APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
14/882,819	10/14/2015	Jigesh Saheba	ES2014057-2	5133

126105 7590 10/02/2020		

Duke W. Yee
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. BOX 6669
MCKINNEY, TX 75071

EXAMINER
SHAIFER HARRIMAN, DANT B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2434	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/02/2020	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):

ptonotifs@yeeiplaw.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

_____

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

_____

Ex parte JIGESH SAHEBA, ROBERTO A. MASIERO,
and ISABEL ESPINA CARVAJAL

_____

Appeal 2019-004252[1]
Application 14/882,819
Technology Center 2400

_____

Before: MARC S. HOFF, JENNIFER L MCKEOWN, and
MICHAEL T. CYGAN,
Administrative Patent Judges.

MCKEOWN, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 134(a), Appellant appeals from the

Examiner's Final decision to reject claims 1–21. We have jurisdiction under

35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We AFFIRM.

CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The claims are directed to a gateway within a web services system.

Spec. ¶ 2. More specifically, the claims "relate[] to a method and apparatus

---

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

for facilitating communication between the client and the proxy server using a gateway." *Id.*

Claim 1, reproduced below, is illustrative of the claimed subject matter:

1. A method for facilitating communication between a client and a proxy server, the method comprising:

   receiving, at a gateway, a message from a client, wherein the message includes a uniform resource identifier that references an interface associated with a resource;

   transforming, by the gateway, the uniform resource identifier in the message received from the client into a context resource identifier that also references the interface;

   performing, by the gateway, an initial authorization check including:

   performing for an authorization check for the client with respect to the interface; and

   performing for an authorization check for a user of the client with respect to the interface;

   inserting, by the gateway, the context resource identifier into the message received from the client to form a modified message in response to a successful initial authorization check; and

   sending, by the gateway, the modified message to the proxy server.

REFERENCES

The prior art relied upon by the Examiner is:

Name	Reference	Date
Webb	US 2002/0083342 A1	June 27, 2002
Cobb	US 2007/0288253 A1	Dec. 13, 2007
Maffione	US 2008/0276304 A1	Nov. 6, 2008
Fresko	US 2010/0223471 A1	Sept. 2, 2010
Bonner	US 8,064,906 B1	Nov. 22, 2011
Aziz	US 2011/0314546	Dec. 22, 2011
Wheeldon	US 2013/0346472 A1	Dec. 26, 2013

REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 11, 18, 19, and 21 as unpatentable over Webb and Islam. Final Act. 8–13.

The Examiner rejects claims 2 and 12 as unpatentable over Webb, Islam, and Cobb. Final Act. 13–18.

The Examiner rejects claims 3, 4, 13, and 14 as unpatentable over Webb, Islam, Cobb, and Fresko. Final Act. 18–20.

The Examiner rejects claim 5 as unpatentable over Webb, Islam, Cobb, and Bonner. Final Act. 20–21.

The Examiner rejects claims 6, 15, and 20 as unpatentable over Webb, Islam, Wheeldon. Final Act. 21–23.

The Examiner rejects claims 7 and 16 as unpatentable over Webb, Islam, and Aziz. Final Act. 23–25.

The Examiner rejects claims 8, 9, and 17 as unpatentable over Webb, Islam, and Malfone. Final Act. 25–26.

The Examiner rejects claim 10 as unpatentable over Webb, Islam, Malfone, and Aziz. Final Act. 26–28.

OPINION

THE OBVIOUSNESS REJECTION BASED ON WEBB AND ISLAM

Claims 1, 11, 18, 19, and 21

Based on the record before us, we are not persuaded that the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 1 as unpatentable over Webb and Islam.

Appellant argues that Webb in view of Islam fails to teach or suggest transforming, by the gateway, the uniform resource identifier in the message received from the client into a context resource identifier that also references the interface. Appeal Br. 7–10. Appellant maintains that while Webb's gateway replaces network addresses within a Web page, that is then provided to the client, "Webb never changes the gateway URL/gateway port address *in the access request received from the client*." Appeal Br. 9. Appellant further contends that Webb redirects the client request message "without any transformation of the IP address/URL indicated in the request." Reply Br. 3. According to Appellant, Webb's "gateway uses the gateway port indicated in the client request to 'redirect' the request according to the indicated port number. This port forwarding occurs without any transformation of the IP address/URL indicated in the request." Reply Br. 3–4.

We disagree. Webb generally relates to a system that allows a client on a public network to access devices on a private network. Webb ¶¶ 41–42, Abstract. In Webb, a gateway has an IP address valid on the private and public network. Webb ¶ 44. The gateway scans a range of private network addresses to identify Web servers of the devices and then maps each identified device Web server to a respective port. Webb ¶ 45. Webb stores

the corresponding port and web address for the device Web server in a
routing list, for example as depicted in Figure 2 below.

```
12.24.3.253:1000  ─────────►  192.168.0.3:80
12.24.3.253:1001  ─────────►  192.168.0.4:80
12.24.3.253:1002  ─────────►  192.168.0.5:80
12.24.3.253:1003  ─────────►  192.168.0.6:80
12.24.3.253:1004  ─────────►  192.168.0.7:80
12.24.3.253:1005  ─────────►  192.168.0.8:80
12.24.3.253:1006  ─────────►  192.168.0.9:80
```

ROUTING LIST *30*

Figure 2 of Webb Depicting an Exemplary Routing List

Webb further explains

> An address and open port of a Web server for each device
> connected to the private network 16 of FIG. 1 is mapped to a
> respective, different gateway port. For example, the Web server
> for the security system 20 (FIG. 1) has an IP address of
> 192.168.0.5 and is listening at port 80. As illustrated in FIG. 2,
> this Web server address (i.e., 192.168.0.5:80) is mapped to port
> 1002 of the gateway 14 (FIG. 1). Thus, as will be described
> below, *a client request directed to the Web server of the security
> system 20 (FIG. 1) will be addressed to port 1002 of the gateway
> 14 (FIG. 1) using the IP address of the gateway 14 (i.e., the IP
> address that is valid on the public network 12).*

Webb ¶ 45 (emphasis added). In other words, Webb teaches that a client,

connected to a public network, requests a device Web server, connected to

the private network, using the publicly available gateway IP address and the

port corresponding to the device Web Server. *Id.* Webb's gateway then

redirects the request to the respective device Web server using the routing

list. *Id.* ¶¶ 51, 45.

As the examiner points out, a skilled artisan understands that in redirecting the request, the gateway transforms the gateway address (i.e. uniform resource identifier) and corresponding port to the device Web server address (i.e. context resource identifier) using the routing list. Ans. 24. The Specification similarly describes, in an exemplary embodiment, that the gateway transforms the uniform resource identifier to the context resource identifier by using an identifier data structure, which "may take the form of a table, a spreadsheet, a database, a word document, a cache, a data store, or some other type of data structure." Spec. ¶ 60. While Appellant generally asserts that no transformation is performed, Appellant fails to persuasively explain how the gateway's redirection fails to satisfy the transforming step. As such, we are not persuaded that the Examiner determining that Webb teaches the transforming limitation.

Appellant next argues that Webb and Islam fail to teach the recited inserting, by the gateway, the context resource identifier into the message received from the client to form a modified message in response to a successful initial authorization check. Appeal Br. 10–13. According to Appellant, Islam's trust broker performs an authentication but does not insert any context resource identifier. Appeal Br. 12. The Examiner, however, points out that Islam's trust broker transmits the session information, i.e. context resource identifier, to the server system, i.e. proxy server, that provides the requested applications and resources. Ans. 29 (citing Islam ¶ 7).

We agree with the Examiner. Islam relates to systems for providing secure access with network resources. Islam, Abstract. In particular, Islam teaches that a trust broker receives a request from a user and determines

6

what applications and resources the user is authorized to access. Islam ¶ 7. If the user is authorized to access the requested applications and resources, the trust broker establishes a connection with the user agent and transmits session information, i.e. context resource identifier, to the server system that provides the applications and resources. *Id.* As such, we are not persuaded of error.

Accordingly, based on the record before us, we sustain the rejection of claims 1, 11, 18, 19, and 21 as unpatentable over Webb and Islam.

THE REMAINING OBVIOUSNESS REJECTIONS

Claims 2–10, 12–17, and 20

As discussed above, we are not persuaded that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1, 11, and 21. Appellant does not present separate arguments of patentability for dependent claims 2–10, 12–17, and 20. *See, e.g.*, Appeal Br. 14–16. As such, we are not persuaded that the Examiner erred in rejecting the remaining claims as unpatentable over the cited combinations of prior art.

DECISION

The Examiner's rejections of claims 1–21 are affirmed.

CONCLUSION SUMMARY

In summary:

Claims Rejected	35 U.S.C. §	Reference(s)/Basis	Affirmed	Reversed
1, 11, 18, 19, 21	103	Webb, Islam	1, 11, 18, 19, 21	
2, 12	103	Webb, Islam, Cobb	2, 12	

3, 4, 13, 14	103	Webb, Islam, Fresko	3, 4, 13, 14	
5	103	Webb, Islam, Cobb, Bonner	5	
6, 15, 20	103	Webb, Islam, Wheeldon	6, 15, 20	
7, 16	103	Webb, Islam, Aziz	7, 16	
8, 9, 17	103	Webb, Islam, Malfone	8, 9, 17	
10	103	Webb, Islam, Malfone, Aziz	10	
Overall Outcome			1–21	

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).

AFFIRMED