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.
11/565,411	11/30/2006	JOHN NICHOLAS GROSS	JNG 2006-7	4147

23694 7590 01/03/2014

Law Office of J. Nicholas Gross, Prof. Corp.
PO BOX 9489
BERKELEY, CA 94709

EXAMINER	
COLLINS, JOSHUA L	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2491	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/03/2014	ELECTRONIC

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.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jngross@pacbell.net
anthonygreek@gmail.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte JOHN NICHOLAS GROSS

Appeal 2011-004811
Application 11/565,411
Technology Center 2400

Before ELENI MANTIS MERCADER, JOHN A. EVANS, and MICHAEL J. STRAUSS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MANTIS MERCADER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Examiner's Final Rejection of claims 1-24. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We reverse.

THE INVENTION

Appellant's claimed invention is directed to presenting relevant advertising to user search queries. The ads are based on content which is derived from a set of documents/pages from websites forming a collective. *See* Abstract.

Independent claim 1, reproduced below, is illustrative of the subject matter on appeal.

1. A method of identifying appropriate electronic advertising information for a search engine implemented using computer software instructions embodied in a computer usable medium executing on one or more computing machines and comprising:

forming a website collective whose members include a plurality of different websites characterized by a common parameter including at least one of a common content topic and/or a common contractual arrangement;

further wherein said website collective members are treated as a single aggregate content entity by the search engine for responding to searches related to at least said common content topic;

compiling content taken from webpages in the website collective to generate a synthetic document representing aggregated content from said different websites for said single aggregate content entity;

identifying an advertisement to be associated with said aggregated content and said single aggregate content entity by

comparing content of said advertisement and said synthetic document.

REFERENCES and REJECTION

1. The Examiner rejected claims 1-15, 19, and 21-24 as indefinite under 35 U.S.C.§ 112, second paragraph.
2. The Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 10-23 under 35 U.S.C.§ 103(a) as unpatentable over Poremsky (Diane Poremsky, *Google and Other Search Engines: Visual Quickstart Guide* (2004)), Dean (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0059708, Mar. 25, 2004), Chang (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0052674 A1; May 2, 2002), Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) AdSense and Giguere (Eric Giguere, *Make Easy Money with Google: Using the AdSense Advertising Program* (2005)) (collectively referred to as the "Primary References").
3. The Examiner rejected claims 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable the above Primary References and Calishain (Tara Calishain, *Web Search Garage* (2004)).
4. The Examiner rejected claims 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable under the above Primary References and Appleman (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,788, Jun. 27, 2000);
5. The Examiner rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable under the above Primary References and Johnson (US Patent No. 6,574,624 B1, Jun. 3, 2003);

ISSUES

The issues are whether the Examiner erred in finding that the:

1. recitation of "and/or" renders the claims indefinite; and

2. combination of Poremsky, Dean, Chang, AAPA, and Giguere teaches the limitation of a website collective members "treated as a single aggregate content entity by the search engine for responding to searches" as recited in claim 1.

ANALYSIS

Claims 1-15, 19, and 21-24 under 35 U.S.C.§ 112

The Examiner rejected claims 1-15, 19, and 21-24 as indefinite based on the use of the term "and/or" (Ans. 4). We agree with Appellant that "and/or" covers embodiments having element A alone, element B alone, or elements A and B taken together (App. Br. 16).[1]

Accordingly, we reverse the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-15, 19 and 21 -24 as being indefinite.

Claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C.§ 103(a)

Appellant argues, *inter alia*, that the combination of the prior art references does not teach the limitation of a website collective members "treated as a single aggregate content entity by the search engine for responding to searches" as recited in claim 1 (App. Br. 18-21).

We agree with Appellant. The Examiner relies on Chang's teaching of a search result being stored and used to determine changes, the search result itself being the single entity made from a collective (Ans. 7). We agree with Appellant that Chang teaches that as the user moves, *different* results can be retrieved based on their respective position (App. Br. 15 and

[1] Should there be further prosecution, we note that the preferred verbiage to claim "at least" clauses of elements A and B would be "at least one of A *and* B" and not "at least one of A and/or B."

Chang's ¶ [0064]). While these search results can be stored, Chang does not explain what format they are stored on the mobile device, let alone that they are made part of a search "index" (App. Br. 15). To the contrary, we agree with Appellant that Chang at best suggests that the prior location search results are kept in some sort of database that can be compared later on against a new list (based on a current location) (App. Br. 15 and Chang's ¶ [0064]). *See* e.g., FIG. 14 and discussion at col. 9, ll. 7 - 8.

Thus, we reverse the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 and for the same reasons, the rejections of claims 2-24.

CONCLUSION

The Examiner erred in finding that the:

1. recitation of "and/or" renders the claims indefinite; and
2. combination of Poremsky, Dean, Chang, AAPA, and Giguere teaches or suggests the limitation of a website collective members "treated as a single aggregate content entity by the search engine for responding to searches" as recited in claim 1.

DECISION

The Examiner's decision rejecting claims 1-24 is reversed.

REVERSED

ke