

## REMARKS

In the Office Action dated January 29, 2009, Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1-20 have been rejected. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,725,228) in view of Gilberto et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0158791).

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103

With regard to the rejection of claim 1, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicant claims, in part, “a method for tracking service orders of service activities each having a *service activity date* . . . creating at least one subfolder at said recipient identified by a *conversion date* associated with a particular set of first data . . . searching . . . said first data and said second data of said email; and moving said email to a corresponding one of said at least one subfolders identified by said first data of said service order.” By contrast, the system of Clark “automatically organizes each saved message into multiple folders based on the contents and attributes of the message.” (Abstract) The Office Action cites FIG. 6, item 62A (“date”) as being a “service activity date” or “conversion date,” as recited in Applicant’s claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees that the date 62A of Clark is either a “service activity date” or “conversion date,” as Clark states, “[t]he date subtree contains folders in which messages are arranged by date. For example, the date subtree might contain folders named “today”, “yesterday”, “this week”, “last week” each containing appropriately selected messages.” (Col. 12, lines 29-33) From this description, it is clear that the date 62A in FIG. 6 of Clark is that of a date when the emails are received or sent, which is not a “service activity date” or “conversion date,” as claimed.

Gilberto describes an order and payment visibility process for facilitating order entry, fulfillment, shipment, and payment in a network environment. (Abstract) The system provides for communicating order entries from a seller to a supplier and provides order status information to the buyer. (Abstract) Gilberto further provides a graphical user interface that shows a number of order fields, including PO number, reference number, date ordered, date requested, and location reference. (FIG. 29, para. [0081]).

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Clark and Gilberto does not teach or suggest Applicants claimed invention. The date 62A of Clark is that of a date of the email and combining Gilberto that adds service orders does not overcome the shortcomings of Clark.

Combining Clark and Gilberto would result in a system that organizes emails by email dates as provided by Clark and would not utilize a method that "creat[es] at least one subfolder at said recipient identified by a *conversion date* . . . and mov[es] said email to a corresponding one set of at least one subfolders identified by said first data of said service order." As the combination of Clark and Gilberto does not teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn. Claims 2-7, which depend from independent claim 1, should be allowable for at least the same reasons. Independent claims 8 and 15, which include the same or analogous elements as claim 1, should be allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 9-14 and 16-21, which depend from independent claims 8 and 15, respectively, should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, and for other apparent reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action. If the Examiner feels a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicant stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-3140, under Docket No. 11000060-0055, of Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal LLP from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: April 29, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Gary B. Solomon

Registration No.: 44,347

SONNENSCHN, NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

1717 Main Street, Suite 3400

Dallas, Texas 75201

(214) 259-0941

(214) 259-0910 Fax

Attorney for Applicants