UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
14/042,564	09/30/2013	Samuel Koppes	418278004US	7664

143198 7590 01/31/2020	**EXAMINER**
MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP (MS)	YU, XIANG
100 E WISCONSIN AVENUE	
Suite 3300	
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2455	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/31/2020	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):

mkeipdocket@michaelbest.com

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

_____

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

_____

Ex parte SAMUEL KOPPES, NEAL MYERSON, SRIKRISHNA GALI,
PAUL LO, and JOSEPH MASTERSON

_____

Appeal 2018-007749
Application 14/042,564
Technology Center 2400

_____

Before JOHNNY A. KUMAR, JOHN A. EVANS, and JOYCE CRAIG,
Administrative Patent Judges.

KUMAR, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION ON APPEAL

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 134(a), Appellant[1] appeals from the
Examiner's decision to reject claims 1–3, 5–8, 12–15, and 21–26. Non-Final
Act. 2. Claim 4, 9–11, and 16–20 have been cancelled. *Id.* We have
jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We affirm.

_____

[1] We use the word Appellant to refer to "applicant" as defined in 37 C.F.R.
§ 1.42(a). Appellant identifies the real party in interest as Microsoft
Corporation. Appeal Br. 2.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Introduction

Appellant's invention relates to a "relationship view system [that] generates a relationship view of information for a relationship between a user and another person for display to the user." Abstract.

Representative Claim

Representative claim 1 under appeal reads as follows:

> 1. A computer-readable storage medium storing computer-executable instructions for controlling a computing device to generate a relationship view of information for a user, the computer-executable instructions comprising instructions that:
> receive from the user an indication of a focus for the
> > relationship view, the focus being an entity such that the relationship view provides information that identifies items of information types that relate both to the user and to the entity; and
> in response to receiving the indication of the focus:
> > display information relating to the entity; and
> > for each of a plurality of information types:
> > > identify items of that information type that are
> > > > related to both the user and the focus, such that only items that relate to both the user and the focus are identified; and
> > > display information that identifies that information
> > > > type and that uniquely identifies each of the identified items of that information type;
> > wherein information for multiple information types is provided
> > > for simultaneous display and wherein the displayed information provides the user with a relationship view of items that relate to both the user and the focus.

Supplemental Appeal Br. 2 filed on January 4, 2018 (Claims Appendix).

REFERENCES AND REJECTION

Claims 1–3, 5–8, 12–15, and 21–26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.
§ 103(a) as unpatentable over Li (US 2011/0078188 A1, published March
31, 2011) in view of Robinson (US 2006/0173957 A1, published August 3,
2006).

ANALYSIS

We have reviewed the Examiner's rejection in light of Appellant's
arguments that the Examiner has erred. We disagree with Appellant's
conclusions. The Examiner has provided a comprehensive response,
supported by sufficient evidence, to each of the contentions raised by
Appellant. We adopt as our own (1) the findings and reasons set forth by the
Examiner in the Non-Final Action from which this appeal is taken (*see* Non-
Final Act. 3–27) and (2) the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the
Examiner's Answer in response to Appellant's Appeal Brief (*see* Ans. 3–
13). However, we highlight and address specific findings and arguments for
emphasis as follows.

Appellant contends that the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 1 under
35 U.S.C. § 103(a) because

> it is not logically possible for Li to describe the remaining portion of
> Claim 1 because the remaining portion of Claim 1 recites 'in response
> to receiving the indication of the focus,' which is conditioned on the
> portion of Claim 1 that Li does not disclose according to the
> Examiner. Hence, any and all arguments that the Examiner provides
> using Li is improper.

Appeal Br. 7.

As to Appellant's above contention, we disagree for the reasons set
forth by the Examiner at pages 16–19 of the Answer. The Examiner finds
Robinson explicitly discloses the disputed features:

>Robinson was introduced and relied upon, as Robinson's system
>more expressly displayed the relationship or connection
>between a requesting user and the queried person or document.
>The appellant did not expressly argue Robinson's teachings and
>citations here, but the examiner would like to clarify that
>*Robinson provided multiple graphical views on how to the
>relationship between two entities can be displayed.* Robinson
>for example discloses early on about sematic network analysis
>of documents as well as event analysis (i.e., how or when they
>occur in time) (e.g., Robinson: ¶ [0021]). Robinson further
>discloses that an analysis mechanism allows a user to model,
>access, analyze, visualize, and report on the *various relations
>that exist between the messages*, such as analyzing and
>extracting information from the messages to determine the
>sender and receiver of each message (e.g., ¶¶ [0042-43]).
>Robinson provided many *different exemplary graphical
>representations,* as depicted in Figures 4-9 and the most
>relevant graphs that we will be focusing on are Figures 5, 7, and
>8 as they most closely depict information related to the claimed
>language, such as the relationship between two entities.

Ans. 5 (emphasis added).

Appellant's arguments are misdirected and are not persuasive. Appellant is attacking the Li reference, when the Examiner relies upon the Robinson for teaching the claimed "in response to receiving the indication of the focus" feature. *See* Ans. 4–6. Thus, Appellant is challenging the wrong reference and not responding to the Examiner's specific findings.

Appellant also contends that the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) because "there is nothing in Figure 8 or any other portion of Robinson that describes, for each of a plurality of information types (e.g., emails and calendar events), displaying information that identifies that information type as recited by applicant's claims." Appeal Br. 8.

4

The Examiner finds, and we agree that Appellant's arguments are not commensurate in scope with the claim language because:

> the *claim language does not explicitly limit it down to e-mails*. Also, once again, as the appellant summarized in the beginning that "both [references were] directed to identifying a social network based on analyzing for example emails and instant messages" which meant that e-mails and instant messages are already being considered by the applied teachings from Li in view of Robinson. Furthermore, with the system receiving from the inquiring user "an indication of a focus," that phrase is being interpreted to be very straightforward, as the system is getting the user's entered search term(s) or query, which is simply an "entity." *Independent claim 1 does not limit down what an "entity"* may be and not until dependent claim 3, where it is further limited to a document.

Ans. 10. (emphasis added, alteration in original).

We also note that Appellant's challenge to the references individually is not convincing of error in the Examiner's findings. *See In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 426 (CCPA 1981) ("[O]ne cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where, as here, the rejections are based on combinations of references.)." Thus, the Examiner, giving the claim its broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the Specification, has properly found that Li and Robinson teach the disputed limitations, as explained above.

Therefore, based on this record, we are not persuaded of error regarding the Examiner's underlying factual findings and ultimate legal conclusion of obviousness for independent claim 1, and independent claims 12 and 21, argued together with claim 1. Separate patentability is not argued for the dependent claims.

Because Appellant has not persuaded us the Examiner erred, we sustain the rejection of claims 1–3, 5–8, 12–15, and 21–26.

CONCLUSION

We affirm the Examiner's decision to reject claims 1–3, 5–8, 12–15, and 21–26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

DECISION SUMMARY

In summary:

Claims Rejected	35 U.S.C. §	Reference(s)/Basis	Affirmed	Reversed
1–3, 5–8, 12–15, 21–26	103(a)	Li, Robinson	1–3, 5–8, 12–15, 21–26	

TIME PERIOD FOR RESPONSE

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) (2017).

AFFIRMED