



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.
13/490,020	06/06/2012	Theodore R. Carraher	RSW920080355US2	1495

75532 7590 09/23/2016
LEE LAW, PLLC
IBM SVL IP
P.O. BOX 189
PITTSBORO, NC 27312

EXAMINER

WEINRICH, BRIAN E

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

2169

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

09/23/2016

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):

docketing@leelawpllc.com
docketing_archive@leelawpllc.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte THEODORE R. CARRAHER and JAKE PALMER

Appeal 2015-003201
Application 13/490,020
Technology Center 2100

Before JASON V. MORGAN, MELISSA A. HAAPALA, and
NABEEL U. KHAN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

HAAPALA, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is a decision on appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from a final rejection of claims 1–24.

We have reviewed Appellants’ contentions in the Briefs, the Examiner’s rejection and the Examiner’s response to Appellants’ contentions. We concur with Appellants’ conclusion that the Examiner fails to establish the combination of Eddings (US 7,788,245 B1; Aug. 31, 2010) and Bowden (US 2007/0073704 A1; March 29, 2007) teaches or suggests *a uniform resource locator (URL) to the ML document with an appended page*

anchor that comprises a text identifier of a markup language tag located within the ML document proximate to the location of a search term within the ML document (“URL limitation”), as recited in independent claims 1, 9, and 17.

The Examiner relies on Eddings to teachings the URL limitation. Final Act. 3; *see also* Ans. 6. As correctly identified by Appellants (App. Br. 16–18), Eddings describes embedding of a search-engine URL into a “href” tag of a document to obtain search results for the search term (e.g., “golden retriever”). *See* Eddings col. 10, l. 55–col. 11, l. 35. We agree with Appellants that an embedded link to invoke a search engine to search for a specified term (e.g., a link to www.google.com to search for the term “golden retriever”) is not a URL to a ML document with an appended page anchor.

Appellants persuade us the Examiner has not established the combination of Eddings and Bowden teaches or suggests the URL limitation. The Examiner has not found the additional reference of record, Jensen, teaches or suggests this limitation. Accordingly, we will not sustain the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of independent claims 1, 9, and 17 and the remaining claims, which depend directly or indirectly from one of claims 1, 9, and 17.¹

¹ We do not reach the additional contentions presented by Appellants because the identified issue is dispositive of the appeal.

Appeal 2015-003201
Application 13/490,020

DECISION

The Examiner's decision to reject claims 1–24 under 35 U.S.C.
§ 103(a) is reversed.

REVERSED