



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.
95/002,132	08/31/2012	7,461,353 B2	SV.95002132	1682

59860 7590 04/06/2022
LAW OFFICE OF R. ALAN BURNETT
4108 131ST AVE. SE
BELLEVUE, WA 98006

EXAMINER

BASEHOAR, ADAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3992

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

04/06/2022

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.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Motorola Mobility, LLC
Requester and Cross-Appellant

v.

Patent of SoftView LLC
Patent Owner and Appellant

Appeal 2022-000153
Reexamination Control 95/002,132
Patent US 7,461,353 B2
Technology Center 3900

Before ALLEN R. MacDONALD, ERIC B. CHEN, and
BRIAN J. McNAMARA, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MacDONALD, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL¹

¹ Related Appeal 2021-005530 (Reexamination Control No. 95/000,634) is directed to a reexamination of the same patent as this appeal. Patent Owner's Appeal Br. 1. This appeal and its related appeal are directed to the same issues. These appeals are decided concurrently. This decision incorporates by reference the related 2021-005530 decision.

I. STATEMENT OF THE CASE²

Appellant appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from a final decision of the Primary Examiner rejecting claims 5, 6, 23–27, 60, 61, 70, 122, 137, 140, 141, 147, 156, 174–177, 216, 238–242, 248, 259, 274–277, 320, and 321. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b). We reverse the Examiner’s decision rejecting these claims.

Cross-Appellant appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from a final decision of the primary examiner favorable to the confirmation/patentability of claim 322. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b). We reverse the Examiner’s decision favorable to the confirmation/patentability of this claim.

II. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

U.S. Patent 7,461,353 issued December 2, 2008 from application No. 11/045,757, filed on January 28, 2005 as a division³ of application No. 09/878,097, filed on June 8, 2001, now U.S. Patent 7,210,099, which is a continuation-in-part of application No. 09/828,511, filed on Apr. 7, 2001, now abandoned. At filing, application No. 11/045,757 claimed priority to application No. 09/828,511 (still pending at that time). Normally, U.S. Patents 7,210,099 and 7,461,353 would have each had an expiration date of April 7, 2021. However, the term of U.S. Patent 7,210,099 was adjusted by

² Hearing held on January 6, 2022.

³ Related U.S. Patent 7,831,926 issued November 9, 2010 from application No. 11/738,486, filed on April 21, 2007 as a continuation of application No. 09/878,097.

818 days to expire on July, 5, 2023, and the term of U.S. Patent 7,461,353 was adjusted by 376 days to expire on April 18, 2022.

As filed, application No. 11/045,757 contained sixteen (16) claims all directed to translating Web content from its original format into a scalable vector representation of the Web content.

During prosecution, amendments expanded the number of claims which then characterized the invention in essentially three ways.

- 1) translating at least a portion of HTML-based Web content from its original format into scalable content, and then scaling that scalable content while preserving the original page layout, functionality and design of the content;
- 2) processing HTML-based Web content to produce scalable content, and then scaling that scalable content while preserving the original page layout, functionality and design of the content at zoom levels and panned views; and
- 3) without limiting to either translating or processing, a) enabling a Web page to be browsed at various zoom levels and panned views while preserving the original page layout, functionality, and design of the Web content at each zoom level and panned view, or even more broadly, b) enabling a Web page to be browsed at various zoom levels and panned views.

As issued on December 2, 2008, U.S. Patent 7,461,353 contained 319 claims.

On August 31, 2012, Cross Appellant (Requester) filed a Request for Inter Partes Reexamination of U.S. Patent 7,461,353, which reexamination 95/002,132 is the subject of this appeal. On May 20, 2011, an unrelated

Requester (Apple Inc.) filed a Request for Inter Partes Reexamination of U.S. Patent 7,461,353, which second reexamination 95/000,634 is not the subject of this appeal.⁴ On April 13, 2012, Apple Inc. filed a separate Request for Ex Parte Reexamination (Control No. 90/009,994) of U.S. Patent 7,461,353.

On October 2, 2012, Kyocera Corporation petitioned for an *inter partes* review challenging the patentability of claims 1, 33, 36, 43, 48, 51, 52, 58, 59, 66, 118, 138, 139, 149, 183, 252, 283, and 317 of U.S. Patent 7,461,353. On March 29, 2013, the Board entered a Decision in IPR2013-00007 to institute an *inter partes* review on the challenges raised by Kyocera Corporation. Subsequently, IPR2013-00256, brought by Motorola Mobility LLC on April 29, 2013, raised the same challenges and later was joined to the IPR2013-00007 proceeding. All challenged claims were determined to be unpatentable by a Final Written Decision (FWD) on March 27, 2014.

We hold all of the challenged claims, i.e., claims 1, 33, 36, 43, 48, 51, 52, 58, 59, 66, 118, 138, 139, 149, 183, 252, 283, and 317 of the '353 Patent, are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Specifically, the preponderance of the evidence shows that claims 1, 33, 36, 43, 48, 51, 52, 58, 59, 118, 138, 139, 149, 183, 252, 283, and 317 of the '353 Patent are unpatentable as obvious over the combination of Zaurus and Pad++. We further hold that the preponderance of the evidence shows that claim 66 of the '353 Patent is unpatentable over Zaurus, Pad++, and SVG.

⁴ Additionally, related U.S. Patent 7,831,926, is the subject of two *inter partes* reexamination appeals which are before this Panel. Per the agreement of Patent Owner and both Third Party Requestors (2022-000153/2022-000154 Hearing Transcript 52–53, and 2022-000716 Hearing Transcript 23), the transcripts of hearings in all four related *inter partes* reexamination appeals are being placed in the record for each of the four related *inter partes* reexaminations.

We also hold that, under a preponderance of the evidence, claims 1, 33, 36, 43, 48, 51, 52, 58, 59, 118, 138, 139, 149, 183, 252, 283, and 317 of the '353 Patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Zaurus, Hara, and Tsutsumitake and that claim 66 is unpatentable over the combination of Zaurus, Hara, Tsutsumitake and SVG.

FWD 36.

The Board's FWD then appealed to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit by the Patent Owner. The Board's FWD was subsequently affirmed on February 9, 2015. *Softview LLC v. Kyocera Corp.*, 592 F. App'x 947 (Fed. Cir. 2015)(Rule 36). As a result, on January 12, 2016, the Office issued an "Inter Partes Review Certificate," thus indicating that further judicial review was not sought. The Certificate cancelled claims 1, 33, 36, 43, 48, 51, 52, 58, 59, 66, 118, 138, 139, 149, 183, 252, 283, and 317 of U.S. Patent 7,461,353. A "Cancelled Claim Appendix" containing copies of these cancelled claims is attached.

During the *inter partes* review, the processing of all reexaminations was stayed. That stay was lifted on November 27, 2015. Subsequently, Ex Parte Reexamination 90/009,994 confirmed amended claims 5, 23–27, 60, 61, 122, 137, 140, 141, 147, 156, 174–177, 238–242, 248, 259, and 274–277 to be patentable as amended, added new claims 320–322, and cancelled claims 84 and 220. The remaining claims were not reexamined. On December 29, 2017, the Ex Parte Reexamination Certificate for 90/009,994 was issued.⁵

⁵ Related U.S. Patent 7,831,926 has followed a similar path with two Inter Partes Reexaminations (95/000,635 and 95/002,126), an Ex Parte Reexamination 90/009,995 (affirmed *In re SoftView LLC*, 847 F. App'x 930 (Fed. Cir. 2021) (Rule 36)); and two Inter Partes Reviews IPR2013-00004

B. Status of the Claims in the Present Appeal

The Claims Appendix of Patent Owner's Appeal Brief lists the status of the appealed claims. Patent Owner's Appeal Brief 61–82. However, as to numerous claims, the Panel disagrees with the status listed in the appendix. For the reasons we set forth at Section III.B.2.b).(2) of our decision directed to related appeal 2021-005530, this distinction between issued and amended/new claims is not result determinative under the Panel's interpretation of § 42.73(d)(3)(i). We incorporate that decision here in full.

However, while the Panel disagrees, Patent Owner argues that § 42.73(d)(3)(i) is not applicable in a reexamination confirming a previously *issued* claim. Should Patent Owner's view ultimately prevail, then the distinction between issued and amended/new claims may be critical.

In amendments included in the Patent Owner's Amendment and Response filed on June 28, 2017, many claims were labeled as “(Amended).” These claims include claims 5, 23–25, 60, 122, 137, 140, 147, 156, 174, 175, 238–240, 248, 259, 274, and 275. Also, in the June 28, 2017 amendments, claims 26, 27, 61, 141, 176, 177, 241, 242, 276, and 277, are labeled as “(Issued)” when they are amended via an amendment to another claim from which they depend. Such claims should have been labeled as “(Amended).” Further, in the June 28, 2017 amendments, claims 320–322 were labeled as “(New).” All these claims are now labeled in the Claim Appendix as “(Issued).” We presume that Patent Owner is labeling all these claims as “(Issued)” based on the Office procedure for handling an

and IPR2013-000257 (affirmed *Softview LLC v. Kyocera Corp.*, 592 F. App'x 949 (Fed. Cir. 2015)(Rule 36)). We do not otherwise discuss herein Patent 7,831,926 and its various proceedings.

ex parte reexamination certificate when there is, as here, a still pending unmerged *inter partes* reexamination. The MPEP states:

The second [reexamination] request is then considered based on the claims in the patent as indicated in the issued reexamination certificate, rather than the original claims of the patent.

MPEP § 2686.01 IV (9th ed. Rev. 10.2019, rev. June 2020). However, under Patent Owner’s interpretation of § 42.73(d)(3)(i), this Office procedure would permit Patent Owner in an *ex parte* reexamination (where a Requestor has no appeal rights) to use an amendment in an *ex parte* reexamination certificate to extinguish (without recourse) the Requestor’s statutory right to an appeal in an *inter partes* reexamination.

THIRD-PARTY REQUESTER.— A third-party requester—

(1) may appeal under the provisions of section 134, and may appeal under the provisions of sections 141 through 144, with respect to any final decision favorable to the patentability of any original or proposed amended or new claim of the patent[.]

35 U.S.C. § 315(b) (pre-AIA). Where there is a conflict between Office procedure and a statute, we determine that the statute prevails. Therefore, contrary to the MPEP procedure, until the time for appeal has expired or any appeal proceeding has terminated in this *inter partes* reexamination, that we treat all these claims as they are labeled (“(Amended)” or “(New)”) in the Patent Owner’s Amendment and Response filed on June 28, 2017.

C. Exemplary Claim in the Present Appeal

Exemplary independent claim 5 under appeal reads as follows:

5. A wireless device, comprising:
processing means;
wireless communications means, to facilitate wireless communication with a network that supports access to the Internet;
a display;
memory; and
storage means, in which a plurality of instructions are stored that when executed by the processing means enable the wireless device to perform operations including,
rendering a browser interface via which a user is enabled to request access to an original Web page, the Web page comprising HTML-based Web content having an original format defining an original width and height of the Web page and an original page layout, functionality, and design of content on the Web page;
in response to a user request to access the Web page, retrieving the Web page via the wireless communication means, and translating the HTML-based Web content from its original format into scalable content that supports a scalable resolution-independent representation of the Web page that preserves the original page layout, functionality and design of the content defined by its original format when scaled and rendered; and
scaling the scalable content to render the Web page on the display such that a width of the Web page is rendered to fit across the display; and
parsing markup language code to determine the original page layout of display content within the Web page, wherein the original page layout defines a layout location for a plurality of HTML objects, including HTML text objects, HTML graphic layout objects, and HTML graphic image objects included in the HTML-based Web content for the Web page;
defining a primary datum corresponding to the original page layout; and, for each HTML object,

defining an object datum corresponding to the layout location for the HTML object;
generating a vector from the primary datum to the object datum for the HTML object; and
creating a reference that links the HTML object to the vector that is generated.

D. References

The Examiner relies on the following references, collectively referred to as the Pad++ references:

Name	Reference	Date
Bederson, Benjamin B., et al. (hereinafter “Bederson-1”)	“Pad++: A Zoomable Graphical Interface System”, CHI ’95 Mosaic of Creativity	May 1995
Bederson, Benjamin B., et al. (hereinafter “Bederson-2”)	“Space-Scale Diagrams: Understanding Multiscale Interfaces,” CHI ’95 Proceedings	1995
Bederson, Benjamin B., et al. (hereinafter “Bederson-3”)	“A Zooming Web Browser,” SPIE, Vol. 2667, 260–71	May 1996
Bederson, Ben, et al. (hereinafter “Bederson-4”)	“Implementing a Zooming User Interface: Experience Building Pad++,” Software-Practice and Experience, Vol. 28(1), 1101–35	August 1998
Bederson, Benjamin B., et al. (hereinafter “Bederson-5”)	“Pad++: A Zoomable Graphical Sketchpad for Exploring Alternate Interface Physics,” Journal of Visual Languages and Computing, Vol. 7, 3–31	1996
Meyer, Jonathan (hereinafter “Pad++ Brief Tour”)	A Brief Tour Through Pad++	April 1997

(hereafter “Reference Manual”)	Pad++ Reference Manual version 0.2.7	July 9, 1996
(hereafter “Programmer’s Guide”)	Pad++ Programmer’s Guide version 0.2.7	June 10, 1996

Also, the Examiner relies on the following reference:

Name	Reference	Date
Matthews, et al. (hereinafter “VML”)	Vector Markup Language (VML), World Wide Web Consortium Note, , Note-VML-19980513, http://www.w3.org/TR/1998/Note-VML-19980513	May 13, 1998

Further, the Examiner relies on the following references, collectively referred to as “the SVF references”:

Name	Reference	Date
(hereinafter “SVF”)	Specification for the Simple Vector Format (SVF) v1.1	Jan. 16, 1995
(hereinafter “SVF Press 1”)	New CAD System Works With AutoCAD Drawings Without Translation, retrieved from http://web.archive.org/web/19961019052917/http://softsource.com/netnews.html	June 17, 1996
(hereinafter “SVF Press 2”)	Bring New CAD Viewing Power to the Internet, retrieved from http://web.archive.org/web/19961019052917/http://softsource.com/netnews.html	Mar. 4, 1996

Furthermore, the Examiner relies on the following references, collectively referred to as “HTML Standards”:

Name	Reference	Date
(hereinafter “HTML 3.2 Standard”)	W3C, “HTML 3.2 Reference Specification, W3C Recommendation,” pp. 1–44	Jan. 14, 1997
(hereinafter “HTML 4.0 Standard”)	W3C, “HTML 4.0 Specification, W3C Recommendation,” pp. 1–363	Dec. 18, 1997

Also further, the Panel relies on the following references:

Name	Reference	Date
Morris	US 5,020,090	May 28, 1991
Culbert	US 5,708,816	Jan. 13, 1998
Kato	US 6,088,730	July 11, 2000
Ausems	US 6,434,403 B1	Aug. 13, 2002
O’Sullivan	US RE38,127 E	May 27, 2003

III. ANALYSIS

We address herein Appellant’s (Patent Owner’s) appeal of the Examiner’s rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103, which we reverse.

As to claim 322, Cross-Appellant (Requester) proposes five issues for review on appeal. Four issues are listed on page 10 of the Third Party Requestor’s Appeal Brief as issues under 35 U.S.C. §§ 103 and 112. The fifth issue is stated on pages 11 and 15–16 of the Third Party Requestor’s Appeal Brief as unpatentable based on 37 C.F.R. § 42.73(d)(3)(i). We do not adopt Cross-Appellant’s (Requester’s) proposed § 103 rejections as they contain the same deficiencies as the Examiner’s rejections discussed *infra*. We do not adopt Cross-Appellant’s (Requester’s) proposed § 112 rejection

because it is presented as contingent on an issue we do not reach (“if the Board maintains the finding that implementing CSS, was outside the skill of a PHOSITA at the time of the invention” (Third Party Requestor’s Appeal Brief 26)). As to Cross-Appellant’s (Requester’s) 37 C.F.R. § 42.73(d)(3)(i) based appeal of the Examiner’s final decision favorable to the patentability of claim 322, we present herein a new ground of rejection as to all claims, which subsumes that appeal. Therefore, except as to the ultimate conclusion reversing the Examiner’s decision favorable to the confirmation/patentability of these claims, we do not further address Cross-Appellant’s appeal.

A. Examiner’s Rejections

The Examiner rejects the claims herein on essentially the same basis as the rejection of the claims in related appeal 2021-005530. The arguments Patent Owner presents in this appeal are the same arguments presented in related appeal 2021-005530. We reverse the Examiner’s rejections herein for the reasons we set forth in our decision directed to related appeal 2021-005530. To the extent that the Examiner relies on additional references in this appeal, those additional references do not cure the deficiencies we set forth in the 2021-005530 decision. We incorporate that decision here in full.

B. New Ground of Rejection – 37 C.F.R. § 42.73(d)(3)(i)

1.

We reject claims 5, 6, 23–27, 60, 61, 70, 122, 137, 140, 141, 147, 156, 174–177, 216, 238–242, 248, 259, 274–277, and 320–322, herein for the reasons we set forth in our decision directed to related appeal 2021-005530. We incorporate that decision here in full.

2.

This decision contains a new ground of rejection pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.77(b). 37 C.F.R. § 41.77(b) provides “a new ground of rejection pursuant to this paragraph shall not be considered final for judicial review.”

37 C.F.R. § 41.77(b) also provides that the owner, WITHIN ONE MONTH FROM THE DATE OF THE DECISION, must exercise one of the following two options with respect to the new grounds of rejection to avoid termination of the appeal as to the rejected claims:

(1) Reopen prosecution. The owner of the patent may file a response requesting reopening of prosecution before the examiner. . . .

(2) Request rehearing. Request that the proceeding be reheard under § 41.79 by the Board upon the same record. . . .

IV. EFFECT OF THE EXPIRATION OF 7,461,353

As we note *supra*, U.S. Patent 7,461,353, which is the subject of this *inter partes* reexamination, will expire on April 18, 2022. If this *inter partes* reexamination is still pending at that time, any further proceedings will be consistent with 37 C.F.R. § § 1.530(j) and (k).

(j) *No enlargement of claim scope.* No amendment may enlarge the scope of the claims of the patent or introduce new matter. No amendment may be proposed for entry in an expired patent. Moreover, no amendment, other than the cancellation of claims, will be incorporated into the patent by a certificate issued after the expiration of the patent.

(k) *Amendments not effective until certificate.* Although the Office actions will treat proposed amendments as though they have been entered, the proposed amendments will not be effective until the reexamination certificate is issued and published.

A. Effect on the Claims

Upon expiration of U.S. Patent 7,461,353, all amendments proposed during this *inter partes* reexamination will be withdrawn *except for* amendments cancelling claims and any claim amendments herein that were also set forth in the related Ex Parte Reexamination Certificate that issued on December 29, 2017 covering amendments to claims 5, 23–27, 60, 61, 122, 137, 140, 141, 147, 156, 174–177, 238–242, 248, 259, and 274–277, and adding new claims 320–322. For all other remaining claims which are not cancelled, any proposed amendments are withdrawn and those claims will be as they were when this *inter partes* reexamination was filed. In this case, they will be as they were issued.

The following claim will revert to depending from a claim that was cancelled during the *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent 7,461,353. Claim 6, will revert back to dependency from cancelled claim 1.

The following claims will revert back to a claim as originally issued in U.S. Patent 7,461,353, that is, revert back to a claim that lacks limitations the Patent Owner relies on to argue (but we disagree) the amended claim is patentably distinct. Independent claim 70, will revert back to “processing ***at least a portion*** of the HTML-based Web content.” Independent claim 216, will revert back to “translating ***at least a portion*** of the HTML-based Web content.”

B. Effect on this Decision

Upon expiration of U.S. Patent 7,461,353, the only effect on this Decision will be that the analysis simplifies as to all limitations added to the claims by proposed amendments that will be withdrawn. For example, the “Entire vs. Portion” discussion at Section III. B. 2. f). of our decision

directed to related appeal 2021-005530 (decision incorporated herein by reference) and the “HTML Objects” discussion at Section III. B. 2. g). of our decision directed to related appeal 2021-005530 (decision incorporated herein by reference) each becomes moot for claim 6 with dependency from cancelled claim 1, as well as for claims 70 and 216, because these added limitations will no longer be present in these claims.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The Examiner erred in rejecting claims 5, 6, 23–27, 60, 61, 70, 122, 137, 140, 141, 147, 156, 174–177, 216, 238–242, 248, 259, 274–277, 320, and 321 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The Examiner erred in making a final decision favorable to the patentability of claim 322.

We newly reject all claims subject to this reexamination based on 37 C.F.R. § 42.73(d) estoppel as not being patentably distinct from claims finally cancelled during an *inter partes* review of the patent which is the subject of this reexamination.

In summary:

Claim(s) Rejected	35 U.S.C. §	Reference(s)/ Basis	Affirmed	Reversed	New Ground
5, 23–27, 60, 61, 70, 122, 137, 140, 141, 147, 156, 174– 177, 216, 238–242, 248, 259, 274–277	103	Pad++		5, 23–27, 60, 61, 70, 122, 137, 140, 141, 147, 156, 174–177, 216, 238– 242, 248, 259, 274– 277	
5, 23–27, 60, 61, 70, 122, 137, 140, 141, 147, 156, 174– 177, 216, 238–242, 248, 259, 274–277	103	Pad++, the SVF references		5, 23–27, 60, 61, 70, 122, 137, 140, 141, 147, 156, 174–177, 216, 238– 242, 248, 259, 274– 277	
5, 23–27, 60, 61, 70, 122, 137, 140, 141, 147, 156, 174– 177, 216, 238–242, 248, 259, 274–277	103	Pad++, VML		5, 23–27, 60, 61, 70, 122, 137, 140, 141, 147, 156, 174–177, 216, 238– 242, 248, 259, 274– 277	

Claim(s) Rejected	35 U.S.C. §	Reference(s)/ Basis	Affirmed	Reversed	New Ground
320, 321	103	Pad++, common knowledge		320, 321	
5, 23–27, 60, 61, 70, 122, 137, 140, 141, 147, 156, 174– 177, 216, 238–242, 248, 259, 274–277	103	Pad++, HTML standards		5, 23–27, 60, 61, 70, 122, 137, 140, 141, 147, 156, 174–177, 216, 238– 242, 248, 259, 274– 277	
5, 6, 23– 27, 60, 61, 70, 122, 137, 140, 141, 147, 156, 174–177, 216, 238– 242, 248, 259, 274– 277	103	Pad++, AAPA		5, 6, 23–27, 60, 61, 70, 122, 137, 140, 141, 147, 156, 174–177, 216, 238– 242, 248, 259, 274– 277	

Claim(s) Rejected	35 U.S.C. §	Reference(s)/ Basis	Affirmed	Reversed	New Ground
5, 6, 23– 27, 60, 61, 70, 122, 137, 140, 141, 147, 156, 174–177, 216, 238– 242, 248, 259, 274– 277, 320– 322		Estoppel under 37 C.F.R. § 42.73(d)			5, 6, 23–27, 60, 61, 70, 122, 137, 140, 141, 147, 156, 174–177, 216, 238– 242, 248, 259, 274– 277, 320– 322
Overall Outcome				5, 6, 23–27, 60, 61, 70, 122, 137, 140, 141, 147, 156, 174–177, 216, 238– 242, 248, 259, 274– 277, 320, 321	5, 6, 23–27, 60, 61, 70, 122, 137, 140, 141, 147, 156, 174–177, 216, 238– 242, 248, 259, 274– 277, 320– 322

REVERSED; 37 C.F.R. § 41.77(b)

CANCELLED CLAIMS APPENDIX

The following claims 1, 33, 36, 43, 48, 51, 52, 58, 59, 66, 118, 138, 139, 149, 183, 252, 283, and 317 of U.S. Patent 7,461,353 B2 were finally cancelled by IPR2013-00007 and IPR2013-00256. Emphasis added.

1. A **wireless device**, comprising:
 - [A.] processing means;
 - [B.] wireless communications means, to facilitate wireless communication with a network that supports access to the Internet;
 - [C.] a display;
 - [D.] memory; and
 - [E.] storage means, in which a plurality of instructions are stored that when executed by the processing means enable the wireless device to perform operations including,
 - [i.] rendering a browser interface via which a user is enabled to request access to an original Web page, the Web page comprising HTML-based Web content having an original format defining an original width and height of the Web page and ***an original page layout, functionality, and design of content on the Web page***;
 - [ii.] in response to a user request to access the Web page,
 - [a.] retrieving the Web page via the wireless communication means, and ***translating at least a portion*** of the HTML-based Web content from its original format into scalable content that supports a scalable resolution-independent representation of the Web page that ***preserves*** the original page layout, functionality and design of the content defined by its original format ***when scaled and rendered***; and
 - [b.] scaling the scalable content to render the Web page on the display such that a width of the Web page is rendered to fit across the display.

33. The wireless device of claim 1, wherein a portion of the scalable content comprises ***vector-based content***.

36. A **mobile hand-held device**, comprising:
- [A.] a processor,
 - [B.] a wireless communications device, to facilitate wireless communication with a network that supports access to the Internet;
 - [C.] a display; and
 - [D.] flash memory, operatively coupled to the processor, in which a plurality of instructions are stored that when executed by the processor enable the mobile hand-held device to perform operations including,
 - [i.] rendering a browser interface via which a user is enabled to request access to a Web page comprising HTML-based Web content **defining an original page layout, functionality, and design of content on the Web page**;
 - [ii.] retrieving the Web page via the wireless communications device, and **processing** HTML-based Web content **to produce scalable content**; and
 - [iii.] employing at least one of the scalable content or data derived therefrom to,
 - [a.] render the Web page on the display; and
 - [b.] re-render the display in response to associated user inputs to enable the Web page to be browsed at various zoom levels and panned views while **preserving** the original page layout, functionality, and design of the Web page content **at each zoom level and panned view**.

43. The mobile hand-held device of claim 36, wherein at least a portion of the scalable content comprises **scalable vector-based content**.

48. The mobile hand-held device of claim 36, wherein execution of the instructions performs further operations comprising enabling a **user** to **zoom on a column** of the Web content via a corresponding user input, wherein in response thereto, the display is re-rendered such that content corresponding to the **selected** column is **rendered to fit across the display**.

51. The mobile hand-held device of claim 36, wherein the Web content includes *at least one image*, and wherein execution of the instructions performs further operations comprising enabling a *user* to *zoom on an image* via a corresponding user input, wherein in response thereto, the display is re-rendered such that the *image* is rendered to *fit across the display*.

52. The mobile hand-held device of claim 51, wherein the corresponding user input comprises *tapping* on the *image* via the display.

58. The mobile hand-held device of claim 36, wherein execution of the instructions performs further operations comprising:

[iv.] parsing HTML-based code corresponding to the retrieved Web page to determine the original page layout of the content on the Web page;

[v.] *logically grouping selected content into objects*;

[vi.] *defining a primary datum* corresponding to the original page layout; and,

[vii.] for each object

[a.] *defining an object datum* corresponding to a layout location datum for the object's associated display content;

[b.] *generating a vector* from the primary datum to the object datum for the object; and

[c.] creating a reference that links the object to the vector that is generated.

59. The mobile hand-held device of claim 58, wherein execution of the instructions performs further operations comprising:

[viii.] *generating a bounding box for each object*, the bounding box representing a portion of a rendered display page occupied by the object's associated group of content.

66. The mobile hand-held device of claim 36, wherein a portion of the HTML-based Web content comprises *cascaded style sheet data* defining aspects of the Web page design that are preserved at each zoom level and panned view.

118. A method, comprising:

[A.] rendering a browser interface on a display of a device via which a user is enabled to request access to a Web page, the Web page comprising HTML-based Web content having an original format defining an original width and height of the Web page and an original page layout, functionality, and design of content on the Web page;

[B.] in response to a user request to access the Web page, retrieving the Web page via the device, and translating at least a portion of the HTML-based Web content from its original format into scalable content that supports a scalable resolution-independent representation of the Web page that preserves the original page layout, functionality and design of the content defined by its original format when scaled and rendered; and

[C.] scaling the scalable content to render the Web page on the display such that a width of the Web page is rendered to fit across the display.

138. The method of claim 118, further comprising:

[D.] parsing markup language code corresponding to the retrieved Web page to determine the original page layout of the content on the Web page;

[E.] *logically grouping selected content into objects*;

[F.] *defining a primary datum* corresponding to the original page layout; and,

[G.] for each object,

[i.] *defining an object datum* corresponding to a layout location datum for the object's associated display content;

[ii.] *generating a vector* from the primary datum to the object datum for the object; and

[iii.] creating a reference that links the object to the vector that is generated.

139. The method of claim 138, further comprising:

[H.] *generating a bounding box for each object*, the bounding box representing a portion of a rendered display page occupied by the object's associated group of content.

149. A method, comprising:

[A.] rendering a browser interface on a *hand-held device* via which a user is enabled to request access to a Web page comprising HTML-based Web content *defining an original page layout, functionality, and design of content* on the Web page;

[B.] retrieving the Web page via the hand-held device, and *processing* HTML-based Web content *to produce scalable content*; and

[C.] employing at least one of the scalable content or data derived therefrom to;

[i.] render the Web page on a display of the hand-held device; and

[ii.] re-render the display in response to associated user inputs to enable the Web page to be browsed at various zoom levels and panned views while *preserving* the original page layout, functionality, and design of the Web page content *at each zoom level and panned view*.

183. The method of claim 149, wherein a portion of the scalable content comprises *vector-based content*.

252. A machine-readable medium having a plurality of instructions comprising a Web browser tangibly stored thereon, which when executed enable a device to perform operations comprising:

[A.] rendering a browser interface on a display associated with the device via which a user is enabled to request access to a Web page comprising HTML-based Web content defining an original page layout, functionality, and design of content on the Web page;

[B.] retrieving the Web page and *processing* HTML-based Web content *to produce scalable content*; and

[C.] employing at least one of the scalable content or data derived therefrom to,

[i.] render the Web page on the display; and

[ii.] re-render the display in response to associated user inputs to enable the Web page to be browsed at various zoom levels and panned views while preserving the original page layout, functionality, and design of the Web page content at each zoom level and panned view of the Web page,

wherein the Web browser enables a user of the device to browse, zoom, and pan *billions of Web pages* in a manner that *preserves* the original layout, functionality, and design of the HTML-based Web page content of each Web page *at each zoom level and panned view*.

283. The machine-readable medium of claim 252, wherein a portion of the scalable content comprises *vector-based content*.

317. A *hand-held wireless device*, comprising:
- [A.] a processor,
 - [B.] a wireless communications interface, to facilitate wireless communication with a network that supports access to the Internet;
 - [B.] a display; and
 - [C.] non-volatile memory, operatively coupled to the processor, in which software comprising a browser is stored, the browser comprising a plurality of instructions that when executed by the processor enable the device to perform operations including,
 - [i.] rendering a browser interface on the display via which a user is enabled to request access to a Web page including at least one image, at least one column, at least one *hyperlink* to an external reference and having a width and height;
 - [ii.] retrieving the Web page via the wireless communications interface;
 - [iii.] rendering the Web page on the display such that at least one of the width and height of the Web page is fully displayed; and
 - [iv.] enabling the *user* to,
 - [a.] *zoom and pan* a view of the Web page;
 - [b.] *activate a currently displayed hyperlink* to an external reference while at a given zoom level and panned view, wherein in response to an activation of a hyperlink to an external reference, Web content associated with the external reference is retrieved and rendered on the display;

- [c.] *zoom in on an image* of the Web page *by tapping* on the image via the display;
- [d.] *zoom in on a column* of the Web page *by tapping* on the column via the display; and
- [e.] *zoom out to a previous view of the Web page.*

Appeal 2022-000153
Reexamination Control 95/002,132
Patent US 7,461,353 B2

FOR PATENT OWNER:

LAW OFFICE OF R. ALAN BURNETT
4108 131ST AVE SE
BELLEVUE, WA 98006

FOR THIRD PARTY REQUESTER:

JOHN S. PRATT, ESQ.
KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP
1100 PEACHTREE STREET
SUITE 2800
ATLANTA, GA 30309

Notice of References Cited				Application/Control		Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination		Page 1 of 1	
				No. 95/002,132		SoftView LLC			
				Examiner		Art Unit			
		Adam Basehoar		3900					
U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS									
*		DOCUMENT NO.	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	DOCUMENT SOURCE **		
							APS	OTHER	
*	A	US 5,020,090	5/28/91	Morris			☐	☐	
*	B	US 5,708,816	1/13/98	Culbert			☐	☐	
*	C	US 6,088,730	7/11/00	Kato			☐	☐	
*	D	US 6,434,403 B1	8/13/02	Ausems			☐	☐	
*	E	US RE38,127 E	5/27/03	O'Sullivan			☐	☐	
☐	F						☐	☐	
☐	G						☐	☐	
☐	H						☐	☐	
☐	I						☐	☐	
☐	J						☐	☐	
☐	K						☐	☐	
☐	L						☐	☐	
☐	M						☐	☐	
FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS									
*		DOCUMENT NO.	DATE	COUNTRY	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	DOCUMENT SOURCE **	
								APS	OTHER
☐	N							☐	☐
☐	O							☐	☐
☐	P							☐	☐
☐	Q							☐	☐
☐	R							☐	☐
☐	S							☐	☐
☐	T							☐	☐
NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS									
*		DOCUMENT (Including Author, Title Date, Source, and Pertinent Pages)						DOCUMENT SOURCE **	
								APS	OTHER
☐	U							☐	☐
☐	V							☐	☐
☐	W							☐	☐
☐	X							☐	☐

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, Section 707.05(a).)

**APS encompasses any electronic search i.e. text, image, and Commercial Databases.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTO-892 (Rev. 03-98) **Notice of References Cited**