

THIS OPINION WAS NOT WRITTEN FOR PUBLICATION

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today
(1) was not written for publication in a law journal and
(2) is not binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 14

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte CHARLES R. ERICKSON
AND ROGER H. SESSIONS

Appeal No. 96-2621
Application 08/077,348¹

ON BRIEF

Before THOMAS, HAIRSTON, and JERRY SMITH, Administrative Patent
Judges.

HAIRSTON, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

¹ Application for patent filed June 14, 1993.

Appeal No. 96-2621
Application No. 08/077,348

This is an appeal from the final rejection of claims 1 through 8.

The disclosed invention relates to a method and system operating in an object oriented programming environment for storing and restoring object persistent attribute data to and from a persistent storage medium.

Claim 1 is illustrative of the claimed invention, and it reads as follows:

1. A system for storing data for a selected object to a persistent medium in an object oriented computer system also having a memory, a processor, and operator interaction means, wherein data resides in system objects in said memory, and wherein said data is manipulated by processing methods associated with said object, the system comprising:

attribute extraction means for determining a number, names, and types of attributes defined for said selected object, said attribute extraction means being responsive to a data storage request;

method construction means for constructing a method invocation request to get attribute values for the attributes extracted by said attribute extraction means, said method construction being responsive to said data storage request;

data formatting means for formatting said attribute names, types and values for storage to said persistent medium; and

data restoration means for restoring said attributes to a restored object instance.

Appeal No. 96-2621
Application No. 08/077,348

The references relied on by the examiner are:

Abraham et al. (Abraham)	5,291,593	Mar. 1, 1994 (filed Oct. 24, 1990)
Filepp et al. (Filepp)	5,347,632	Sept. 13, 1994 (filed July 28, 1989)

Claims 1 through 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Abraham in view of Filepp.

Reference is made to the brief and the answer for the respective positions of the appellants and the examiner.

OPINION

We have carefully considered the entire record before us, and we will reverse the obviousness rejection.

We agree with the examiner (Answer, page 3) that Abraham's system includes:

an object oriented computer system having a memory (112) for storing data objects;
a processor (114) for manipulating data objects;
operator interaction means (116).

Although data 214 (Figure 2) represent various attributes (e.g., number, names and types) of the object 202 (column 2, lines 8 through 11 and column 5, lines 1 through 16), and "Object Reference 300 is likely to be a data attribute within some other persistent object that has saved the object ID" (column 7, lines 51 through 53), the examiner has not demonstrated how the "attribute extraction means (300)" (Answer, page 3) in Abraham is

Appeal No. 96-2621
Application No. 08/077,348

"responsive to a data storage request" as required by claim 1.

The "method construction means" in claim 1 is likewise dependent upon the "data storage request." The examiner has not discussed such a request.

With respect to the "data formatting means" in claim 1, the examiner has turned to Filepp to show formatting of attributes (Answer, pages 3 and 4). In Abraham, the "Object Reference 300 is . . . a data attribute within some other persistent object" (column 7, lines 51 through 53), and the class ID 340 within Object Reference 300 "will indicate whether the class of the object is persistent, and consequently, whether or not the object might be stored persistently on a database 134" (column 8, lines 10 through 13). Thus, a persistent object will be stored on persistent database 134 when the class of the object is persistent. It is assumed that the attribute data of the persistent object has to be formatted in some form when it is stored on the database. If so, then the teachings of Filepp are redundant to teachings and suggestions that are inherently a part of Abraham.

According to the examiner (Answer, page 3), the Object Manager (Figure 4) in Abraham is a "data restoration means" (column 8 and column 9, lines 26 through 33). The examiner's

Appeal No. 96-2621
Application No. 08/077,348

contentions to the contrary notwithstanding, none of the functions of the Office Manager includes "restoring said attributes to a restored object instance" as set forth in claim 1.

In summary, we agree with the appellants' arguments (Brief, pages 6 and 7) that Abraham does not disclose the claimed "attribute extraction means," "method construction means," and "data restoration means." The obviousness rejection of claim 1 and the claims that depend therefrom is reversed.

The obviousness rejection of claims 5 through 8 is reversed because the examiner has not come to grips with the accessing of a "repository"² for persistent attributes, and the above-noted "restoring" of persistent object data.

² There is a lack of antecedent basis for "said repository" in claim 7.

Appeal No. 96-2621
Application No. 08/077,348

DECISION

The decision of the examiner rejecting claims 1 through 8
under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is reversed.

REVERSED

JAMES D. THOMAS)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	
)	
)	
)	BOARD OF PATENT
KENNETH W. HAIRSTON)	APPEALS AND
Administrative Patent Judge)	INTERFERENCES
)	
)	
)	
JERRY SMITH)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	

Appeal No. 96-2621
Application No. 08/077,348

David A. Mims, Jr.
IBM CORPORATION
Intellectual Property
Law Department 923/815-4054
11400 Burnet Road
Austin, TEXAS 78758