements separately, the function performed by the computer at each step of the process is purely conventional. Using a computer for storing, analyzing, modifying, receiving, and transmitting data amounts to electronic data query and retrieval—one of the most basic functions of a computer. All of these computer functions are generic, routine, conventional computer activities that are performed only for their conventional uses. *See Elec. Power Grp. LLC v. Alstom S.A.*, 830 F.3d 1350, 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2016). *See also In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litig.*, 639 F.3d 1303, 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (“Absent a possible narrower construction of the terms ‘processing,’ ‘receiving,’ and ‘storing,’ . . . those functions can be achieved by any general purpose computer without special programming”). None of these activities is used in some unconventional manner nor does any produce some unexpected result. Appellant does not contend it invented any of these activities. In short, each step does no more than require a generic computer to perform generic computer functions. As to the data operated upon, “even if a process of collecting and analyzing information is ‘limited to particular content’ or a particular ‘source,’ that limitation does not make the collection and analysis other than abstract.” *SAP America, Inc. v. InvestPic LLC*, 898 F.3d 1161, 1168 (Fed. Cir. 2018).

Considered as an ordered combination, the computer components of Appellant’s claim 13 add nothing that is not already present when the steps are considered separately. The sequence of data reception-analysis-

modification-transmission is equally generic and conventional. *See Ultramercial, Inc. v. Hulu, LLC*, 772 F.3d 709, 715 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (sequence of receiving, selecting, offering for exchange, display, allowing access, and receiving payment recited an abstraction), *Inventor Holdings, LLC v. Bed Bath & Beyond, Inc.*, 876 F.3d 1372, 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (sequence of data retrieval, analysis, modification, generation, display, and transmission), *Two-Way Media Ltd. v. Comcast Cable Communications, LLC*, 874 F.3d 1329, 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (sequence of processing, routing, controlling, and monitoring). The ordering of the steps is therefore ordinary and conventional.

We conclude that claim 13 does not provide an inventive concept because the additional elements recited in the claim do not provide significantly more than the recited judicial exception.

REMAINING CLAIMS

Claim 13 is representative. The remaining method claims merely describe process parameters. We conclude that the method claims at issue are directed to a patent-ineligible concept itself, and not to the practical application of that concept.

As to the structural claims, they

are no different from the method claims in substance. The method claims recite the abstract idea implemented on a generic computer; the system claims recite a handful of generic computer components configured to implement the same idea. This Court has long “warn[ed] ... against” interpreting § 101 “in ways that make patent eligibility ‘depend simply on the draftsman’s art.’”

Alice, 573 U.S. at 226. As a corollary, the claims are not directed to any particular machine.

LEGAL CONCLUSION

From these determinations we further determine that the claims do not recite an improvement to the functioning of the computer itself or to any other technology or technical field, a particular machine, a particular transformation, or other meaningful limitations. From this we conclude the claims are directed to the judicial exception of the abstract idea of certain methods of organizing human activity as exemplified by the managing interactions between people of medical information management by advising one to cut up medical forms into smaller pieces, without significantly more.

APPELLANT'S ARGUMENTS

As to Appellant's Appeal Brief arguments, we adopt the Examiner's determinations and analysis from Final Action 2–3 and Answer 2–14 and reach similar legal conclusions. We now turn to the Reply Brief.

We are not persuaded by Appellant's argument that "the Board already held these claims to be patent eligible." Reply Br. 2. This is not true. The Board has not opined on the issue. Appellant attempts to equate the fact that the Board did not address the issue of eligibility where no such rejection was placed at issue with an affirmative holding of eligibility.

There is no basis for such a conclusion.

We are not persuaded by Appellant's argument that "Appellant's claims provide technical solutions to technical problems." *Id.* Appellant first contends the use of a server is a technical solution. *Id.* Simply calling for a server is insufficient for eligibility.

The use and arrangement of conventional and generic computer components recited in the claims—such as a database, user terminal, and server— do not transform the claim, as a whole,

into “significantly more” than a claim to the abstract idea itself. “We have repeatedly held that such invocations of computers and networks that are not even arguably inventive are ‘insufficient to pass the test of an inventive concept in the application’ of an abstract idea.”

Credit Acceptance Corp. v. Westlake Servs., 859 F.3d 1044, 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (citations omitted).

Appellant next contends that claim 24’s “selectively usable data transfer facility for downloading and uploading the data” is a technical solution. Reply Br. 2. But this is no more than a label for a conceptual idea devoid of technological implementation details. Appellant goes on to enumerate high level benefits the idea produces. *Id.* But although abstract ideas are often useful, this does not make them eligible. “That the automation can ‘result in life altering consequences,’ is laudable, but it does not render it any less abstract.” *Univ. of Fla. Research Found., Inc. v. Gen. Elec. Co.*, 916 F.3d 1363, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (citation omitted).

Appellant next contends that the “creation of such systems and processes required an integration of electronic hardware and development of software to allow effective synchronization of these components.” Reply Br. 3. Appellant goes on to contend that the inventor

developed *custom software programs to run on the PDA* and synchronize with other supporting and interconnected application software as well as hardware-specific operating systems, to access data stored in a binary format, download such data and display such data to be legible as well as useful for the physician and medical services provider.

Reply Br. 4. But no such integration technological implementation details are recited in the claims, nor are technological process details described in the Specification.

The main problem that Two-Way Media cannot overcome is that the *claim*—as opposed to something purportedly described in the specification—is missing an inventive concept. While the specification may describe a purported innovative “scalable architecture,” claim 1 of the ’187 patent does not.

Two-Way Media Ltd. v. Comcast Cable Commc’ns, LLC, 874 F.3d 1329, 1338–1339 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (citation omitted).

Appellant next contends these capabilities were unavailable on conventional PSAs at the time of the invention. Reply Br. 6. But this is entirely conclusory and absent evidentiary support. It also defies common sense as the ability to parse and cut data streams is as old as data processing. To the extent Appellant means that newly emerging technology for presenting data at the time of the invention did not have such capability, this is not commensurate with the broad scope of the claims.

We are not persuaded by Appellant’s argument that “the Answer still fails to clearly articulate a rational[e] for why the claims are directed to an abstract idea.” *Id.* Appellant contends that the Examiner’s determinations are not specific, not that they are non-existent. We expand upon the specificity *supra*.

We are not persuaded by Appellant’s argument that the “Answer’s conclusory allegations fail to refute appellant’s evidence about the technical features recited in the claims and described in the specification.” Reply Br. 8. This is a repeat of the earlier argument regarding technical solutions and is equally unpersuasive here.

Appellant next argues that the “Answer does not differentiate appellant’s claims from the similar patent-eligible example claims.” Reply Br. 9. Appellant expands on this as follows.

Appellant contends that the claims are analogous to those in *Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.*, 822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016). Reply Br. 10–11. The claims differ from those found patent eligible in *Enfish*, where the claims were “specifically directed to a *self-referential* table for a computer database.” 822 F.3d 1327, 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2016). The claims thus were “directed to a specific improvement to the way computers operate” rather than an abstract idea implemented on a computer. *Id.* at 1336. Here, by contrast, the claims are not directed to an improvement in the way computers operate. Though the claims purport to accelerate the process of entering medical data, our reviewing court has held that speed and accuracy increases stemming from the ordinary capabilities of a general purpose computer “do[] 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). Instead, the claims are more analogous to those in *FairWarning IP, LLC v. Iatric Systems, Inc.*, 839 F.3d 1089 (Fed. Cir. 2016), wherein claims reciting “a few possible rules to analyze audit log data” were found directed an abstract idea because they asked “the same questions (though perhaps phrased with different words) that humans in analogous situations detecting fraud have asked for decades.” 839 F.3d at 1094, 1095.

Appellant also cites to *Trading Technologies International, Inc. v. CQG, Inc.*, 875 F. App’x 1001 (Fed. Cir. 2017). Reply Br. 12. First, this case is non-precedential and two related precedential cases with user interfaces had their claims held ineligible. *Trading Techs. Int’l, Inc. v. IBG LLC*, 921 F.3d 1084 (Fed. Cir. 2019) and *Trading Techs. Int’l, Inc. v. IBG LLC*, 921 F.3d 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2019). Second, the claims do not recite

and the Specification does not describe structure associated with the process, only data content. In *Trading Technologies*, in response to a similar argument that the claims “provide a particular graphical user interface that improves usability, visualization, and efficiency,” the court determined that “the claims are focused on providing information to traders in a way that helps them process information more quickly, not on improving computers or technology. . . . The ‘tool for presentation’ here . . . is simply a generic computer.” *Trading Techs. Int’l, Inc. v. IBG LLC*, 921 F.3d at 1384–85 (citations omitted). Similarly here the claims are not focused on an interface, but on providing information to users in a way that helps them process information more quickly, not on improving computers or technology and the tool for presentation is a generic computer.

We are not persuaded by Appellant’s argument that claims 6 and 18 recite a conversion module for converting data from the screen displays to standard ADT (Admit-Discharge-Transfer) HL-7 (Health Level 7 international standard) record segments. Reply Br. 13. As with claim 13, this claim does not recite technological implementation details for doing so. As such records are by definition defined by international standards, simply reciting their use is entirely conventional.

Claims 13–16 and 18–23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Jones, Metzger, and Adolph

We are persuaded by Appellant’s argument that the Examiner failed to rebut Appellant’s argument that the art does not describe limitation 2, as recited in claim 13. Reply Br. 13.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The rejection of claims 1–28 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to a judicial exception without significantly more is proper.

The rejection of claims 13–16 and 18–23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Jones, Metzger, and Adolph is improper.

CONCLUSION

The rejection of claims 1–28 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is affirmed.

In summary:

Claims Rejected	35 U.S.C. §	Basis	Affirmed	Reversed
1–28, 30	101	Eligibility	1–28, 30	
13–16, 18–23	103	Jones, Metzger, Adolph		13–16, 18–23
Overall Outcome			1–28, 30	

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. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv) (2011).

AFFIRMED