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.
12/786,246	05/24/2010	YunRui SiMa	14917.1502US01/329310.01	2405

27488 7590 01/10/2012
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER
CHANNAVAJJALA, SRIRAMA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/10/2012	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)	
	12/786,246	SIMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SRIRAMA CHANNAVAJJALA	2157	

-- 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 *24 May 2010*.

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

3)☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.

4)☐ 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

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

5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

7)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

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

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

Application Papers

10)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

11)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *24 May 2010* 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).

12)☐ 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

13)☐ 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 *5/24/2010*.

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 in this application.

Drawings

2. The Drawings filed on 5/24/2010 are acceptable for examination purpose

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed on 5/24/2010 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, and has been considered and a copy is enclosed with this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

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.

4. ***Claims 1-10,20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter***.

5. In the method Claims 1-10, they neither involve any particular machine or apparatus nor transform a particular article into a different state or thing, merely suggests “a contents display system”. They lack any hardware means or machine (e.g. processor and memory, or the like) to indicate the method in or by the machine or apparatus.

A claimed process is eligible for patent protection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 if:

> "(1) it is tied to a particular machine or apparatus, or (2) it transforms a particular article into a different state or thing. See Benson, 409 U.S. at 70 ('Transformation and reduction of an article 'to a different state or thing' is the clue to the patentability of a process claim that does not include particular machines.'); Diehr, 450 U.S. at 192 (holding that use of mathematical formula in process 'transforming or reducing an article to a different state or thing' constitutes patent-eligible subject matter); see also Flook, 437 U.S. at 589 n.9 ('An argument can be made [that the Supreme] Court has only recognized a process as within the statutory definition when it either was tied to a particular apparatus or operated to change materials to a 'different state or thing' '); Cochrane v. Deener, 94 U.S. 780, 788 (1876) ('A process is...an act, or a series of acts, performed upon the subject-matter to be transformed and reduced to a different state or thing.').7 A claimed process involving a fundamental principle that uses a particular machine or apparatus would not pre-empt uses of the principle that do not also use the specified machine or apparatus in the manner claimed. And a claimed process that transforms a particular article to a specified different state or thing by applying a fundamental principle would not pre-empt the use of the principle to transform any other article, to transform the same article but in a manner not covered by the claim, or to do anything other than transform the specified article." (In re Bilski, 88 USPQ2d 1385, 1391 (Fed. Cir. 2008))

Also noted in Bilski is the statement, "Process claim that recites fundamental principle, and that otherwise fails 'machine-or-transformation' test for whether such claim is drawn to patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101, is not rendered patent eligible by mere field-of-use limitations; another corollary to machine-or-transformation test is that recitation of specific machine or particular transformation of specific article does not transform unpatentable principle into patentable process if recited machine or transformation constitutes mere 'insignificant post- solution activity.'" (In re Bilski, 88 USPQ2d 1385, 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008)) Examples of insignificant post-solution activity include data gathering and outputting. Furthermore, the machine or transformation must impose meaningful limits on the scope of the method claims in order to pass the machine-or-transformation test. Please refer to the USPTO's "Guidance for Examining Process Claims in view of In re Bilsk memorandum dated January 7, 2009, http://www.uspto..gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/documents/bilski_guidance_memo.pdf

6. The Claims 11-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 101 because the claims encompass non-statutory subject matter. Official Gazette Notice 1351 OG 212, dated February 23, 2010, states "the broadest reasonable interpretation of a claim drawn to a computer readable medium which stores a set of instructions...typically covers forms of both statutory and non- statutory categories in view of specification page 18, 046, page 19, 047-048, further, it is noted that specification page 19, 047 defines “computer-readable media” include “modulated data signal, such as a “***carrier wave***”…….tangible media and transitory propagating signals per se in view of the ordinary and customary meaning of computer readable media."

Given that claims 11-19 are drawn to a computer readable medium, those claims are construed to cover both transitory and non-transitory media.

"A transitory, propagating signal ... is not a 'process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter.' Those four categories define the explicit scope and reach of subject matter patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 101 ; thus, such a ***signal*** cannot be patentable subject matter." In re Nuijten, 84 USPQ2d 1495, 1503 (Fed. Cir. 2007). Because the full scope of the claim encompasses non-statutory subject matter (i.e., transitory propagating signals), the claim as a whole is non-statutory.

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.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-7,20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe, US Pub. No. 2001/0047351 published on Nov 2001 in view of Forman et al. [hereafter Forman], US Pub. No. 2005/0102368 published May 2005.

8. As to Claim 1, Abe teaches a system which including " A method for providing search-based system management, the method comprising: [Abstract, fig 1-3], search

based system management corresponds to Abe's fig 2-3;

"displaying a management interface comprising a search input element and a result list element" [fig 6B, page 3, 0034,page 5, 0039], Abe specifically teaches graphical user interface allows users to initiate searching process using "keywords" as detailed in fig 6B, displaying a management interface comprising a search input corresponds to Abe's fig 6B;

"receiving a keyword via the search input element;" [fig 6B,element 74], Abe specifically teaches keyword input box for searching file[s]

"displaying at least one of the plurality of configuration properties associated with the received keyword in the result list element,[page 5, 0042, fig 10], Abe specifically teaches displaying multiple properties related to file for example address, size [fig 10]; " wherein each of the displayed plurality of configuration properties comprises a selectable user interface element[fig 6B, page 5, 0039].

It is however, noted that Abe does not specifically disclose "identifying a plurality of matching configuration properties associated with the received keyword", although Abe specifically disclosed user interface allows to keyword search file information [Abstract] On the other hand, Forman disclosed "identifying a plurality of matching configuration properties associated with the received keyword" [fig 4-5, page 4, 0045-0046], Forman specifically teaches "find match" that identifying , that searches and matches the criteria.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate e-mail attribute matching system of Forman et al.

into keyword based searching system of Abe because, both Abe, Forman specifically directed to user interface allows searching information [Abe: Abstract, fig 2-3; Forman: Abstract, fig 1,4-5] and they both support search criteria. Because both Abe, Forman supports search system, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art the time of applicant's invention to substitute one method for the other to achieve the predictable result of extracting exact match attributes from the information database, further supporting filtering, searching, sorting various operations [page 2, 0016], thus improving the quality and reliability of the system.

9. As to Claim 20, Abe teaches a system which including " A system for providing search-based system management, the system comprising: [Abstract, page 5, 0044, fig 1-2], the method executed by the set of instructions comprising: Abe specifically teaches search based system as detailed inn fig 1-2;

a memory storage; and a processing unit coupled to the memory storage, wherein the processing unit is operative to:[page 5, 0044]

"extract a plurality of configuration properties associated with at least one configurable service"[page 5, 0042, fig 10], Abe specifically teaches displaying multiple properties related to file for example address, size [fig 10]

create a database [fig 11A] comprising a plurality of entries each associated with at least one of the plurality of configuration properties [fig 11A-11B,page 5, 0043], Abe specifically teaches creating database, defining various attributes is part of the configuration properties;, "wherein each entry comprises plurality of elements a name, a

navigation path, a description, a value, and a configuration type" [fig 6B,10-11], Abe specifically teaches description of file, file type,

"receive a search keyword from an administrator of the at least one configurable service via search element within a management interface[fig 6B,element 74], Abe specifically teaches keyword input box for searching file[s]

retrieve a plurality of search results comprising a subset of the plurality of entries from the database [fig 11A-11B], wherein each of the plurality of search results comprises, the search keyword and at least one of the plurality of elements associated with each of the subset of the plurality of entries from the database [fig 6B, 10-11, page 5, 0039,0043], Abe specifically teaches user interface inputting search words searching from the database;,

"display at least a portion of the plurality of search results in a result element of the management interface" [fig 6B],

receive a selection of one of the displayed plurality of search results within the result element of the management interface" [fig 6B,element 74], Abe specifically teaches keyword input box for searching file[s]

"display the navigation path associated with the selected one of the displayed plurality of search results within the management interface" [fig 6B, 10], Abe specifically teaches user interface including displaying user input and search results;

display a configuration dialog comprising the selected one of the displayed plurality of search results [fig 6B, 0039], Abe specifically teaches displaying file selection dialog element 84; and a value modification user interface element according to the

configuration type of the selected one of the displayed plurality of search results and comprising the value of the selected one of the displayed plurality of search results" [page 5, 0040, fig 7], Abe specifically teaches "count" value selecting important words used as keywords;,

"determine whether a change to the value of the selected one of the displayed plurality of search results has been received via the configuration dialog" [page 5, 0040], Abe specifically teaches range of values in selecting keywords and formulating query expression in search documents, and

"in response to determining that the change to the value of the selected one of the displayed plurality of search results has been received via the configuration dialog, save the changed value of the selected one of the displayed plurality of search results" [page 5, 0041-0042, fig 3-4,fig 10].

It is however, noted that Abe does not specifically disclose "a match between the search keyword and at least one of the plurality of elements associated with each of the subset of the plurality of entries from the database", although Abe specifically disclosed user interface allows to keyword search file information [Abstract] On the other hand, Forman disclosed "a match between the search keyword and at least one of the plurality of elements associated with each of the subset of the plurality of entries from the database" [fig 4-5, page 4, 0045-0046], Forman specifically teaches "find match" that identifying , that searches and matches the criteria.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate e-mail attribute matching system of Forman et al.

into keyword based searching system of Abe because, both Abe, Forman specifically directed to user interface allows searching information [Abe: Abstract, fig 2-3; Forman: Abstract, fig 1,4-5] and they both support search criteria. Because both Abe, Forman supports search system, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art the time of applicant's invention to substitute one method for the other to achieve the predictable result of extracting exact match attributes from the information database, further supporting filtering, searching, sorting various operations [page 2, 0016], thus improving the quality and reliability of the system.

10. As to Claim 2, Abe disclosed “further comprising creating a database comprising a plurality of rows, wherein each row is associated with at least one configuration property” [fig 11A-11B, page 5, 0043].

11. As to Claim 3, Abe disclosed “ wherein each of the plurality of rows comprises at least one of the following: a name of the associated configuration property, a description of the associated configuration property, a value of the associated configuration property, and a type of the associated configuration property [fig 11A-11B, page 5, 0043].

12. As to Claim 4, Forman disclosed “ wherein identifying the plurality of matching configuration properties associated with the received keyword comprises comparing the

keyword to each of the rows of the database" [fig 1, fig 4-5, page 2, 0022, page 4, 0041, 0045].

13. As to claim 5, Abe disclosed " receiving a selection of the displayed at least one of the plurality of configuration properties [fig 6B, fig 10], Abe specifically displaying keyword, location of file, file name, files of type related to configuration properties, further fig 10 is specifically directed to size, date of formation, and like;

"providing a value input user interface element associated with the selected one of the plurality of configuration properties" [page 2, 0009, 0010], Abe suggests keyword forming unit tracks "count" related to document property information.

14. As to Claim 6, Abe disclosed "receiving a new value for the selected one of the plurality of configuration properties via the value input element" [page 2, 0009-0010, page 5, 0040]; and

"storing the new value in the row of the database associated with the selected one of the plurality of configuration properties" [page 5, 0043, fig 11A-11B].

15. As to claim 7, Abe disclosed " wherein the received keyword comprises a text input from a user" [fig 6B, element 14].

16. ***Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe, US Pub. No. 2001/0047351 published on Nov 2001 in view of Forman et al. [hereafter Forman], US Pub. No. 2005/0102368 published May 2005 further in view of*** *Bhandarkar et al [hereafter Bhandarkar], US 2006/0074915 published April 2006.*

17. As to Claim 8, Forman disclosed "wherein each of the plurality of matching configuration properties" [fig 4-5,page 4, 0045-0046]. It is however, noted that both Abe, Forman do not disclose "security permission to view and a required security permission to change an associated value". On the other hand, Bhandarkar disclosed security permission to view and a required security permission to change an associated value" [page 4, 0050-0051, page 5, 0054-0056,page 9, 0091, fig 9-11].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate "security permission associated with specific properties of Bhandarkar into Abe, Forman because that would have allowed users of Abe, Forman define various permission levels to access to the confidential data particularly granting user privileges with respect to assigned role[s] [page 2, 0010], thus improving overall quality and reliability and ensuring security of the system [Abstract].

18. As to Claim 9, Bhandarkar disclosed "determining whether the user is permitted to view the at least one of the plurality of matching configuration properties according to the required security permission to view of the at least one of the plurality of matching

configuration properties" [fig 11-12, page 10, 0096-0097]; and

"in response to determining that the user is permitted to view the at least one of the plurality of matching configuration properties, displaying at least one of the plurality of configuration properties associated with the received keyword in the result list element" [page 10, 0096, 0100, fig 11].

19. As to claim 10, Bhandarkar disclosed "receiving a selection of the displayed at least one of the plurality of configuration properties" [fig 10];

determining whether the user is permitted to change the associated value of the at least one of the plurality of matching configuration properties according to the required security permission to change the associated value [fig 11-12, page 10, 0096-0097; and

"in response to determining that the user is permitted to change the associated value of the at least one of the plurality of matching configuration properties [fig 10-11,, providing a value input user interface element associated with the selected one of the plurality of configuration properties [0096-0097].

20. ***Claims 11- 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe, US Pub. No. 2001/0047351 published on Nov 2001 in view of Forman et al. [hereafter Forman], US Pub. No. 2005/0102368 published May 2005 further in view of*** *Bhandarkar et al [hereafter Bhandarkar], US 2006/0074915 published April 2006.*

21. As to claim 11, Abe teaches a system which including " A computer-readable medium which stores a set of instructions which when executed performs a method for providing search-based system management [Abstract, page 5, 0044, fig 1-2], the method executed by the set of instructions comprising: Abe specifically teaches search based system as detailed inn fig 1-2;

"displaying a management console user interface comprising a search element and a result list element" [[fig 6B, page 3, 0034,page 5, 0039], Abe specifically teaches graphical user interface allows users to initiate searching process using "keywords" as detailed in fig 6B, displaying a management interface comprising a search input corresponds to Abe's fig 6B;

receiving a search term from the user via the search element [fig 6B,element 74], Abe specifically teaches keyword input box for searching file[s]

"identifying a plurality of configuration properties associated with the search term" [fig 6B, fig 10], configuration properties associated with the search term[s] corresponds to file name, file type, folder destination [fig 6B], further date of formation, date of change [fig 10];

"displaying at least a subset of the configuration properties associated with the received search term in the result list element [fig 6B,fig 10, page 5, 0039,0042], Abe specifically teaches file[s] associated properties related to keyword received as search term[s] displayed as detailed in fig 6B, wherein each of the configuration properties comprises a selectable user interface element [page 5, 0039,0042], Abe specifically supports user interface allows to select and execute search.

It is however, noted that Abe does not specifically disclose “matching configuration properties associated with the received search term”, although Abe specifically disclosed user interface allows to keyword search file information [Abstract] On the other hand, Forman disclosed “matching configuration properties associated with the received search term” [fig 4-5, page 4, 0045-0046], Forman specifically teaches “find match” that identifying , that searches and matches the criteria.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant’s invention to incorporate e-mail attribute matching system of Forman et al. into keyword based searching system of Abe because, both Abe, Forman specifically directed to user interface allows searching information [Abe: Abstract, fig 2-3; Forman: Abstract, fig 1,4-5] and they both support search criteria. Because both Abe, Forman supports search system, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art the time of applicant's invention to substitute one method for the other to achieve the predictable result of extracting <u>exact match</u> attributes from the information database, further supporting filtering, searching, sorting various operations [page 2, 0016], thus improving the quality and reliability of the system.

It is however, noted that both Abe,Forman do not specifically disclose “authenticating a user as comprising at least one administrator security permission”. On the other hand, Bhandarkar disclosed “authenticating a user as comprising at least one administrator security permission” [page 4, 0050-0051, page 5, 0053,0059, page 8, 0079], Bhandarkar specifically defines authentication and security policy is part of the administrator security control [fig 10-11].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate "security permission associated with specific properties of Bhandarkar into Abe, Forman because that would have allowed users of Abe, Forman define various permission levels to access to the confidential data particularly granting user privileges with respect to assigned role[s] [page 2, 0010], thus improving overall quality and reliability and ensuring security of the system [Abstract].

22. As to claim 12, Abe disclosed " wherein the search element comprises at least one filtering option" [page 5, 0039, fig 6A-6B].

23. As to claim 13-14, Abe disclosed " receiving a selection of the at least one filtering option"[page 5, 0039, fig 6A-6B].; and

On the other hand, Forman disclosed "limiting the display of matching configuration properties to a subset of the matching configuration properties associated with the at least one filtering option" [fig 4-5,page 4, 0041,0045-0046].

24. As to claim 15, Abe disclosed " wherein the input element comprises an input field within the result list element" [fig 6B,10].

25. As to claim 16, Abe disclosed " wherein the input element comprises an input field within a dialog box window" [fig 6B,10].

26. As to claim 17, Abe disclosed " wherein the input element is configured according to a type of the value" [page 2, 0009, 0010].

27. As to claim 18-19, further comprising: receiving a new value input from the user via the input element [page 2, 0009-0010, page 5, 0040]; and

On the other hand, Forman disclosed "updating the at least one of the matching configuration properties with the new value input" [page 4, 0044-0045]

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

a.	US Pub. No.	2005/0102368
b.	US Pub. No.	2001/0047351
c.	US Pub. No.	2006/0074915

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

SEE MPEP 2141.02 [R-5] VI. PRIOR ART MUST BE CONSIDERED IN ITS ENTIRETY, INCLUDING DISCLOSURES THAT TEACH AWAY FROM THE CLAIMS: A prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention. W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984) In re Fulton, 391 F.3d 1195, 1201,73 USPQ2d 1141, 1146 (Fed. Cir. 2004). >See also MPEP §2123.

In the case of amending the Claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon, if any, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is 571-272-4108. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim, Charles, can be reached on (571) 272-7421. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the 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)

/Srirama Channavajjala/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2157.

Notice of References Cited	Application/Control No. 12/786,246	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination SIMA ET AL.	
	Examiner SRIRAMA CHANNAVAJJALA	Art Unit 2157	Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
*	A	US-2001/0047351	11-2001	Abe, Seiichiro	707/3
*	B	US-2005/0102368	05-2005	Forman et al.	709/207
*	C	US-2006/0074915	04-2006	Bhandarkar et al.	707/009
*	D	US-2006/0080278	04-2006	Neiditsch et al.	707/001
*	E	US-2005/0144241	06-2005	Stata et al.	709/206
*	F	US-2005/0267880	12-2005	Ohashi, Tadashi	707/003
*	G	US-7,743,051	06-2010	Kashyap et al.	707/713
*	H	US-2004/0133564	07-2004	Gross et al.	707/003
*	I	US-7,216,298	05-2007	Ballard et al.	715/760
*	J	US-6,546,417	04-2003	Baker, Michelle	709/206
*	K	US-2009/0234840	09-2009	Chatani, Masayuki	707/5
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N	WO 2005/001733	01-2005	PCT	Seen,Dong-J	
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	Maryam S et al. "EzMail: using information visualization techniques to help manage Email", proceedings of the eight international conference on information visualization, IEEE 2004, 6 pages
	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.