



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.
11/024,967	12/30/2004	Daniel Egnor	0026-0130	7261
44989	7590	01/13/2012	EXAMINER	
HARRITY & HARRITY, LLP 11350 Random Hills Road SUITE 600 FAIRFAX, VA 22030			HWA, SHYUE JIUNN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2163	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/13/2012	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.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte DANIEL EGNOR and GEETA CHAUDHRY

Appeal 2009-012635
Application 11/024,967
Technology Center 2100

Before JEFFREY S. SMITH, ERIC B. CHEN, BRUCE R. WINSOR,
Administrative Patent Judges.

SMITH, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This is an appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Examiner's final rejection of claims 1-29, which are all the claims pending in the application. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We affirm.

Invention

Appellants' invention relates to a system that determines documents that are associated with a location, identifies a group of signals associated with each of the documents, and determines authoritativeness of the documents for the location based on the signals. Abstract.

Representative Claim

1. A method comprising:

identifying a set of documents, as candidate documents, that are all associated with a same geographic location;

identifying signals associated with the candidate documents;

determining a measure of authoritativeness of the candidate documents for a business at the location based on the signals; and

processing the candidate documents based on their measures of authoritativeness for the business at the location.

Prior Art

Agoni	US 2002/0133374 A1	Sep. 19, 2002
Getchius	US 6,643,640 B1	Nov. 4, 2003
Nye	US 2004/0064334 A1	Apr. 1, 2004

Examiner's Rejections

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10, 12-18, 20-22, 24, and 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Getchius and Agoni.

Claims 5, 9, 11, 19, 23, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Getchius, Agoni, and Nye.

Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Getchius and Nye.

Claim Groupings

Based on Appellants' arguments in the Appeal Brief, we will decide the appeal on the basis of claims 1, 4, 6-8, 10, and 29.

FINDINGS OF FACT

We rely on, and adopt as our own, the findings of fact set forth by the Examiner in the Final Rejection and Examiner's Answer.

ANALYSIS

Section 103 rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 9, 11-17, 19, 23, 25, and 26- 28

Appellants contend that the combination of Getchius and Agoni does not teach “determining a measure of authoritativeness of the candidate documents for a business at the location based on the signals” as recited in claim 1. App. Br. 9-11; Reply Br. 4-10. The Examiner finds that Getchius teaches this limitation. Ans. 6; 23-28. We agree with the Examiner.

Appellants contend that Getchius does not teach “identifying signals associated with the candidate documents,” therefore, Getchius cannot teach determining authoritativeness based on “signals associated with the candidate documents.” App. Br. 12. The Examiner finds that the combination of Getchius and Agoni teaches identifying signals associated with the candidate documents. Ans. 7. We agree with the Examiner. We further find that the term “identifying signals associated with the candidate documents” as recited in claim 1 encompasses identifying any data associated with the candidate documents, such as the data discussed in col. 28, ll. 7-11 of Getchius.

We sustain the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the action from which this appeal is taken and the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the Examiner’s Answer in response to the Appellants’ Appeal Brief. We concur with the conclusion reached by the Examiner.

Appellants present arguments for independent claims 14 and 15 (App. Br. 26-37) similar to those presented for claim 1, which we find unpersuasive. Appellants have not presented arguments for separate

patentability of claims 2, 3, 5, 9, 11-13, 16, 17, 19, 23, and 25-28, which thus fall with corresponding independent claims 1 and 15.

Section 103 rejection of claims 4 and 18

Appellants contend that the combination of Getchius and Agoni does not teach “determining documents that are linked to by the candidate documents, and identifying the determined documents as candidate documents.” App. Br. 15-16; Reply Br. 10-12. The Examiner finds that the combination of Getchius and Agoni teaches the limitations of claim 4. Ans. 8, 29-30. We agree with the Examiner.

We sustain the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the action from which this appeal is taken and the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the Examiner’s Answer in response to the Appellants’ Appeal Brief. We concur with the conclusion reached by the Examiner.

Appellants present arguments for claim 18 (App. Br. 38-39) similar to those presented for claim 4, which we find unpersuasive. We sustain the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Section 103 rejection of claims 6 and 20

Appellants contend that the combination of Getchius and Agoni does not teach “determining a number of outlinks from ones of the candidate documents that point to other ones of the candidate documents; and wherein determining a measure of authoritativeness of the candidate documents includes: generating an authoritative score for one of the candidate documents based on the number of outlinks from other ones of the candidate

documents that point to the candidate document” as recited in claim 6. App. Br. 16-19; Reply Br. 13-15. The Examiner finds that the combination of Getchius and Agoni teaches this limitation. Ans. 8, 30-31. We agree with the Examiner.

We sustain the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the action from which this appeal is taken and the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the Examiner’s Answer in response to the Appellants’ Appeal Brief. We concur with the conclusion reached by the Examiner.

Appellants present arguments for claim 20 (App. Br. 39-42) similar to those presented for claim 6, which we find unpersuasive. We sustain the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Section 103 rejection of claims 7 and 21

Appellants contend that the combination of Getchius and Agoni does not teach “identifying anchor text associated with links to the candidate documents; and wherein determining a measure of authoritativeness of the candidate documents includes: generating an authoritative score for one of the candidate documents based on whether the candidate document is pointed to by one or more links whose anchor text matches all or part of a name of the business at the location” as recited in claim 7. App. Br. 19-21; Reply Br. 15-17. The Examiner finds that the combination of Getchius and Agoni teaches this limitation. Ans. 8-9, 31-32. We agree with the Examiner.

We sustain the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the action from which this appeal is

taken and the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the Examiner's Answer in response to the Appellants' Appeal Brief. We concur with the conclusion reached by the Examiner.

Appellants present arguments for claim 21 (App. Br. 42-44) similar to those presented for claim 7, which we find unpersuasive. We sustain the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Section 103 rejection of claims 8 and 22

Appellants contend that the combination of Getchius and Agoni does not teach "identifying titles of ones of the candidate documents; and wherein determining a measure of authoritativeness of the candidate documents includes: generating an authoritative score for one of the candidate documents based on whether a title associated with the candidate document matches all or part of a name of the business at the location" as recited in claim 8. App. Br 21-24; Reply Br. 17-20. The Examiner finds that the combination of Getchius and Agoni teaches this limitation. Ans. 9, 32-33. We agree with the Examiner.

We sustain the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the action from which this appeal is taken and the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the Examiner's Answer in response to the Appellants' Appeal Brief. We concur with the conclusion reached by the Examiner.

Appellants present arguments for claim 22 (App. Br. 44-46) similar to those presented for claim 8, which we find unpersuasive. We sustain the rejection of claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Section 103 rejection of claims 10 and 24

Appellants contend that the combination of Getchius and Agoni does not teach “determining locations with which ones of the candidate documents are associated; and wherein determining a measure of authoritativeness of the candidate documents further includes: increasing the measure of authoritativeness of one of the candidate documents based on whether the candidate document is associated with a single location” as recited in claim 10. App. Br. 24-25; Reply Br. 20-22. The Examiner finds that the combination of Getchius and Agoni teaches this limitation. Ans. 9-10, 33-34. We agree with the Examiner.

We sustain the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the action from which this appeal is taken and the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the Examiner’s Answer in response to the Appellants’ Appeal Brief. We concur with the conclusion reached by the Examiner.

Appellants present arguments for claim 24 (App. Br. 46-48) similar to those presented for claim 10, which we find unpersuasive. We sustain the rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Section 103 rejection of claim 29

Appellants contend that the combination of Getchius and Nye does not teach the limitations of claim 29. App. Br. 56-61. The Examiner finds that the combination of Getchius and Nye teaches the limitations of claim 29. Ans. 17-22. We agree with the Examiner.

We sustain the rejection of claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the action from which this appeal is

Appeal 2009-012635
Application 11/024,967

taken and the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the Examiner's Answer in response to the Appellants' Appeal Brief. We concur with the conclusion reached by the Examiner.

DECISION

The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-8, 10, 12-18, 20-22, 24, and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Getchius and Agoni is affirmed.

The rejection of claims 5, 9, 11, 19, 23, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Getchius, Agoni, and Nye is affirmed.

The rejection of claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Getchius and Nye is affirmed.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.50(f).

AFFIRMED

tj