

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was not written for publication and is not binding precedent of the Board.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte ALAN RAMALEY, SANKAR RAMASUBRAMABIAN,
MICHAEL SCHMIDT and PIERO SIERRA

Appeal No. 2006-0653
Application 09/211,337

ON BRIEF

Before THOMAS, HAIRSTON, and BARRETT, Administrative Patent Judges.

THOMAS, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellants have appealed to the Board from the examiner's final rejection of claims 1 through 12, 21, 22 and 24 through 37.

Representative claim 1 is reproduced below:

1. A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing steps comprising:

performing a file operation on a file stored on said computer-readable medium, said file containing at least one reference to at least one image, stylesheet or object, said file

Appeal No. 2006-0653
Application 09/211,337

having a folder stored on said computer-readable medium, said folder containing said at least one image, stylesheet or object referenced in said file; and

performing a folder operation on the folder containing said at least one image, stylesheet or object referenced in said file, said folder operation corresponding to said file operation,

wherein said folder operation is performed only on said folder containing said at least one image, stylesheet or object referenced in said file.

The following references are relied on by the examiner:

Chang et al. (Chang)	6,081,806	Jun. 27, 2000
		(Filed Jan. 15, 1998)
Carter et al. (Carter)	W098/22881	May 28, 1998
[Mangosoft]		

Lehto, Kerry et al., Introducing Microsoft FrontPage97 (Microsoft Press: 1997) pages 226-229

All claims on appeal, claims 1 through 12, 21, 22, and 24 through 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. As to claims 1 through 12, 21, 22, 36 and 37, the examiner relies upon Carter/Mangosoft in view of Chang, with the addition of Lehto as to claims 24 through 35.

Rather than repeat the positions of the appellants and the examiner, reference is made to the brief (no reply brief has been filed) for appellants' positions, and to the answer for the examiner's positions.

OPINION

According to appellants' disclosed invention, a file contains at least one reference to at least one image, stylesheet or object. There also exists a folder that contains each image, stylesheet or object referenced, that is, linked to this file. The mirroring functionality of the claimed invention is best shown in the flow chart of Figure 5, the discussion of which begins at the bottom of page 10 of the specification as filed. According to the showing in this figure, if a file exists, the disclosed and claimed invention performs a requested operation on both the file and the folder in step 514 because of this linking capability. Correspondingly, if a folder exists, the invention performs a corresponding requested operation on both the folder and the file in this same step. Example operations include delete, cut, copy, move, undo or restore. Therefore, such linked files and folders may be treated as a single entity by providing a file and folder system for storing linked entities and by mirroring file or folder operations performed on one or the other. Whatever operation is performed on a folder, the same operation is also performed on the file.

Appeal No. 2006-0653
Application 09/211,337

With this background in mind, we must reverse the rejection of independent claims 1, 7, 21, 22, 24 and 30 and, correspondingly, their dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Representative independent claim 1 requires "said file containing at least one reference to at least one image, stylesheet or object" as well as the requirement that "said folder containing said at least one image, stylesheet or object referenced in said file." Corresponding limitations are recited in effect in each independent claim on appeal.

Based on the examiner's interpretations of Carter/Mangosoft as well as our review of the entire reference, it appears to us that the noted relationship of the data with respect to the individual files and folders as recited in representative independent claim 1 is not taught in this reference. The hierarchy of the structured file system 60 in Figure 2 appears to present conventional one way directionality from the directory entity 80, which the examiner considers to be a folder, to respective subdirectories and eventually to respective files and documents as the arrows depict in Figure 2. Because of what we characterize as the bidirectional linking or relationship or "references" of the actual data in the respectively claimed files and folders, there appears to be only the conventional teaching approach in Mangosoft of the relationship of a directory/subdirectory/folder to respective files or documents

and not the corresponding requirement of the linked relationship of the data in a file to the corresponding data in a folder.

According to the fileset deletion capability at page 15 of Mangosoft, the operation of deleting a fileset is implemented by deleting all files in the fileset and in all shared memory space allocated to the files in the fileset as well as the backing store. As noted at page 13 beginning at line 19, the filesets 66 through 74 in Figure 2 are stated to be considered to be equivalent to a traditional file system partitioning approach. This traditional approach does not necessarily include the bidirectionality of the linking noted earlier. It appears to us, therefore, that according to the examiner's reasoning, the requirement of a folder operation in independent claim 1 being performed only on a folder containing the noted image, stylesheet or object referenced in the file can not functionally be obtained according to Mangosoft since all of the related files within a given directory/folder will be deleted and not only those containing the corresponding image, stylesheet or object "referenced" in the file. If a folder is deleted in Mangosoft, all of the respective files within the folder would be deleted and not only those that may have referenced information corresponding to the folder or the file.

Since Mangosoft does not appear to teach or suggest the claimed relationship or linking of the actual data with respect

to files and folders separately, the additional requirement of each independent claim of the folder or file operation being perform only on the folder containing the at least one image, stylesheet or object referenced in a respective file or folder (independent claims 1, 7, 21 and 22) would not result. The same may be said of independent claims 24 and 30 even though these claims additionally require that the file is not stored within a folder and the folder is not stored within the file, thus suggesting that both are located in different directories. According to the disclosed and claimed invention, it is the linked relationship of the actual data within the respective files and folders that is the key to the claimed functionality and not the fact that they may be in the same directory.

From our study of Chang, the secondary reference relied upon by the examiner, it appears that this reference does not provide for these noted deficiencies of Mangosoft. The synchronization operations between different devices in Chang is not detailed to the extent as to teach or suggest the folder operation that corresponds to a file operation and vice versa for example. Chang does not appear to teach or describe files with corresponding folders that contain items referenced by the files, and likewise for the folders. As such, even if we conclude that the artisan would have combined the teachings of Mangosoft with Chang, the invention set forth in independent claims 1, 7, 21 and

Appeal No. 2006-0653
Application 09/211,337

22 would not be obtained. Lehto, as to claims 24 through 35, does not make up for the deficiencies of the Mangosoft-Chang combination.

Appeal No. 2006-0653
Application 09/211,337

In view of the foregoing, the decision of the examiner
rejecting all claims on appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is reversed.

REVERSED

JAMES D. THOMAS)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	
)	
)	
KENNETH W. HAIRSTON)	BOARD OF PATENT
Administrative Patent Judge)	APPEALS AND
)	INTERFERENCES
)	
)	
LEE E. BARRETT)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	

JDT:pgc

Appeal No. 2006-0653
Application 09/211,337

Banner & Witcoff LTD.
Attorneys for Microsoft
1001 G Street, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20001-4597