



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.
13/973,883	08/22/2013	David R. Richardson	SEAZN.284C1	8777
79502	7590	11/14/2019	EXAMINER	
Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear, LLP AMAZON TECHNOLOGIES, INC. 2040 Main Street Fourteenth Floor Irvine, CA 92614			HARRELL, ROBERT B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2442	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/14/2019	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):

SEAZN.Admin@knobbe.com
efiling@knobbe.com
jayna.cartee@knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte DAVID R. RICHARDSON, BRADLEY EUGENE MARSHALL,
SWAMINATHAN SIVASUBRAMANIAN and TAL SARAF

Appeal 2018-007143
Application 13/973,883
Technology Center 2400

Before JOHNNY A. KUMAR, JOHN A. EVANS, and
JAMES W. DEJMEK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

KUMAR, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellant¹ appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from a Final Rejection of claims 1–20. We have jurisdiction over the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We reverse.

¹ Throughout this Decision, we use the word “Appellant” to refer to “applicant” as defined in 37 C.F.R. § 1.42 (2017). Appellant identifies the real party in interest as Amazon Technologies, Inc. App. Br. 3.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Introduction

Appellant's disclosed and claimed invention generally relates to "routing of a DNS query from a client computing device to a network computing component via an application broker for processing requested content associated with the DNS query." Spec. 4:1–3.

Claim 1 is exemplary of the subject matter on appeal and is reproduced below:

1. A system comprising:
 - a data store configured to store specific computer executable instructions; and a DNS server including a processor in communication with the data store, the processor configured to execute the stored specific computer executable instructions in order to at least:
 - obtain a DNS query from a client computing device, wherein the DNS query corresponds to a requested resource associated with a resource identifier and wherein the DNS server corresponds to an application broker;
 - select a network computing component for processing the requested resource from a plurality of network computing components based on application information included in a DNS portion of the resource identifier; and
 - cause transmission of information identifying the selected network computing component from the DNS server to the client computing device.

The Examiner's Rejection

Claims 1–20 stand rejected under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cranor et al. (US 2003/0112792 A1; published June 19, 2003). Final Act. 2–8.

ANALYSIS²

Appellant disputes the Examiner’s findings that Cranor discloses “select[ing] a network computing component for processing the requested resource from a plurality of network computing components based on application information included in a DNS portion of the resource identifier,” as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 10, 19, and 20. App. Br. 11–13; Reply Br. 2–6.

In particular, Appellant contends “Cranor, in paragraph [0023], states ‘[n]ote it is not possible to do content aware redirection with other known redirection methods, in particular, DNS-based redirection. The reason is that DNS resolution resolves a DNS hostname to an IP address. The content part of a URL is therefore not taken into account.’” App. Br. 13.

We agree with Appellant as our interpretation of the disclosure of Cranor coincides with that of Appellant. *See* App. Br. 11–13; Reply Br. 2–6.

We conclude that the Examiner’s findings are not supported by Cranor for the reasons set forth by Appellant.

Therefore, on this record, we find the weight of the evidence supports the positions articulated by Appellant in the briefs. Accordingly, as such, we cannot sustain the Examiner’s rejections of claims 1, 10, 19, and 20.

Because we reverse the rejection of independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 20 on appeal, we also reverse the rejections of dependent claims 2–9, and 12–18, which depend on claims 1 and 10 respectively.

² Throughout this Decision, we have considered the Appeal Brief, filed January 16, 2018 (“App. Br.”); the Reply Brief, filed July 03, 2018 (“Reply Br.”); the Examiner’s Answer, mailed May 03, 2018 (“Ans.”); and the Final Office Action, mailed April 18, 2017 (“Final Act.”), from which this Appeal is taken.

DECISION

In summary:

Claims Rejected	35 U.S.C. §	Reference	Affirmed	Reversed
1-20	102(b)	Cranor et al.		1-20

REVERSED