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.
11/771,554	06/29/2007	Prabhat Pandey	30835/319419	8156

45373 7590 12/23/2009
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP (MICROSOFT)
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
6300 SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER
MINA, FATIMA P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2159	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/23/2009	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)	
	11/771,554	PANDEY ET AL.	
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Fatima P. Mina	2159	

-- 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 29 September 2009.

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4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.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

It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of record in the file: Amendment dated 9/29/2009.

Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

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 –
>
> (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.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by Irle et al. (US 7,133,867).

With respect to claim 1, Irle teaches a method of searching data on a computer system, the method executed by a processor of the computer system, the method comprising:

accepting a search query *(figure 1, element 102);*

searching multiple applications on the computer system for data related to the search query wherein the data can be in a variety of formats and *(col. 2, lines 15-20,lines 37-40, col. 3, 40-45,col. 6, lines 50-65; Examiner's Note: different search engines are built in different systems which are interpreted as different applications, col. 3, lines 15-20, the system specify different format for different data, col. 1, lines 28, col. 2, 19-20, the business objects can be of different types);*

displaying search results wherein the search results comprise data related to the search query *(A computer-implemented method for searching business objects includes receiving search criteria, providing the search criteria to one or more search engines, receiving search results from the search engines, defining a result list from the search results, and providing the result list, [abstract], fig. 1, 110).*

With respect to claim 2, Irle teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising determining the security rights of a search query creator; and searching only data that the search query creator has rights *(col. 2, lines 29-30, The system can provide only results that the user is authorized to access, claim 7).*

With respect to claim 6, Irle teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising allowing the search results to be sorted *(figure 6B, element 612).*

With respect to claim 7, Irle teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising allowing the search results to be filtered *(col. 4, lines 30-35).*

With respect to claim 8, Irle teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising not requiring installation of a search program on a user computer *(Methods and apparatus, including computer program products, for performing text and attribute searches of data stores that include business objects, [abstract], EN: the user is not installing any program for the search).*

With respect to claim 9, Irle teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising allowing the selection of the applications that are searched *(figure 6B, the user can select which system has to be search which in interpreted as applications).*

With respect to claim 10, Irle teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the multiple applications are remote applications not resident on a single computer *(col. 3, lines 35-40).*

With respect to claim 13, Irle teaches the method of claim 1, wherein searching multiple applications on the computer system for data related to the search query further comprises: a first tier comprising a user interface client application; a second tier comprising a business data search website; a third tier

comprising a connection application that connects a business data search application to the plurality of applications *(col. 7, lines 45-55).*

With respect to claim 14, Irle teaches the method of claim 13, wherein the second tier further comprises:

a sharepoint access logic which uses a business data search runtime object model to do the search and get the search results *(performing text and attribute searches of data stores that include business objects, [abstract], the system is searching the business data and presenting the search results which is interpreted as a sharepoint access logic);*

an authentication layer that authenticates a search requestor with each application to be searched and *(claim 7, the user has to be authorized to access the data which is interpreted as authentication);*

a presentation layer that presents the search information through the business data search web site *(fig. 5).*

With respect to claim 18, Irle teaches a plug in for a business computer system wherein the computer system has a plurality of applications and wherein the applications are stored remote from a user terminal, the plug in comprising a software module having:

a first tier comprising a user interface client application *(a client computer having a graphical user interface or an Internet browser, [col. 7, lines 50-51]);*

a second tier comprising a business data search website and *(the invention can be implemented in a computer system that can include a back-end component, such as a data server. The system can also include a middleware component, such as an application server or an Internet server. The system, [col. 7, lines 445-50]);*

a third tier comprising a connection application that connects a business data search application to the plurality of applications, wherein each of the first, second, and third tiers comprises computer-readable instructions stored on a tangible medium *(The components of the system can be connected by links, networks, or any combination of both, [col. 7, lines 51-52], col. 7, lines 32-44).*

Claim 19 is rejected on the same basis of rejection of claim 14.

With respect to claim 20, Irle teaches the plug in of claim 18, wherein the business data search website determines the security rights of a search query creator and searches only data that the search query creator has rights *(claim 7, col. 2, lines 28-30).*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to

be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 4, 5, 12 are rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irle et al.(US 7,133,867) in view of Gross et al. (US 2004/0133564).

With respect to claim 3, Irle teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising creating a summary of the found data and displaying the summary in an application *(figure 6D, is a displaying a summery of the search result)* but does not explicitly teach selected from the group comprising an email and a web-browser application.

However, Gross teaches selected from the group comprising an email and a web-browser application *(fig. 1, element 106 109, fig. 3A, 3C, [0147]).*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time of invention was made to modify the invention of Irle to include the feature of Gross. One would have been motivated to make this modification because it provides the advantage to select the type of application in which the search result would be displayed for user convenience.

With respect to claim 4, Irle and Gross both teach the method of claim 4, Gross further teaches wherein, the search results are displayed in one of the applications search *([0106], the search results are displayed in the native application where the data was found, Fig. 3C, 3G, fig. 1, the user terminal has*

the search engine, Email application and a browser associated with the application system as a result it is interpreted that whenever the search result will be displayed it will be displayed in the same browser of the application).

With respect to claim 5, Irle and Gross both teach the method of claim 4, Gross further teaches wherein additional information about the search results is displayed in the application in which the data was found *(fig. 3G, [0106]).*

With respect to claim 12, Irle teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the search is accomplished using a search application on a server *(providing the search criteria to one or more search engines, receiving search results from the search engines, [abstract])* but does not explicitly teach URL.

However, Gross teaches a URL *(a Web page may be added to the search engine databases 112 by directly entering a URL [0068]).*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time of invention was made to modify the invention of Irle to include the feature of Gross. One would have been motivated to make this modification because it provides the advantage to select the search application from a URL which will save time and it will be easier for the user to search.

Claim11 is rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irle et al.(US 7,133,867) in view of Hargarten (US 2006/0101046) and in view of Chiu et al. (US 2003/0078925)

With respect to claim 11, Irle teaches the method of claim 1, but does not explicitly teach the method of claim 1, wherein the applications are business applications selected from a group comprising: a CRM program, an email program, an accounting program, a supply chain management program, word processing program, ERP application and spreadsheet program.

Hargarten teaches However, Hargarten teaches an email program, an accounting program spreadsheet program, word processing program *(The method may also entail storing the financial document as a word processing file, allowing a user to modify the word processing document, allowing the modifications made on the word processing document to be communicated to the accounting program, allowing a user to edit existing templates, the word processing program, communicating the document by one of email, fax, a communication link [0003]).*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time of invention was made to modify the invention of Irle to include the feature of Hargarten. One would have been motivated to make this modification because it provides the advantage to display the records in a different application.

Irle and Hargarten both in combination do not teach a CRM program, a supply chain management program, ERP application.

Chiu teaches a CRM program, a supply chain management program, ERP application *(enterprise resource planning (ERP), supply chain management (SCM) and customer relationship management (CRM), [0020]).*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time of invention was made to modify the invention of Irle and Hargarten to include the feature of Chiu. One would have been motivated to make this modification because it provides the advantage to have different management system to store the data in various systems.

Claims 15 -17 are rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irle et al. (US 7,133,867) in view of DelGobbo et al. (US 7,007,229).

With respect to claim 15, Irle teaches a user interface for searching data on a computer system, the user interface embodied in a set of computer-readable instructions stored on a tangible medium, the user interface comprising:

a first field to accept a search query *(fig. 6B, element 606);*

a second field to allow a user to select a selection of one or more applications to be searched for data related to the search query *(fig. 6E, target system is interpreted to have different type of applications);*

a third field to allow a selection of a type of report to be created *(fig. 6E, the document type, object type are interpreted as the report type)* and

Irle does not explicitly teach a fourth field to allow a selection of the type of application in which the report is to be displayed.

However, DelGobbo teaches a field to allow a selection of the type of application in which the report is to be displayed *(fig. 6, output type 142, the user*

can select the output type as HTML or RTF, the out of the report is the displaying of the report and HTML and RTF are different types of applications).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time of invention was made to modify the invention of Irle to include the feature of DelGobbo. One would have been motivated to make this modification because it provides the advantage to select the type of application in which the report would be displayed for user convenience.

With respect to claim 16, Irle and DelGobbo both teach the user interface of claim 15, Irle further teaches wherein the user interface is a first tier, wherein a business data search website is a second tier and a connection application that connects a business data search application to the plurality of applications is the third tier *(col. 7, lines 45-55).*

With respect to claim 17, Irle and DelGobbo both teach the user interface of claim 16, Irle further teaches wherein the second tier further comprises:

a sharepoint access logic which uses a business data search runtime object model to do the search and get the search results *(performing text and attribute searches of data stores that include business objects, [abstract], the system is searching the business data and presenting the search results which is interpreted as a sharepoint access logic);*

an authentication layer that authenticates a search requestor with each application to be searched and *(claim 7, the user has to be authorized to access the data which is interpreted as authentication);*

a presentation layer that presents the search information through the business data search web site *(fig. 5).*

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fatima P. Mina whose telephone number is 571-270-3556. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trujillo can be reached on (571) 272-3677. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information With respect to 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.

/F. P. M./
/Fatima P Mina/
Examiner, Art Unit 2169

/James Trujillo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2159

Notice of References Cited	Application/Control No. 11/771,554	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination PANDEY ET AL.	
	Examiner Fatima P. Mina	Art Unit 2159	Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
*	A	US-7,133,867	11-2006	Irle et al.	707/4
*	B	US-2004/0133564	07-2004	Gross et al.	707/003
*	C	US-7,007,229	02-2006	DelGobbo et al.	715/212
	D	US-			
	E	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	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	
	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.