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.
11/128,397	05/13/2005	Eric B. Watson	MFCP.117776	7213

45809 7590 05/18/2007
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
(c/o MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
2555 GRAND BOULEVARD
KANSAS CITY, MO 64108-2613

EXAMINER
CHUNG, ANDREW W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2109	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/18/2007	PAPER

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.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	11/128,397	WATSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit 2160 ~~2100~~ ~~2164~~
	Andrew W. Chung	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 May 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *13 May 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are pending.

Specification

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds the 150 word limit. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 2 paragraph [0005] 'searches' is misspelled as 'searchers.'

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 16-20 recite the limitation "a set of search results according to claim 8" in line 1, however, claim 8 recites a method, not "a set a of search results." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Examiner interprets the limitation to be "a set of search results according to claim 15."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-20 lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. The language of the claims raises a question as to whether the claims are directed merely toward an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological environment or machine that would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter. The claims require the addition of physical hardware elements to provide tangible results.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dumais et al. (US 2004/0267700 A1)

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

As per claim 1 Dumais et al. discloses:

- ***generating search results*** (paragraph [0029] "The **results** can be interleaved with the personal results or **returned in a separately marked region of the display**") where the results are search results (paragraph [0029]) and being returned and displayed inherently means the search results have been generated.

- ***an input interface to receive search input*** (paragraph [0027] "A search component 150 is provided that **receives a user query** 154 for information items contained in the content index 140. The search component 150 can be provided as **part of a user interface**") where the "user interface" is an "input interface" as claimed and receiving a suer query is receiving "search input" as claimed.

- ***an access engine, the engine communicating with the input interface to receive the search input*** (paragraph [0027] "A **search component** 150 is provided that **receives a user**

query 154 for information items contained in the content index 140. The search component 150 can be provided as part of a user interface.") where the "search component" is an "access engine" as claimed and being part of the "user interface" (i.e. input interface) inherently means it communicates with the "user interface."

- manage the distribution of the search input to at least one email store and at least one search service (paragraph [0005] "The user interface **facilitates information searches that automatically cut across different information sources** while supporting fast information retrieval") where the "search component" is part of the "user interface" and facilitating information search across different information sources is managing the distribution of the search input and the "information sources" can include at least one email store and at least one search service (paragraph [0024] "The system 100 includes one or more information sources 110 that are accessed or considered by a user. These sources 110 can be similar or disparate in nature having dissimilar information content, whereby some of the information sources may represent local data locations such as files, folders, applications, images, audio files, appointments, **email**, and so forth, and **other sources 110 may represent remote sources such as web information**, for example.") and (paragraph [0029] "One approach to combining methods for indexing and retrieval of information from a personal store is to also send a submitted query (or an automatically reformulated version of that query) to **another search engine** in addition to the personal search system, e.g., MSN Search or Google for the accessing resources from the World Wide Web") where MSN Search and Google exemplify a search service.

- manage the presentation of a set of search results received from the at least one email store and at least one search service. (paragraph [0021] "A search component responds to a search query, initiates a search across the indexed data, and **outputs links to locations of a subset and/or provides sparse representations of the subset.**") where outputing links to locations inherently involves "managing the presentation of a set of search results" as claimed and the search component searches across at least one email store and at least one search service (paragraph [0024] "The system 100 includes one or more information sources 110 that are accessed or considered by a user. These sources 110 can be similar or disparate in nature having dissimilar information content, whereby some of the information sources may represent local data locations such as files, folders, applications, images, audio files, appointments, **email**, and so forth, and **other sources 110 may represent remote sources such as web information**, for example.") and (paragraph [0029] "One approach to combining methods for indexing and retrieval of information from a personal store is to also send a submitted query (or an automatically reformulated version of that query) to **another search engine** in addition to the personal search system, e.g., MSN Search or Google for the accessing resources from the World Wide Web") where MSN Search and Google exemplify a search service.

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Dumais et al. further discloses:

- the at least one email store comprises at least one local email store hosted in a client. (paragraph [0038] "By default, the **users' mail profile** (both **local** and network **stores**), web cache, and personal files are indexed") where "users' mail profile" contains email stores.

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Dumais et al. further discloses:

- the at least one email store comprises at least one remote networked email store. (paragraph [0038] "By default, the **users' mail profile** (both local and **network stores**), web cache, and personal files are indexed") where "users' mail profile" contains email stores.

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Dumais et al. further discloses:

- the at least one email store comprises a plurality of email stores. (paragraph [0038] "By default, the **users' mail profile (both local and network stores),** web cache, and personal files are indexed") where "users' mail profile" contains email stores and having "both local and network stores" is "a plurality of email stores" as claimed.

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Dumais et al. further discloses:

- the search service comprises at least one of a public Internet search service (paragraph [0029] "One approach to combining methods for indexing and retrieval of information from a personal store is to also send a submitted query (or an automatically

reformulated version of that query) to another search engine in addition to the personal search system, e.g., MSN Search or Google for the accessing resources from the World Wide Web") where MSN Search and Google exemplify "a public Internet search service" as claimed.

- and a private network search service. (paragraph [0029] "One approach to combining methods for indexing and retrieval of information from a personal store is to also send a submitted query (or an automatically reformulated version of that query) to another search engine in addition to the **personal search system**") where personal search system is "a private network search service" as claimed.

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Dumais et al. further discloses

- the presentation of the set of search results comprises a ranked list of matches in a interleaved fashion (paragraph [0029] "Gathering results from the personal store and from the outside resources (e.g., the Internet) provide opportunities for display of the two lists of results in different ways. For example, a system can mark the search results as coming from outside the personal store, or from the particular store it has been retrieved from (e.g., from "the Web" or from "cs.stanford.edu" on the Web"). The **results can be interleaved with the personal result.**") where "results" are the search results of the search service (private and/or public) and the "personal results" are the search results of the "personal search system" which includes email stores and (paragraph [0042] "The **results 314 are sorted by Date or Rank** by default") where

"results" are the search results of the search service (private and/or public) where "results 314" are the set of search results including results from both the search service and the email stores.

- based on a unified ranking of relevance from the at least one email store and the at least one search service. (paragraph [0044] "By default date or **a match score can be used to rank the items**") and (paragraph [0029] "Gathering results from the **personal store and from the outside resources (e.g., the Internet)** provide opportunities for display of the two lists of results in different ways.") where "personal store" can include "at least one email store" as claimed and outside resources can include "at least one search service" as claimed.

As per claim 7, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Dumais et al. further discloses:

- the access engine accesses a cache to return matches associated with the at least one email store. (paragraph [0027] "**the search component** 150 extracts items from the **content index** 140 such as **emails**") where "the search component" is the "access engine" as claimed and extracting emails the "content index" is "accessing a cache to return matches associated with the at least one email store."

As per claims 8-14, claims 8-14 are method claims corresponding to the system claims 1-7 and as such are rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection to the rejection of claims 1-7 respectively.

As per claims 15-20, claims 15-20 are method claims corresponding to the system claims 1-6 and as such are rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection to the rejection of claims 1-6 respectively.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew W. Chung whose telephone number is (571) 270-3205. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chameli Das can be reached on (571) 272-3696. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrew Chung
Patent Examiner

Chameli C. Das
CHAMELI DAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
5/15/07

Notice of References Cited	Application/Control No. 11/128,397	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination WATSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Andrew W. Chung	Art Unit 2160	Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
*	A	US-2004/0267700 A1	12-2004	Dumais et al.	707/002
*	B	US-2004/0133564 A1	07-2004	Gross et al.	707/003
*	C	US-6,078,866	06-2000	Buck et al.	702/2
*	D	US-6,460,029	10-2002	Fries et al.	707/3
*	E	US-6,513,031	01-2003	Fries et al.	707/3
*	F	US-6,687,696	02-2004	Hofmann et al.	707/6
*	G	US-6,708,162	03-2004	Morgan et al.	707/3
*	H	US-6,973,450	12-2005	Silverbrook et al.	707/2
*	I	US-2004/0143569 A1	07-2004	Gross et al.	707/003
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	Susan Dumais, Edward Cutrell, JJ Cardiz, Gavin Jancke, Raman Sarin, Daniel C. Robbins; Stuff I've Seen: A System for Personal Information Retrieval and Re-Use; July 2003; Publisher: ACM Press; SIGIR '03 Pages 72-79
	V	
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.