



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.
12/910,726	10/22/2010	Lukasz Wladyslaw Pawlowski	14917.1582USU1/330341.02	8759
27488	7590	09/26/2019	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)			SISON, JUNE Y	
P.O. BOX 2903			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			2443	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/26/2019	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):

USPTO27488@merchantgould.com
usdoCKET@microsoft.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte LUKASZ WLADYSLAW PAWLOWSKI,
JOHN EDWARD GALLARDO, and YUNXIN WU

Appeal 2018-007285
Application 12/910,726¹
Technology Center 2400

Before CARL W. WHITEHEAD JR., JASON V. MORGAN, and
PHILLIP A. BENNETT, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MORGAN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL
STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Introduction

This is an appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Examiner's Final Rejection of claims 1–17, 21, and 23. Claims 18–20 are canceled. Appeal Br. 26. The Examiner objects to claim 22 as depending from a rejected claim, but otherwise concludes it would be allowable if rewritten in

¹ Appellants identify Microsoft Technology Licensing, LLC, as the real party in interest. Appeal Br. 3.

independent form and incorporating the recitations of claim 17, from which it depends. Final Act. 22. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We AFFIRM.

Summary of the disclosure

The Specification discloses “providing a preview feature in a report designer that allows modifications to report metadata to be made and previewed accurately.” Abstract. Editable previews are provided for by allocating a memory location that “allows relative paths and references to sub-reports or data sources in the original report to be accurately reflected in a preview on the client.” *Id.*

Representative claims (key limitations emphasized)

1. A computer implemented method of previewing modifications to an original report in a reporting service application, the method comprising:

receiving, at a report publishing server, a request to publish the original report;

publishing the original report, wherein the original report is stored at a location at the report publishing server;

receiving, from a first client, a first request at the report publishing server to create a first in-memory temporary namespace, wherein the first in-memory temporary namespace is associated with the location and allows for access to one or more paths used by the original report;

receiving, from the first client, first modified metadata associated with the original report;

storing the first modified metadata in the first in-memory temporary namespace;

generating first preview information from the first in-memory temporary namespace, wherein the first preview information comprises the original report modified by the first modified metadata;

sending, to the first client, the first preview information;

receiving, from a second client, a second request at the report publishing server to create a second in-memory temporary namespace, wherein the second in-memory temporary namespace is associated with the location and allows for access to one or more paths used by the original report;

receiving, from the second client, second modified metadata associated with the original report;

storing the second modified metadata in the second in-memory temporary namespace;

generating second preview information from the second in-memory temporary namespace, wherein the second preview information comprises the original report modified by the second modified metadata; and

sending, to the second client, the second preview information.

9. A computer implemented method of testing a connection between a report publishing server and a shared data source, the method comprising:

publishing, at the report publishing server, an original report;

receiving a request at the report publishing server to create an in-memory temporary namespace for storing modified metadata of the original report, wherein the modified metadata includes at least one data source definition representing a reference to the shared data source, *wherein the modified metadata further includes data source credentials*, and the in-memory temporary namespace allows a connection between the report publishing server and the shared data source to be tested using the at least one data source definition and the data source credentials;

receiving, at the report publishing server., the modified metadata from a client; and

storing the modified metadata in the in-memory temporary namespace.

17. A non-transitory computer readable storage media device storing computer executable instructions that when executed perform a method of testing connection data referenced in a report, the method comprising:

at a report publishing server, *receiving a request to test a connection between the report publishing server and a shared data source of the report*, wherein the report publishing server is configured to access data source location information and data source credentials of the shared data source, wherein the data source location information and data source credentials are stored in metadata of the report, wherein the report is published in a server environment on the report publishing server;

attempting to establish the connection with the shared data source using the data source location information and the data source credentials; and

sending an indication to the client regarding whether the connection to the data source was established.

Examiner's rejections and references

The Examiner rejects claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iremonger et al. (US 7,000,182 B1; issued Feb. 14, 2006) (“Iremonger”) and Deutscher et al. (US 2004/0001106 A1; published Jan. 1, 2004) (“Deutscher”). Final Act. 3–8.

The Examiner rejects claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iremonger, Deutscher, and Fazal et al. (US 2007/0239508 A1; published Oct. 11, 2007) (“Fazal”). Final Act. 8–9.

The Examiner rejects claims 5–8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iremonger, Deutscher, and Wu et al. (US 2005/0033726 A1; published Feb. 10, 2005) (“Wu”). Final Act. 9–12.

The Examiner rejects claims 9, 10, and 12–16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iremonger and Wu. Final Act. 12–17.

The Examiner rejects claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iremonger, Wu, and Fazal. Final Act. 17–18.

The Examiner rejects claims 17 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griffin et al. (US 6,442,714 B1; issued Aug. 27, 2002) (“Griffin”) and Wu. Final Act. 18–21.

The Examiner rejects claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iremonger, Deutscher, and Griffin. Final Act. 21.

CLAIMS 1–8 AND 21

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner finds that Iremonger’s creation of a temporary file and temporary data structure as part of a layout/report wizard teaches or suggests *receiving, from a first client, a first request at the report publishing server to create a first in-memory temporary namespace, wherein the first in-memory temporary namespace is associated with the location and allows for access to one or more paths used by the original report.* Final Act. 4 (citing Iremonger Fig. 4, col. 4, ll. 1–31); *see also* Ans. 26.

Appellants argues that because Iremonger stores temporary data in a temporary folder to *create* an original report, Iremonger fails to teach or suggest *creating a first in-memory temporary namespace that allows for access to one or more paths used by an original report.* *See* Appeal Br. 16 (citing Iremonger col. 4, ll. 22–30). That is, Appellant argues that “at best, Iremonger teaches a report creation wizard that is used to *create* reports.” Reply Br. 4 (citing Iremonger Fig. 22).

Appellants’ arguments are unpersuasive because the claim limitations, given their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the Specification, do not exclude report creation. “Unless the steps of a method actually recite an order, the steps are not ordinarily construed to require one.” *Interactive Gift*

Exp., Inc. v. Compuserve Inc., 256 F.3d 1323, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (citing *Loral Fairchild Corp. v. Sony Corp.*, 181 F.3d 1313, 1322 (Fed.Cir.1999)). Even though claim 1 recites *receiving a request to publish an original report and publishing the report at a location* before the disputed recitation of *receiving a request to create a first in-memory temporary namespace associated with the location and allowing for access to paths used by the original report*, we are unable to discern any requirement that the *publication request* and *publication* steps must be performed before the *in-memory temporary namespace creation request* step. That is, claim 1 is not limited to the *first request* being directed to *editing* an existing report. Instead, claim 1 is broader than the process disclosed in Figure 4 (publishing the report (404) explicitly takes place before receiving a request to establish a memory location (406)). Claim 1 is also broader than and claim 3 (not argued separately)—which depends from claim 1 and further defines the *receiving the first request* step as comprising *receiving a request to establish an edit session*. Because Appellants' arguments are not commensurate with the scope of the disputed recitation, Appellants arguments are unpersuasive of error.

The Examiner relies on Deutscher's preview tab—which allows for iteratively changing and previewing changes to a presentation—to teach or suggest *generating first preview information from the first in-memory temporary namespace, wherein the first preview information comprises the original report modified by the first modified metadata*, and, similarly *generating second preview information from the second in-memory temporary namespace, wherein the second preview information comprises*

the original report modified by the second modified metadata. Final Act. 6–7 (citing Deutscher Fig. 22, ¶¶ 15, 174, 190, 219–21); *see also* Ans. 26–27.

Appellants contend the Examiner erred because “Iremonger discloses creating a report and even discloses an option to preview the created report, *but fails entirely to disclose or suggest previewing modifications to a previously created report.*” Appeal Br. 15 (emphasis added). Appellants argue that Deutscher fails to cure the alleged deficiency of Iremonger because Deutscher merely “discloses a system for creating interactive, multi-media presentations that integrate video, audio, presentation slides, text, and other media components into a manageable production environment. . . . Deutscher is entirely unrelated to the modification of reports, and even more, unrelated to reports in general.” Appeal Br. 16 (citing Deutscher, Abstract). The Examiner’s findings, however, persuasively show that it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to apply Deutscher’s teachings and suggestions as they relate to making changes to and previewing the representation of information to enable similar changes in and previews to the reports of Iremonger. *See* Ans. 26–27 (citing, e.g., Deutscher ¶¶ 13–14). In particular, the Examiner correctly notes that Deutscher is not limited to particular types of presentations, but is instead broadly applicable to “documents of various kinds, HTML files, animations, and the like.” Deutscher ¶ 13 (cited in Ans. 27).

Accordingly, we sustain the Examiner’s 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 1, and the Examiner’s 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 2–8 and 21, which Appellants do not argue separately. Appeal Br. 17.

CLAIMS 9–16

Appellants contend the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 9 because “Iremonger discloses a report creation wizard that is used to create original reports and does not disclose or even suggest previewing *modifications* to an *original* report” and because “Iremonger discloses the creation of a temporary file and a temporary data structure that stores information obtained from the interview process in order to create such an original report.” Appeal Br. 18 (citing Iremonger, col. 2, ll. 19–25, col. 4, ll. 22–25). Appellants’ arguments are similar to those discussed above with respect to the Examiner’s reliance on Iremonger in rejecting claim 1, and thus are unpersuasive for similar reasons. Appellants’ arguments are also unpersuasive to the extent they pertain to issues that are unrelated to claim 9 (e.g., claim 9 does not have *previewing* recitations).

In rejecting claim 9 as obvious, the Examiner finds that Wu’s teaching that logon credentials can be saved as part of a data connection to teach or suggest *wherein the modified metadata further includes data source credentials*. Final Act. 14 (citing Wu ¶ 84); *see also* Ans. 29. Appellants contend the Examiner erred because Wu “merely refers to the use of a console that users must use to re-enter login information if the underlying data sources are not saved as part of the data connection,” which Appellants argue “is entirely unrelated to whether the metadata includes data source credentials.” Appeal Br. 19.

Appellants’ arguments are unpersuasive because Wu teaches that login information must be re-entered only *if* logon credentials are not saved as part of a data connection. Wu ¶ 84. Thus, Wu plainly teaches saving login credentials as part of a data connection. That is, if it was not possible

to save login credentials as part of the data connection, then the login re-entry of Wu would not be conditional in the manner disclosed. *See id.* Appellants do not persuasively distinguish the claimed *modified metadata* from Wu’s saved data connection information, nor do Appellants persuasively distinguish the claimed *data source credentials* from Wu’s logon credentials. Therefore, we agree with the Examiner that Wu teaches or suggests “wherein the modified metadata further includes data source credentials,” as recited in claim 9. *See* Final Act. 14.

Accordingly, we sustain the Examiner’s 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 9, and the Examiner’s 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 10–16, which Appellants do not argue separately. Appeal Br. 20.

CLAIMS 17 AND 23

In rejecting claim 17 as obvious, the Examiner finds that Griffin’s web-based test form creation process—which includes both sending a request to a web server and passing SQL instructions to a database—teaches or suggests *receiving a request to test a connection between a report publishing server and a shared data source of the report*. Final Act. 19 (citing Griffin Fig. 7, col. 5, l. 23–col. 6, l. 35); *see also* Ans. 30–32.

Appellants argue Griffin is not related to the claimed invention because “Griffin discloses a central electronic repository for storing test procedures, test equipment, test data log formats, and report formats.” Appeal Br. 21. Specifically, Appellants contend “Griffin’s mere recitation of ‘test data stored in a relational database’ and accessing ‘test report data from database server 22’ . . . cannot be said to be analogous to the claimed step of ‘receiving a request *to test a connection* between the report publishing server and a shared data source of the report.’” Reply Br. 6.

Appellants' arguments are unpersuasive because Griffin's test application server 20, in accessing test report data from database server 22, tests the connection between the test application server 20 and database server 22. *See* Ans. 31–32 (citing Griffin Figs. 1, 3, 7, col. 3, l. 35–col. 4, l. 29, col. 5, l. 5–col. 6, l. 35). That is, if the connection between test application server 20 and database server 22 is broken, then any attempt to access test report data will fail, making all such requests *a test of the connection* in the same manner of claim 17. Therefore, we agree with the Examiner that Griffin teaches or suggests “receiving a request to test a connection between the report publishing server and a shared data source of the report,” as recited in claim 17. Final Act. 19.

Furthermore, Appellants' arguments regarding claim 17, to the extent they are similar to Appellants' arguments discussed above with respect to the Examiner's reliance on Wu, and to the extent to which they are not commensurate with the scope of claim 17 and the Examiner's rejection thereof, are unpersuasive of error. *See* Appeal Br. 20–21.

Accordingly, we sustain the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 17, and claim 23, which Appellants do not argue separately. Appeal Br. 22.

DECISION

We affirm the Examiner's decision rejecting claims 1–17, 21, and 23.

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. § 41.50(f).

AFFIRMED