



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.
14/170,564	01/31/2014	Michael Winlo	60152-0169	4569
115191	7590	09/13/2019	EXAMINER	
Hickman Palermo Becker Bingham / Palantir 1 Almaden Boulevard, Floor 12 San Jose, CA 95113			HOLCOMB, MARK	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3626	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/13/2019	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):

usdoCKET@h35g.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte MICHAEL WINLO and AVANTI SHRIKUMAR

Appeal 2018-007064
Application 14/170,564
Technology Center 3600

Before MAHSHID D. SAADAT, ALLEN R. MacDONALD, and
NABEEL U. KHAN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MacDONALD, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellants¹ appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from a non-final rejection of claims 11–20. Claims 1–10 have been cancelled. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We affirm.

¹ According to Appellants, the real party in interest is Palantir Technologies, Inc. App. Br. 1.

Representative Claim

Representative claim 11 under appeal reads as follows (emphasis added):

11. A method comprising:

storing member objects that describe healthcare recipients;

storing healthcare event objects that describe healthcare services received by the healthcare recipients from one or more healthcare providers;

correlating the healthcare event objects to corresponding member objects of the member objects;

executing one or more first rules to generate missing service reports each of which identifies for a particular member object one or more healthcare services that are expected to occur within a certain time period for the particular healthcare recipient for which no healthcare event records exists for the particular member object, wherein the one or more rules associate each of a plurality of different service types with one or more specific member characteristics and one or more specific timeframes in which a member possessing the specific member characteristics should receive that type of service;

in response to generating the missing service reports, based on the missing service reports, executing one or more second rules to generate member priority scores for the member objects, wherein the member priority scores are computed as a function of an estimated value of providing the one or more healthcare services and an estimated likelihood that a member will receive the one or more healthcare services without intervention;

based on the member priority scores, ***identifying a first set of high priority member objects;***

wherein the method is performed by one or more computing devices.

App. Br. 9–10 (Claims Appendix).

*Rejection on Appeal*²

The Examiner rejected claims 11–20 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for being directed to patent-ineligible subject matter.³ *See* Non-Final Act. 2.

Issue on Appeal

Did the Examiner err in rejecting claim 11 as being directed to patent-ineligible subject matter?

ANALYSIS

A. *Section 101 Case Law*

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 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*, 573 U.S. 208, 216 (2014) (quoting *Ass’n for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc.*, 569 U.S. 576, 589 (2013)). The Supreme Court in *Alice* reiterated the two-step framework previously set forth in *Mayo Collaborative Services v. Prometheus Laboratories, Inc.*,

² The Examiner withdrew the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 4–10 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112, in light of Appellants’ cancellation of claims 1–10 in Appellants’ Amendment filed January 15, 2018, as indicated in the Advisory Action issued January 22, 2018 (“Advisory Action”). *See* Advisory Action at 2.

³ We select claim 11 as representative. Separate patentability, in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(iv), is not argued for claims 12–20. Accordingly, except for our ultimate decision, the rejection of claims 12–20 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is not discussed further herein.

566 U.S. 66 (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*, 573 U.S. at 217. 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* that “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. Therefore, we look to whether the claims focus on a specific means or method that improves the relevant technology or are instead directed to a result or effect that itself is the abstract idea and otherwise merely recite generic processes and machinery. *See Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.*, 822 F.3d 1327, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2016). If the claims are not directed to an abstract idea, the inquiry ends. Otherwise, the inquiry proceeds to the second step, in which 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*, 573 U.S. at 217 (quoting *Mayo*, 566 U.S. at 79, 78).

B. *USPTO Section 101 Guidance*

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) recently published revised guidance on the application of 35 U.S.C. § 101. USPTO’s January 7, 2019 Memorandum, 2019 REVISED PATENT SUBJECT MATTER ELIGIBILITY GUIDANCE, 84 Fed. Reg. 50, 50–57 (Jan. 7, 2019) (“Revised Guidance”). Under the Revised Guidance, we first look to whether the claim recites:

- (1) (Step 2A – Prong One) any judicial exceptions, including certain groupings of abstract ideas (*i.e.*, mathematical concepts, certain methods of organizing human activity such as a fundamental economic practice, or mental processes); and
- (2) (Step 2A – Prong Two) additional elements that integrate the judicial exception into a practical application (*see* MANUAL OF PATENT EXAMINING PROCEDURE (“MPEP”) §§ 2106.05(a)–(c), (e)–(h) (9th Ed., Rev. 08.2017, Jan. 2018)).⁴

See Revised Guidance, 84 Fed. Reg. at 54–55. Only if a claim (1) recites a judicial exception and (2) does not integrate that exception into a practical application, do we then look to whether the claim:

- (3) adds a specific limitation beyond the judicial exception that is not “well-understood, routine, conventional” in the field (*see* MPEP § 2106.05(d)); or
- (4) simply appends well-understood, routine, conventional activities previously known to the industry, specified at a high level of generality, to the judicial exception.

See Revised Guidance, 84 Fed. Reg. at 56.

⁴ We acknowledge that some of these considerations may be properly evaluated under Step 2 of *Alice* (Step 2B of Revised Guidance). Solely for purposes of maintaining consistent treatment within the Office, we evaluate it under Step 1 of *Alice* (Step 2A of Revised Guidance). *See* Revised Guidance, 84 Fed. Reg. at 54–55.

C. Examiner's § 101 Rejection Alice/Mayo – Steps 1 and 2

C.1. USPTO Revised Guidance Step 2A – Prong One

Applying step 1 of the *Alice/Mayo* analysis, the Examiner concludes claim 11 recites and is directed to an abstract idea. More specifically, the Examiner concludes:

The abstract idea in independent [claim 11] . . . is embodied in the claim and is identified as: in response to generating a missing service report identifying a service expected to occur but for which no record exists for a member object using rules associating service types with characteristics and relevant specific timeframes, generating priority scores for the member objects as a function of an estimated value of providing the service and an estimated likelihood that a member will receive the service without intervention. A system wherein, in response to generating a missing service report identifying a service expected to occur but for which no record exists for a member object using rules associating service types with characteristics and relevant specific timeframes, generating priority scores for the member objects as a function of an estimated value of providing the service and an estimated likelihood that a member will receive the service without intervention ***is an abstract idea because:***

(1) it is analogous to the court-defined abstract idea in *Digitech* in that ***it organizes information*** (missing services for a patient) ***through mathematical correlations*** (scores are generated based on the missing services for a patient); and/or

(2) it is analogous to the court-defined abstract idea in *Electric Power Group* in that ***it collects information*** (object information), ***analyzes it*** (determines whether a missing service report should exist and makes a score based on that missing service report), ***and displays certain results*** (outputs ranked data) of the collection and analysis.

Non-Final Act. 9–10 (emphasis added); *see also* Ans. 3–4.

C.2. *USPTO Revised Guidance Step 2A – Prong Two*

Applying step 2 of the *Alice/Mayo* analysis, the Examiner concludes:

When viewed as a whole, the claims do not include additional limitations that are sufficient to amount to significantly more than the judicial exception because the claims recite ***processes that are routine and well-understood in the art of healthcare communication systems and simply implement the process or processes on a computer(s)***, which is not enough to qualify as “significantly more” as described herein. Specifically, the applicant is taking the well-understood wherein, in response to generating a missing service report identifying a service expected to occur but for which no record exists for a member object using rules associating service types with characteristics and relevant specific timeframes, generating priority scores for the member objects as a function of an estimated value of providing the service and an estimated likelihood that a member will receive the service without intervention, which does not qualify as significantly more. The claims do not include additional limitations that are sufficient to amount to significantly more than the judicial exception because the additional limitations of storing data, correlating data and filtering data by scored rank ***merely represent insignificant, conventional extra-solution activities well-understood in the industry of healthcare data processing systems***. Furthermore, the additional elements or combination of elements in the claims, other than the abstract idea per se, amount to no more than a recitation of:

- A) ***generic computer structure that serves to perform generic computer functions that serve to generally link the abstract idea to a particular technological environment or field of use*** (Applicant’s specification discloses the following material, at the corresponding paragraphs, to be composed of conventional hardware: computing hardware (64-67), computing device (64-67), data repository (252).); and
- B) ***functions that are well-understood, routine, and conventional activities previously known to the pertinent industry*** (i.e., storing, correlating, generating and identifying data).

Non-Final Act. 10–11 (emphasis added).

Unlike the claims in *McRO*, which presented a very specific set of rules in order to improve a lip animation technique, the present claims present *fairly generic, broad limitations* directed to correlating and generating data. . . . Appellant’s position that *McRO* did not set out algorithms is in direct contrast to the claims of *McRO*, which clearly provided a very specific set of algorithms limited to a very particular environment, animating lips, in contrast to the present invention[.]

. . . .

The mere fact that the present claims are novel does not mean that they are unconventional under the McRO analysis. . . .

McRO indicates that an “improvement in computer-related technology” is not limited to improvements in the operation of a computer or a computer network per se, but may also be claimed as a set of rules (basically mathematical relationships) that improve computer-related technology by allowing a computer performance of a function *not previously performable by a computer*. This is distinct from the present invention, where the Appellant claims that the generic computing functions performed by generic computing structure *was not previously known (not that it was previously unperformable)*.

Ans. 6–7 (emphasis added).

C.3 USPTO Revised Guidance Step 2B

Further applying step 2 of the *Alice/Mayo* analysis, the Examiner concludes:

Generic 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. The use of generic computer components to make generic determinations based on available data, store, communicate and display data does not impose any meaningful limit on the computer implementation of the abstract idea. Thus, taken alone, the additional elements do

not amount to significantly more than the above-identified judicial exception (the abstract idea).

Non-Final Act. 11 (emphasis added); *see also* Ans. 8.

D. *Appellants' § 101 Arguments*

D.1. *Step 2A, Prong 1*

D.1.a.

Appellants contend:

Here, the Office Action alleges that claim 11 is directed to an abstract idea of “in response to generating a missing service report identifying a service expected to occur but for which no record exists for a member object using rules associating service types with characteristics and relevant specific timeframes, generating priority scores for the member objects as a function of an estimated value of providing the service and an estimated likelihood that a member will receive the service without intervention.” The Office Action bases the determination that the above element is an abstract idea on surface level comparisons between the claim element and unpatentable claims in cases such as *Cyberfone*, *Digitech*, and *Electric Power Group*.

While the three cases mentioned above refer to data transformations generally, ***they are distinct from the present case where the transformations are used to identify services that have not occurred and prioritize members for outreach.*** In *Electric Power Group, LLC v. Alstom S.A.*, the claims recited receiving data streams and detecting events in those data streams based on information in the data streams. The claims in *Digitech Image Techs., LLC v. Elecs. for Imaging, Inc.* recite a method of generating a device profile by combining two sets of data into a single profile. The claims in *Cyberfone Systems v. CNN Interactive Group* (a non-precedential decision) recited a method for receiving data, separating the data out into individual components, and storing the data. ***None of the cases cited recite any use of the data, instead claiming data transformations at a high level. In the present case, the missing service reports generated by the system are then used to prioritize members for outreach.***

App. Br. 4–5 (Appellants’ citations omitted; panel’s emphasis added).

D.1.b.

Claim 11 recites the following limitations:

- (a) storing member objects that describe healthcare recipients;
- (b) storing healthcare event objects that describe healthcare services received by the healthcare recipients from one or more healthcare providers;
- (c) correlating the healthcare event objects to corresponding member objects of the member objects;
- (d) executing one or more first rules to generate missing service reports each of which identifies for a particular member object one or more healthcare services that are expected to occur within a certain time period for the particular healthcare recipient for which no healthcare event records exists for the particular member object, wherein the one or more rules associate each of a plurality of different service types with one or more specific member characteristics and one or more specific timeframes in which a member possessing the specific member characteristics should receive that type of service;
- (e) in response to generating the missing service reports, based on the missing service reports, executing one or more second rules to generate member priority scores for the member objects, wherein the member priority scores are computed as a function of an estimated value of providing the one or more healthcare services and an estimated likelihood that a member will receive the one or more healthcare services without intervention; and
- (f) based on the member priority scores, identifying a first set of high priority member objects.

In short, claim 11 recites, with the exception of generic computer-

implementation (*i.e.*, “wherein the method is performed by one or more computing devices,”) a method of storing healthcare recipient data and healthcare services data, correlating the healthcare recipient data with the healthcare services data, generating missing service reports that identify expected healthcare services based on the correlated data via one or more rules, calculating member priority scores based on the generated missing service reports via one or more rules, and identifying high priority members based on the calculated scores. As such, claim 11 is analogous to those claims the Federal Circuit has found to be directed to an abstract idea. For example, the Federal Circuit has explained in various cases that steps involving collecting, analyzing, and organizing information are drawn to an abstract idea. *See Digitech Image Techs., LLC v. Elecs. for Imaging, Inc.*, 758 F.3d 1344, 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (“The [claim] recites a process of taking two data sets and combining them into a single data set, the device profile. The two data sets are generated by taking existing information . . . and organizing this information into a new form. The [claim] thus recites an ineligible abstract process of gathering and combining data that does not require input from a physical device”); *Elec. Power Grp., LLC, v. Alstom*, 830 F.3d 1350, 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (“The focus of the asserted claims . . . is on collecting information, analyzing it, and displaying certain results of the collection and analysis”).

Because the claims involve correlating data and calculating scores based on the correlated data, the claims recite “mathematical relationships, mathematical formulas or equations, mathematical calculations,” which are mathematical concepts. Revised Guidance, 84 Fed. Reg. at 52; *see also Digitech*, 758 F.3d at 1350 (“The method in the . . . claims an abstract idea

because it describes a process of organizing information through mathematical correlations and is not tied to a specific structure or machine.”). Under the Revised Guidance, mathematical concepts are identified as a category of abstract ideas. Revised Guidance, 84 Fed. Reg. at 52. Accordingly, we conclude that claim 11 recites a mathematical concept, and, thus, an abstract idea.

D.1.c.

We are not persuaded by Appellants’ argument that claim 11 is different from the claims at issue in *Digitech* and *Electric Power Group* because the claims in the aforementioned cases allegedly refer to data transformations generally, and claim 11 allegedly recites data transformations used to identify services that have not occurred and priority members for outreach. *See* App. Br. 5. Consistent with the Examiner’s findings, even assuming *arguendo* that the argued features are recited in claim 11, such features do not distinguish claim 11 from the claims at issue in *Digitech* and *Electric Power Group*, as identifying missing services and prioritizing members for outreach is analogous to the abstract ideas respectively identified in *Digitech* and *Electric Power Group* (*i.e.*, organizing information through mathematical correlations; and analyzing, collecting, and displaying information). *See* Ans. 4.

D.2. Step 2A, Prong 2

Appellants contend:

The present claims are additionally patentable as significantly more than an abstract idea because ***they provide specific nonconventional rules to solve a particular problem that differ from prior art ways of solving the problem.*** Whether claims are directed to an abstract idea is dependent on whether the claims are an improvement to a particular type of process or whether

they “simply use a computer as a tool to automate conventional activity.” In *McRO*, the Federal Circuit noted that the incorporation of claimed rules, not the use of the computer, is what led to the improvement over conventional methods. Just as the court in *McRO* focused on the difference between the rule based process of the claims and the manual methods performed by humans, the present claims provide for a specific application of rules to produce a tangible result in a way that differs from methods traditionally applied by people.

The Office Action argues that the claims in the present case are distinguishable from the claims in *McRO* because the claims in *McRO* presented the rules in more detail than the claims in the present case. Specifically, the Office Action notes that *McRO* recited “presented a very specific set of rules in order to improve a lip animation technique.” Yet the claims in *McRO* did not set out the algorithms as argued by the Office Action. Instead, the claims identified rules that generated a result using a specific input. The court in *McRO* did not focus on the specificity or narrowness of the rules, but instead focused on the fact that the rules recited a method different from how humans have historically performed the same task.

The court in McRO held that unconventional ways of performing prior tasks can still be patent eligible even if the unconventionality lies in the use of particular rules or functions. In the present claims, rules are recited for identifying missing services and prioritizing patients for outreach. These rules are unconventional in the field and therefore the rules cannot be considered an abstract idea.

App. Br. 5–6 (Appellants’ citations omitted; panel’s emphasis added).

To the extent that Claim 11 recites claim elements of an abstract idea, Claim 11 recites significantly more than any abstract idea. . . . Limitations that may be enough to qualify as “significantly more” when recited in a claim with a judicial exception include: . . . [a]dding a specific limitation other than what is well-understood, routine and conventional in the field, or ***adding unconventional steps that confine the claim to a particular useful application***; or ***[o]ther meaningful limitations***

beyond generally linking the use of the judicial exception to a particular technological environment.

The elements of Claim [11] comprise significantly more than an abstract idea because they fall within the categories set forth . . . above.

Claim 11 recites unconventional steps that confine the claim to a particular useful application, as evidenced by the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Specifically, as noted in the Final Office Action, Claim 11 is non-obvious over analogous art at least partly due to the recitation of employing a set of rules to identify missing services and prioritize members for outreach based on the missing services. By prioritizing members using the algorithms described in the specification, a computer is able to direct outreach and cause tangible benefits outside of the computer system. ***These limitations link the claims to a particular technological environment which uses an object-oriented system to improve methods of identifying missing services and prioritizing members for outreach.***

App. Br. 7–8 (Appellants’ citations omitted; panel’s emphasis and formatting added).

In addition to the aforementioned abstract idea, claim 11 recites that the aforementioned abstract idea “is performed by one or more computing devices.” The aforementioned element does not transform claim 11 into something more than the aforementioned abstract idea, because the aforementioned element does no more than generally link the use of the aforementioned abstract idea to a particular technological environment. *See* MPEP § 2106.05(h); *see also FairWarning IP, LLC v. Iatric Sys., Inc.*, 839 F.3d 1089, 1095 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (“Although [the] . . . claims require the use of a computer, it is this incorporation of a computer, *not* the claimed rule,

that purportedly ‘improve[s] [the] existing technological process’ by allowing the automation of further tasks.”) (citation omitted).

We are not persuaded by Appellants’ argument that claim 11 is allegedly similar to the claims at issue in *McRO, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games Am. Inc.*, 837 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2016). *See* App. Br. 5–6. Unlike the claims at issue in *McRO*, claim 11 fails to recite the technical details that distinguishes the claimed process of identifying high priority healthcare recipients from prior processes of identifying high priority healthcare recipients.

We are also not persuaded by Appellants’ argument that claim 11 allegedly recites either: (a) unconventional steps that confine the claim to a particular useful application; or (b) meaningful limitations beyond generally linking the use of the abstract idea to a particular technological environment. *See* App. Br. 7. Appellants support this argument with the contention that the Examiner withdrew a prior-art rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. *See* App. Br. 7–8. However, this contention conflates the non-obviousness test under 35 U.S.C. § 103 with the patent-eligibility test under 35 U.S.C. § 101, and, thus, is not persuasive.

Accordingly, consistent with the Examiner’s findings, we determine claim 11 does not include an improvement to another technology or technical field, an improvement to the functioning of the computer itself (*see* MPEP § 2106.05(a)), or meaningful limitations beyond generally linking the use of an abstract idea to a particular technological environment (*see* MPEP § 2106.05(h)). *See* Non-Final Act. 10–11; *see also* Ans. 7. Further, in view of Appellants’ Specification (*see, e.g.*, Spec. ¶¶ 64–65, discussed below in further detail), and consistent with the Examiner’s findings, we conclude

that claim 11 does not integrate the judicial exception into a practical application. We determine claim 11 does not recite:

- (i) an improvement to the functioning of a computer;
- (ii) an improvement to another technology or technical field;
- (iii) an application of the abstract idea with, or by use of, a particular machine;
- (iv) a transformation or reduction of a particular article to a different state or thing; or
- (v) other meaningful limitations beyond generally linking the use of the abstract idea to a particular technological environment.

See MPEP §§ 2106.05(a)–(c), (e)–(h). We agree with the Examiner that claim 11 is *directed to* a judicial exception.

D.3. Step 2B

Appellants contend:

In *Berkheimer v. HP Inc.*, . . . the Federal Circuit clarified that whether an additional element represents well-understood, routine, conventional activity to a skilled artisan at the time of the patent is a factual determination. Thus, for a determination that the additional elements alone or in combination do not amount to significantly more than an abstract idea requires some showing of fact.

The various Office Actions and [Examiner’s Answer] . . . *fail to provide a showing of fact that the additional elements in the independent and dependent claims are not sufficient to amount to significantly more than the judicial exception.*

Reply Br. 1 (Appellants’ citations omitted; panel’s emphasis added).

Consistent with the Examiner’s findings, the recited “one or more computing devices” are generic computers that perform functions (*e.g.*,

storing and correlating data, executing rules to generate reports and to calculate scores based on the generated reports, and categorizing data) that are well-understood, routine, and conventional to one of ordinary skill in the art. *See* Non-Final Act. 10–11; *see also* Ans. 7. Further, Appellants’ Specification provides objective evidence that the recited “one or more computing devices” are generic computer components that perform functions that are well-understood, routine, and conventional to one of ordinary skill in the art, as shown below:

FIG. 1 and FIG. 2 are illustrative views of various aspects of *an example system 100 in which the techniques described herein may be practiced*, according to an embodiment. *System 100 is a computer-based system. The various components of system 100 are implemented at least partially by hardware at one or more computing devices, such as one or more hardware processors executing instructions stored in one or more memories for performing various functions described herein*

....

... In an embodiment, *system 100 is a server computer system*, comprising one or more server computer devices that collectively implement the various components of system 100 as a set of server-side processes. *The server computer system may include web server, application server, database server, and/or other conventional server components that the depicted components utilize to provide the described functionality.*

Spec. ¶¶ 64–65.

We are not persuaded by Appellants’ argument that the Examiner has allegedly failed to provide a showing of fact that the additional elements of claim 11 are not sufficient to amount to significantly more than the abstract idea. *See* Reply Br. 1–2. While patent eligibility is ultimately a question of law, whether something is well-understood, routine, and conventional to a skilled artisan at the time of the invention is a factual determination. *See*

Berkheimer v. HP Inc., 881 F.3d 1360, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2018). Contrary to Appellants’ argument, the Examiner provided an objective analysis as to why the additional element recited in claim 11 beyond the abstract idea (*i.e.*, “one or more computing devices”) does not amount to significantly more than the abstract idea. *See* Non-Final Act. 10 (describing that the claimed one or more computer devices was “generic computer structure that serves to perform generic computer functions that serve to generally link the abstract idea to a particular technological environment or field of use”). Further, as found by the Examiner and previously described above, paragraphs 64 and 65 of Appellants’ Specification support the Examiner’s analysis. *See* Non-Final Act. 11 (citing Spec. ¶¶ 64–65).

In view of Appellants’ Specification, and consistent with the Examiner’s determinations, we determine the claims do not recite:

- (vi) a specific limitation other than what is well-understood, routine, conventional activity in the field or unconventional steps that confine the claim to a particular useful application.

See MPEP § 2106.05(d).

CONCLUSION

- (1) The Examiner has not erred in rejecting claims 11–20 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.
- (2) Claims 11–20 are not patentable.

We affirm the Examiner’s rejection of claims 11–20 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Appeal 2018-007064
Application 14/170,564

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

In summary:

Claims Rejected	Basis	Affirmed	Reversed
11-20	§ 101	11-20	

AFFIRMED