



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.
11/643,245	12/21/2006	Brad Krassner	RV D2 US	3941
93220	7590	12/18/2018	EXAMINER	
Jones IP Group 2500 Dallas Parkway Suite 550 Plano, TX 75093			CHOI, PETER H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3622	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/18/2018	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):

docket@jonesip.com
cofficeaction@apcoll.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte BRAD KRASSNER, NIKOLAI MENTCHOUKOV,
FRED BERNSTEIN, and ALAN EDWARDS

Appeal 2017-009980¹
Application 11/643,245²
Technology Center 3600

Before ALLEN R. MACDONALD, JAMES B. ARPIN, and
NABEEL U. KHAN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

ARPIN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

I. DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a), the Examiner’s decision rejecting claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9–15, 17–19, 21, 23–35, 37, 38, 40–42, and 46–53. Final Act. 2; App. Br. 1. Claims 3, 6, 8, 16, 20, 22, 36, 39, and 43–45

¹ In this Decision, we refer to Appellants’ Appeal Brief (“App. Br.,” filed October 5, 2016) and Reply Brief (“Reply Br.,” filed July 19, 2017); the Final Office Action (“Final Act.,” mailed April 5, 2016); the Examiner’s Answer (“Ans.,” mailed May 19, 2017); and the originally filed Specification (“Spec.,” filed December 21, 2006).

² According to Appellants, Rich Media Club, LLC is the real party-in-interest. App. Br. 2.

are cancelled. App. Br. 29–37 (Claims App’x). We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We reverse.

II. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The recited systems and methods relate to:

creating electronic advertisements using licensed digital content, and distributing such advertisements for display at desired network locations, including on multiple networks (such as, without limitation, computer networks such as the Internet as well as cellular, wireless, cable, satellite and other networks), whereby the ad to be displayed at a particular network location is selected from a group of ads that reference the same keyword or category and network location via an auction when the display location is acted upon by a network user/ad viewer. The digital content is delivered to designated advertising locations on the network and becomes part of an advertising display composed at the time requested by the network user/ad viewer by using a relational database for storing data required for commands that execute retrieval, assembly and dispatching of the licensed digital content files previously stored in one or more servers, as well as messaging, tracking, display, and billing for both use of the licensed content and display of the ad at the designated location on a cost-per-use basis.

Spec. ¶ 10.

As noted above, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9–15, 17–19, 21, 23–35, 37, 38, 40–42, and 46–53 are pending. Claims 1, 15, and 21 are independent. App. Br. 28–29, 32, 34 (Claims App’x). Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9–14, 23–26, 40, 46, and 49–53 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1; claims 17–19, 27–30, 41, and 47 depend directly or indirectly from claim 15, and claims 31–35, 37, 38, 42, and 48 depend directly or indirectly from claim 21. *Id.* at 29–39.

Claim 1, reproduced below, is illustrative.

1. A system comprising:

a database configured to store a plurality of records comprising:

one or more commands for retrieving one or more of a plurality of electronic content files designated by one or more advertiser users;

one or more commands for assembling and presenting the one or more designated electronic content files as an advertisement at one or more of a plurality of webpages; and

one or more parameters for presentation of the advertisement at the one or more webpages; and

one or more computing systems operable to:

generate, in response to one or more options selected by a particular one of the one or more advertiser users in a user interface, first code for placement at a particular one of the one or more webpages, the first code written to cause a billboard module to be loaded when the particular webpage is loaded, the billboard module comprising second code written to:

communicate, over one or more computer networks, with the one or more computing systems; and
retrieve and display one or more advertisements on the particular web page;

select, in response to a communication from the billboard module over the one or more computer networks, a subset of the plurality of records, the selection based at least in part on one or more keywords in the communication from the billboard module;

after selecting the subset of the plurality of records based at least in part on the one or more keywords in the communication from the billboard module, *conduct an auction to select a winning advertisement from the selected subset of records; and*

provide instructions to the billboard module for the billboard module to retrieve the winning advertisement and present the winning advertisement in an area on the particular webpage designated by the billboard module.

Id. (disputed limitations emphasized)

III. REFERENCES

The Examiner relies upon the following prior art in rejecting the pending claims:

Patel <i>et al.</i> (“Patel”)	US 7,962,363 B2	Issued June 14, 2011; Published May 27, 2004
Scholl <i>et al.</i> (“Scholl”)	US 8,447,651 B1	Issued May 21, 2013; Filed Jan. 25, 2005

IV. THE REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9–15, 17–19, 21, 23–35, 37, 38, 40–42, and 46–53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a judicial exception (i.e., a law of nature, a natural phenomenon, or an abstract idea) without significantly more. Final Act. 2–3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9–15, 17–19, 21, 23–35, 37, 38, 40–42, and 46–53 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Patel and Scholl. *Id.* at 3–13.

Unless otherwise indicated, we adopt the Examiner’s findings in the Answer as our own and add any additional findings of fact appearing below for emphasis. We address these rejections below.

A. Patent Eligible Subject Matter

Under 35 U.S.C. § 101, a patent may be obtained for “any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new

and useful improvement thereof.” The U.S. Supreme Court has “long held that this provision contains an important implicit exception: Laws of nature, natural phenomena, and abstract ideas are not patentable.” *Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l*, 134 S. Ct. 2347, 2354 (2014) (quoting *Ass’n for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc.*, 569 U.S. 576, 589 (2013)). The Court in *Alice* reiterated the two-step framework previously set forth in *Mayo Collaborative Services v. Prometheus Laboratories, Inc.*, 566 U.S. 66, 75–79 (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 that analysis is to “determine whether the claims at issue are directed to one of those patent-ineligible concepts,” such as an abstract idea. *Id.*

The Court acknowledged in *Mayo* “all inventions at some level embody, use, reflect, rest upon, or apply laws of nature, natural phenomena, or abstract ideas.” *Mayo*, 566 U.S. at 71. We, therefore, look to whether the claims focus on a specific method or means that improves the relevant technology or are directed instead to a result or effect that itself is the abstract idea and merely invoke generic processes and machinery. *See Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.*, 822 F.3d 1327, 1335–36 (Fed. Cir. 2016). If the claims are not directed to an abstract idea, the inquiry ends. *Id.* at 1339. Otherwise, the inquiry proceeds to the second step where the elements of the claims are considered “individually and ‘as an ordered combination’ to determine whether the additional elements ‘transform the nature of the claim’ into a patent-eligible application.” *Alice*, 134 S. Ct. at 2355 (quoting *Mayo*, 566 U.S. at 78, 79). That is whether the claims recite

elements making the claims *significantly more* than the judicially excepted subject matter.

With regard to the first step of the *Alice* analysis, the Examiner determines that “[c]laim(s) 1-2, 4-5, 7, 9-15, 17-19, 21, 23-35,37,38,40-42 and 46-53 is/are directed to the abstract idea of: providing an online advertising auction platform” and, in particular, to “**providing an online advertising platform and conducting an auction.**” Final Act. 2, 14. With regard to the second step of the *Alice* analysis, the Examiner further finds that “[t]he claim(s) does/do not include additional elements that are sufficient to amount *to significantly more* than the judicial exception because the additional elements of ‘retrieving..., assembling... and presenting...’ are merely instructions to implement the idea on a general computer.” *Id.* at 2 (emphasis added). Referring to claim 1, the Examiner finds that each of the additional limitations to the identified abstract idea, namely, including one or more commands in the database, generating a first code to be uploaded with a particular webpage, communicating between computer systems, retrieving and displaying an advertisement on a webpage, selecting a records subset based on keywords, and providing instructions to retrieve and present the auction winning advertisement, are themselves no more than abstract ideas. *Id.* at 14–16 (citing *SmartGene, Inc. v. Advanced Biological Labs., SA*, 555 F. App’x 950 (Fed. Cir. 2014); *Ultramercial, Inc. v. Hulu, LLC*, 772 F.3d 709 (Fed. Cir. 2014); and *Cyberfone Sys., LLC v. CNN Interactive Grp, Inc.*, 558 F. App’x 988 (Fed. Cir. 2014)); *see also* Ans. 4–8 (adding citations to *Classen Immunotherapies, Inc. v. Biogen IDEC*, 659 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011) and *Electric Power Group, LLC v. Alstom S.A.*, 830 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2016)). The Examiner determines that:

Generic computers performing generic computer functions, alone, do not amount to significantly more than the abstract idea. *Considered individually*, the steps of **receiving and retrieving electronic content, assembling and presenting electronic content, generating information and conducting an auction**[f]urther describe the abstract idea but do not make it less abstract. . . . *Considered as a whole*, the recited steps merely organize the abstract idea into a stepwise description of a process used to perform the abstract idea and amount to no more **conducting an online auction, receiving electronic content and applying parameters to assemble and display electronic content**. The claim merely instructs the practitioner to implement the concept of **conducting an online auction, receiving electronic content and applying parameters to assemble and display electronic content** with routine, conventional activity specified at a high level of generality in a particular technological environment. When view[ed] either individual[ly] or as an order[ed] combination, the claim as a whole does not add significantly more to the abstract idea of **providing an online advertising auction platform**. As such, the claim is not patent eligible.

Ans. 8–9 (italics added).

Appellants contend, however, that the recited systems and methods are “necessarily rooted in computer technology because they address a problem that only arises in the realm of computer networks,” and, therefore, are analogous to those found patent eligible in *DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.*, 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014). App. Br. 12–13; Reply Br. 2–4. Specifically, Appellants contend that certain features of the claims “address the problem of minimizing the network and computational resources needed to facilitate presenting advertisements on webpages. This problem has no pre-computer analog” App. Br. 13.

In *DDR Holdings*, the Federal Circuit noted that “[a]lthough the claims address a business challenge (retaining website visitors), it is a challenge particular to the Internet.” *DDR Holdings*, 773 F.3d at 1257. Like

other cases in which the Federal Circuit found the claims patent ineligible, the claims in *DDR Holdings* “involve both a computer and the Internet.” *Id.* However, the Federal Circuit found that that the claims in *DDR Holdings*:

stand apart because they do not merely recite the performance of some business practice known from the pre-Internet world along with the requirement to perform it on the Internet. Instead, the claimed solution is necessarily rooted in computer technology in order to overcome a problem specifically arising in the realm of computer networks.

Id. Here, the claims similarly recite a business challenge, i.e., placing the appropriate advertisement on webpages retrieved as the result of a search, but make clear that this problem is technological in nature, involving both computers and the Internet. App. Br. 12; *see* Spec. ¶¶ 7, 19.

As the Specification explains:

The present invention improves over prior advertising systems and methods in many ways. The present invention does not embed advertising HTML files within a web page, providing considerable economies to advertisers in saved labor, time and cost in terms of both inserting advertisements into web page files, and later changing any of those advertisements. The present invention functions totally transparently to a network user and which neither inconveniences nor burdens the user. The present invention does not require a network user to download or install on the user’s computer a separate application program specifically to receive advertising or perform any affirmative act other than normal browsing to receive such advertising. The present invention also provides proper accounting to an advertiser, content licensor and ad publisher by accurately and validly ascertaining and tracking user click-throughs/impressions of fully rendered advertisements. The present invention also allows ad publishers to maximize the revenues an increase effectiveness they receive from running third party ads, by being able to select for display (via the auction) the most profitable ads due to cost-per-click and click-through rate statistics. The present invention allows advertisers

to more accurately target their advertising on search engine websites by separating the advertising auction process from the search engine process, allowing for second generation relevancy. The present invention allows for optimization of advertising campaigns by allowing for real-time auctions for available advertising spots, taking into account the amount of available advertising spots at the time of the action, optimizing the value of the advertising spot at the time it is requested, and by allowing for the assembly of advertising on the fly for display on the network, and the ability to license quality digital media creative files on a cost effective cost-per-use basis, and update campaign parameter and creative according to campaign results derived in real time by FSDC tracking.

Spec. ¶ 19; *see id.* ¶¶ 7 (discussing improvements over past practices), 8 (defining “FSDC”). Appellants contend that the recited system operations and method steps address the described problems and achieve the sought improvements. App. Br. 12–13. The Examiner asserts, however, that the claims do not recite *how* recited systems and methods achieve the improvements identified in the Specification. Ans. 2–3. We disagree.

We are persuaded by Appellants’ contentions that the claims are rooted in computer technology. For example, each independent claim addresses the problem of inserting appropriate advertisements *into webpages* based on stored parameters (App. Br. 28, 32, 34 (Claims App’x (claims 1, 15, and 21)); *see id.* at 30, 33, 36 (Claims App’x (claims 5, 18, and 31))) and recites “generat[ing], in response to one or more options selected by a particular. . . advertiser user[] in a user interface, *first code* for placement at a particular one of the one or more webpages, *the first code written to cause a billboard module to be loaded when the particular webpage is loaded*” (*e.g.*, *id.* at 28 (Claims App’x (claim 1 (emphases added)))). Further, each of the independent claims recites that “*the billboard module compris[es]*

second code written to: communicate, over one or more computer networks, with the one or more computing systems; and retrieve and display one or more advertisements on the particular web page.” *E.g., id.* at 28 (Claims App’x (claim 1 (emphases added))). Thus, the limitations reciting generation of “first code” and “a billboard module” comprising “second code” indicate that the recited systems and methods seek to solve problems rooted in computer technology and arising in the context of advertising on webpages, rather than advertising in media in general, and how the recited systems and methods solve these problems.

In addition, independent claim 15 recites that a stored record comprises “one or more advertisement parameters *and tracking parameters.*” App. Br. 32 (Claims App’x (claim 15 (emphasis added))); *see id.* at 29, 30, 37 (Claims App’x (claims 2, 9, and 38 (reciting “tracking data” or “a tracking server”))). As the Specification explains:

The present invention allows advertisers to create their own advertisements and license quality third party digital content for use in creating their advertisements (and also for content creators and providers to market their content) with payment for licensing of such third party content and ad distribution based on a cost-per-click, cost-per-impression or other pay-as-used scheme and with clicks/usage of the licensed ad content being accurately trackable.

Spec. ¶ 12; *see id.* ¶¶ 17 (“The system serves the advertisement files in addition to tracking impressions and click through rates in real time while the advertisement runs.”), 18 (linking the use of FSDC technology “to process ad viewer activity tracking data”). The monitoring of such tracking data, such as impressions and click through rates, relates to data generated by viewing of advertisements *on a webpage*, which also seeks to solve

problems rooted in computer technology and arising in the context of advertising on webpages, rather than advertising in media in general.

Accordingly, as in *DDR Holdings*, the claims recite “a solution to this network-centric challenge,” e.g., the efficient, timely, and cost effective application of advertisements to webpages, for which there was no pre-computer or pre-Internet analog. App. Br. 12–13. The Examiner provides no evidence or persuasive argument to the contrary. Thus, the claims here recite “significantly more” than the abstract idea of “providing an online advertising platform and conducting an auction.”

The Examiner erred in finding the recited systems and methods patent ineligible, and we do not sustain the Examiner’s rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

B. Nonobviousness Over Patel and Scholl

The Examiner finds that claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9–15, 17–19, 21, 23–35, 37, 38, 40–42, and 46–53 are rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Patel and Scholl. Final Act. 3–13. In particular, referring to claim 1, the Examiner finds that Patel teaches or suggests a system including one or more servers that store and dispatch one or more webpages on one or more computers. *Id.* at 3–4 (citing Patel, 10:1–22, 15:20–59, 20:53–59, Figs. 10 and 26). Further, the Examiner finds that Patel teaches or suggests a database storing a plurality records, those records including commands for retrieving and receiving one or more plurality of electronic content files designated by one or more advertiser users, commands for assembling and presenting the one or more designated electronic content files (e.g., customized content) as an advertisement at one or more plurality of webpages, and parameters (e.g., advertisement audience demographics,

location, keyword, type, and/or bid) for presentation of the advertisement at the one or more webpages. *Id.* at 4 (citing Patel, 5:60–64, 9:50–54, 10:4–11, 10:35–47); *see also* Scholl, 3:52–65 (describing the use of “stop words” to notify selected advertisers), 6:42–67 (creating a “stop list” based on search terms to preclude certain advertisers from an auction).

The Examiner also finds that Patel teaches or suggests generating first code for placement at a particular one of the one or more webpages in response to one or more options selected by a particular one of the one or more advertiser users (e.g., advertisers) in a user interface. The first code may be written to cause a billboard module (*see* Spec. ¶ 81) to be loaded. Final Act. 4; Ans. 10 (citing Patel, 13:49–67, 14:44–67). In particular, Patel uses HTML IFRAME tags and JavaScript to identify certain areas of the webpages to receive advertisements, and the Examiner finds HTML IFRAME tags to be a type of computer coding. Ans. 10. Because the tags are for certain areas of the webpages, the Examiner finds these tags teach generating a first code for advertisement placement. Final Act. 4–5 (citing Patel, 14:44–59, 21:1–6). Further, Patel teaches or suggests that when the particular webpage is loaded, the call to JavaScript is second code that is written to communicate over one or more computer networks with the one or more computing systems and to retrieve and display one or more advertisements on the particular webpage. *Id.* at 5 (citing Patel, 15:5–55).

The Examiner finds that Scholl teaches or suggests the system actions of selecting a subset of the plurality of records in response to a communication from the billboard module over the one or more computer networks. Final Act. 5–6 (citing Scholl, 6:1–21, 3:37–38, 3:52–65); Ans. 12–13. The plurality of records subset is selected based “at least in part

on one or more keywords in the communication from the billboard module.” Final Act. 6 (emphasis omitted); *see* Patel, 12:52–62, 13:49–55. Further, Scholl teaches or suggests that, after selecting the plurality of records subset, the system conducts an auction to select a winning advertisement from the selected subset of records. Final Act. 6 (citing Scholl, 4:39–45, 6:42–67, 8:51–9:9); Ans. 12–13. Finally, the combination of Patel and Scholl teaches or suggests that, as a result of the auction, the winning advertisement may be retrieved and presented. Patel, 18:34–41 (describing real-time auctions), 35:23–55 (describing media exchange via auction); Scholl, 6:27–41 (describing dynamic bidding in response to search request); *see* Final Act. 6; Ans. 11.

The Examiner finds that because Scholl teaches that the search engine sends the invitation to advertisers to participate in the dynamic bidding, a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand that an auction would be conducted *after* the search engine receives the user’s search query. Final Act. 6; Ans. 11; *see* Scholl, 4:39–44, 8:51–9:9 (describing search query prompting dynamic bids). The Examiner further finds that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have had reason to combine Scholl’s teaching regarding the dynamic bidding motivations and techniques (Scholl, 3:52–65, 4:39–44, 6:27–67) with Patel’s teachings regarding the use of embedded transparent pixels to communicate with the advertisement server (Patel, 14:44–67), thus, giving a person of ordinary skill reason to program the transparent pixel with code language and to initiate an auction. *See* Final Act. 6–7; Ans. 11–12. “When there is a design need or market pressure to solve a problem and there are a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known

options within his or her technical grasp.” *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 421 (2007); *see* Patel, 2:31–58 (describing known problems with the exchange of advertising media and the placement of advertisements on a webpage); Scholl, 2:14–49 (describing known problems with search result advertising bidding). Because Patel and Scholl are directed to advertising selection, the Examiner finds that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have had reason to combine their teachings to achieve the recited systems and methods.

1. Independent Claims 1 and 21

Appellants disagree for at least three reasons. App. Br. 17–24; Reply Br. 5–9. First, Appellants contend that Patel does not teach or suggest the system action of generating first code for placement at a webpage in response to one or more options selected by a user in a user interface. App. Br. 17–19; Reply Br. 5–6. In particular, Appellants contend that the portions of Patel, upon which the Examiner relies, may teach the use of HTML IFRAME tags and JavaScript and activation of a throttling mechanism for banner serving, but do not teach or suggest generating the claimed “first code” in response to “one or more options selected by a particular one of the one or more advertiser users in a user interface,” as recited in claim 1. App. Br. 18. We disagree.

The Examiner finds that Patel teaches the use of HTML IFRAME tags and JavaScript, which designates a section of the webpage at which information will be displayed. Ans. 10 (citing Patel, 14:44–67). In particular, Patel states that:

if the consumer’s browser supports the IFRAME tag, said tag is used. If said browser does not support IFRAME tags, but does

support JavaScript, *JavaScript is used to insert the HTML into the web page at the desired location. If said browser does not support JavaScript, a default creative is selected for display.*

Patel, 14:45–51 (emphases added). Patel explains that these methods are used to achieve integration of the advertisement and the webpage. *Id.* at 14:21–33, 52–53. The Examiner finds that the identification of the first code is the HTML IFRAME tags and within that code is a call, i.e., *the second code*, to initiate JavaScript running in the designated area of the webpage to select the advertisement, which shows that a code is generated for advertisement placement on a webpage. Ans. 10.

Appellants contend that, although the Examiner finds that “[t]he advertiser [user] does have input or makes selections through the user interface to make several options such as the ad id, targeting criteria, banner, dimensions, etc. figs. 18-22 which gets matched to publisher” (*Id.*; see Patel, Fig. 21 (“Banner Management Page”)), “the Examiner does not explain how or cite to any location in *Patel* that discloses that *Patel’s* ‘HTML Iframe tags’ (equated to the claimed ‘first code’ by the Examiner) is generated ‘***in response to one or more options selected by a particular one of the one or more advertiser users in***’ any of the webpages of figures 18-22” (Reply Br. 6). Referring to Figures 21 and 22, however, Patel explains how an advertiser user’s input may manage or edit banner size and shape, including designating alternative tags. Patel, 25:6–61 (“‘Banner Name’ and ‘Alt. Tag’ are editable” and “Define an Alternate Tag”). Because the Specification does not define—or even use—the term “first code” apart from the claims, we interpret it broadly and are persuaded that the Examiner has shown that Patel teaches or suggests this limitation.

Second, Appellants contend that Patel does not teach or suggest a database comprising “*one or more commands for assembling and presenting the one or more designated electronic content files as an advertisement at one or more of a plurality of webpages.*” App. Br. 19–20; Reply Br. 7–8. In particular, Appellants contend that (1) the Examiner erroneously maps “[t]he call to the JavaScript” to *both* the billboard module, i.e., the second code, (*see* Ans. 10) and to commands for assembling and presenting the advertisement content (*see id.* at 11) and (2) the “commands for assembling and presenting” are part of the plurality of records stored on the database, and the Examiner has not shown that Patel teaches or suggests that the call to JavaScript is stored in the plurality of records. Reply Br. 7–8. We agree.

With respect to Appellants’ contention regarding the mapping of the call to the JavaScript to *both* the billboard module and to the commands for assembling and presenting, we agree that the Examiner’s mapping is inconsistent. Initially, we note that claims 1 and 21 recite the billboard module and the commands for assembling and presenting as separate elements. App. Br. 28, 34 (Claims App’x (claims 1 and 21)); *see id.* at 32–33 (Claims App’x (claims 15 and 17)). Further, the Specification explains that, once the auction has determined the winning advertisement, the advertisement is displayed within the designated billboard module according to the commands contained in the relational database file for the winning advertisement. Spec. ¶¶ 65, 66. The Examiner’s mapping is inconsistent with this disclosure.

In addition, although the claims do not recite where the billboard module is stored, the Examiner does not find that Patel teaches or suggests

that the call for the JavaScript is stored with the plurality of advertisement records. Final Act. 4–5; Ans. 10–11. Therefore, we agree with Appellants that Examiner fails to show that Patel’s call for the JavaScript teaches or suggests the commands for assembling and presenting stored in the plurality of records. Reply Br. 7–8.

Appellants contend that “[f]or at least these reasons, independent Claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable. For at least certain analogous reasons, independent Claims 15 and 21 and their dependent claims also are allowable. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.” *Id.* at 8. Because each of independent claims 1 and 21 recite that commands for assembling and presenting are stored in the plurality of records within a database and a separate billboard module, i.e., second code, we do not sustain the Examiner’s rejections of claims 1 and 21 and the claims that depend therefrom.

Further, claim 17, which depends from independent claim 15, recites “storing in the particular record one or more of: . . . one or more commands for retrieving, assembling, and presenting the one or more content files and customized text content as an advertisement.” App. Br. 33 (Claims App’x (claim 17)). Because claim 15 recites a billboard module, i.e., second code, in substantially the same manner as claims 1 and 21, we conclude that Appellants’ contentions regarding the Examiner’s mapping of the call for the JavaScript apply equally to dependent claim 17, but not to independent claim 15 or to the other claims dependent therefrom.

2. *Independent Claim 15*

Because the Examiner’s findings and Appellants’ contentions with respect to all of the rejections are based on the application of the combined teachings of Patel and Scholl to the recitations of claim 1, we now consider Appellants’ remaining contentions in so far as they apply to independent claim 15 and dependent claims 18, 19, 27–30, 41, and 47. Appellants’ third contention is that the combination of Patel and Scholl does not teach or suggest “provid[ing] [one or more] instructions to the billboard module for the billboard module to retrieve the winning advertisement and present the winning advertisement in an area on the particular webpage designated by the billboard module,” as recited in claim 15. *See* App. Br. 20 (quoting claim 1). In particular, although Appellants acknowledge that Patel teaches the HTML IFRAME tag and Scholl teaches a search engine system, Appellants contend that the portions of Patel and Scholl, relied upon by the Examiner and quoted in the Reply Brief, fail to show instructions provided to the billboard module to retrieve and present the winning advertisement. App. Br. 20–22; Reply Br. 8–9. In the quoted portion of Scholl, Scholl states that:

Based in part on the notification response, the search engine computer system composes a search result web page 112—also called a “search response”—potentially including an advertising message specified by the bid in the notification response. This search result is returned to the client computer system for display. Table 4 below shows a sample search response.

Scholl, 5:22–29 (emphasis added); *see* App. Br. 21. Further, in the quoted portion of Scholl, Scholl states that:

After performing steps **303** and **304**, the [software] facility continues in step **305**. In step **305**, the facility selects one or more advertising bids for inclusion with the search result. The selected advertising bids may be among the bids *received in the responses to the notification*, cached bids from responses to earlier notifications, and/or earlier received prospective bids. Bids may be selected in a variety of ways, such as by highest bid amount, highest expected value based upon bid amount and historical performance of advertising messages from each advertiser, etc.

Scholl, 6:43–51 (emphasis added); *see* App. Br. 22. Referring to Scholl’s Figure 3, step 306 provides that the facility “repl[ies] to search request with response containing search result and advertising messages of selected advertising bids.” Scholl, Fig. 3; *see id.* at 6:51–55. Patel teaches that, upon receipt of notification, *the search engine* retrieves and presents the winning advertisement and Scholl teaches that, upon receipt of notification, *the software facility* retrieves and presents the winning advertisement. However, as discussed above, the Examiner finds that Patel’s call to the JavaScript teaches the recited billboard module. Thus, neither Patel nor Scholl, alone or together, teaches or suggests that *the billboard module*, after being provided instructions, retrieves and presents the winning advertisement, as recited in claim 15.

In the Answer, the Examiner does not show where either Patel or Scholl, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests this limitation. Ans. 11–12; *see* Reply Br. 8–9. Thus, we are persuaded that the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 15 and claims 18, 19, 27–30, 41, and 47 that depend therefrom, and we do not sustain those rejections.

Appeal 2017-009980
Application 11/643,245

V. DECISION

For the above reasons, we reverse the Examiner's decision rejecting claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9–15, 17–19, 21, 23–35, 37, 38, 40–42, and 46–53.

REVERSED