

I. Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest is International Business Machines Corporation, the assignee of the present Application.

II. Related Appeals and Interferences

None

III. Status of Claims

A. TOTAL NUMBER OF CLAIMS IN APPLICATION

There are 20 claims in this Application.

B. STATUS OF ALL THE CLAIMS

1. Claims cancelled: none.
2. Claims withdrawn from consideration but not cancelled: none.
3. Claims pending: 1-20.
4. Claims allowed: None.
5. Claims rejected: 1-20.

C. CLAIMS ON APPEAL

Claims on appeal: 1-6, 8-12, and 14-19.

IV. Status of Amendments

No amendments were filed after the Final Rejection.

V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

Independent claim 1 is annotated as follows with respect to the Specification and Drawings.

1. In a network of computer controlled user interactive display stations, [network of Fig. 1, described on page 6, lines 7-9 of the Specification] a method for the scheduling of meetings on the calendars of invitee users comprising:

prompting an inviter, at a sending display station, to enter into an invitation a predetermined set of general attributes for the scheduled meeting [Fig. 3, described on page 10, lines 15-25];

enabling each invitee to predetermine a set of invitee-specific attributes applicable to each invitation [Fig. 4, described on page 12, lines 1-13]; and

enabling each invitee to prioritize each predetermined general attribute and each invitee-specific attribute to a numerical priority level to determine the priority of said meeting on the invitee's calendar [Fig. 5, described from page 12, line 14 through page 14, line 2].

Independent claim 9 is annotated as follows with respect to the Specification and Drawings.

9. A computer controlled system, for the scheduling of meetings on the calendars of invitee users [network of Fig. 1, described on page 6, lines 7-9 of the Specification] in a network of computer controlled user interactive display stations, comprising:

a processor [CPU 10, Fig. 2, page 9, lines 7-10]; and

a computer memory holding computer program instructions [Fig. 2, application programs including those of the present invention stored in RAM Memory 13 for running programs of the present invention described with respect to Fig. 2, described on page 9, lines 16-18] which when executed by the processor perform the method comprising:

prompting an inviter, at a sending display station, to enter into an invitation an predetermined general set of attributes for the scheduled meeting [Fig. 3, described on page 10, lines 15-25];

enabling each invitee to predetermine a set of invitee-specific attributes applicable to each invitation [Fig. 4, described on page 12, lines 1-13]; and

enabling each invitee to prioritize each predetermined general attribute and each invitee-specific attribute to a numerical priority level to determine the priority of said meeting on the invitee's calendar [Fig. 5, described from page 12, line 14 through page 14, line 2].

Independent claim 13 is annotated as follows with respect to the Specification and Drawings.

13. A computer usable storage medium having stored thereon a non-transitory computer readable program [Fig. 2, application programs including those of the present invention stored in RAM Memory 13 for running programs of the present invention described with respect to Fig. 2, described on page 9, lines 16-18] for the scheduling of meetings on the calendars of invitee users in a network of computer controlled user interactive display stations, wherein the computer readable program [the computer program sequenced in Fig. 7, which is described from page 14, line 9 through page 15, line 10] when executed on a computer causes the computer to:

prompt an inviter, at a sending display station, to enter into an invitation a predetermined set of general attributes for the scheduled meeting [Fig. 7, step 72, page 14, lines 17-21];

enable each invitee to predetermine a set of invitee-specific attributes applicable to each invitation [Fig. 7, step 75, page 14, lines 27-31]; and

enable each invitee to prioritize each inviter-predetermined general attribute and each invitee-specific attribute to a numerical priority level to determine the priority of said meeting on the invitee's calendar [Fig. 7, steps 76-77, from page 14, line 31 through page 15, line 4].

Dependent claim 2, argued separately, is annotated as follows with respect to the Specification and Drawings.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein said inviter is prompted, via an interactive displayed dialog to enter values for each of the predetermined set of general attributes [Fig. 3, page 10, lines 20-30].

Dependent claim 10, argued separately, is annotated as follows with respect to the Specification and Drawings.

10. The system of claim 9, wherein the performed method prompts inviter, via an interactive displayed dialog to enter values for each of the predetermined set of general attributes [Fig. 3, page 10, lines 20-30].

Dependent claim 14, argued separately, is annotated as follows with respect to the Specification and Drawings.

14. The computer usable medium of claim 13, wherein the computer program when executed prompts the inviter, via an interactive displayed dialog to enter values for each of the predetermined set of general attributes [Fig. 3, page 10, lines 20-30].

VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

- Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 USC 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter.

- Claims 1, 9, and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Olliphant (US2010/093029) in view of O'Sullivan (US2006/0271419).

- Claims 2-8, 10-12, and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olliphant (US2010/093029), in view of O'Sullivan (US2006/0271419, further in view of Doss (US2004/0093290).

VII. ARGUMENTRejection under 35 USC 101 Based on Claims 1-8 Directed to Non-Statutory Subject Matter

Applicants submit that claims 1-8, as amended, meet both prongs of the in re Bilski tests. With reference to prong 1, the method instructions carried out are tied to a machine, a user interactive computer controlled display station in a network of such display stations via which a an invitee in developing a meeting calendar prioritizes both a set of general attributes provided by the inviter, and a specific attribute set provided by the invitee to form the meeting calendar. These steps are tied to the interactive computer controlled display stations. It is submitted that the correlation of both prioritized sets to develop meeting schedules is too complex an operation to be performed by a human being without the computer controlled display station.

With reference to prong 2, Applicants submit that the method steps do make a tangible transformation i.e. the two prioritized sets of attributes are correlated into a meeting schedule for an invitee in a general meeting between invitees. This is a transformation of the two attribute sets into a meeting scheduled between network display stations.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 USC 101 be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 9, and 13 are submitted not to be anticipated by, and thus patentable under 35 U.S.C.102(e) over Olliphant (US2010/0293029) in view of O'Sullivan (US2006/0271419).

Olliphant fails to suggest the present invention under 35 USC 103(a). Olliphant fails to disclose several elements of the present claimed invention, and O'Sullivan fails to make up for the several deficiencies of Olliphant as a reference under 35 USC 103(a).

An inviter, who is scheduling the meeting, is prompted to set up priority levels for each of a selected set of general attributes for the meeting.

Each invitee is enabled to set up his own set invitee-specific set of attributes.

Each invitee is also enabled to prioritize both the general set of attributes as well as his invitee-specific set of attributes to a numerical priority level.

In Olliphant:

there is no disclosure or suggestion of any invitee setting up any invitee-specific attributes; and

there is no disclosure or suggestion of any invitee prioritizing the invitee-specific set of attributes.

The disclosure in Olliphant is primarily concerned with attributes and attribute properties determined by only the inviter - not the invitee.

Starting with the Abstract of Olliphant, and throughout the whole reference, Olliphant's "user" who is scheduling the meeting is the Inviter, and Olliphant's "contacts" are his invitees. Applicants fail to find anything in the entire Olliphant reference which discloses that his contacts i.e. invitees set up any invitee-specific attributes or prioritize the invitee-specific attributes.

For a teaching of the invitee setting up invitee-specific attributes, Examiner cites Section 56 in Olliphant. Paragraph 56 describes a user (inviter) who determines the general attributes which the user then sends through the server system to other contacts or clients. While the contacts or clients who receive the inviter's proposed meeting scheduler message, may respond to the general attributes, there is nothing which suggests that these client/contacts set up any responsive client/contact-specific attributes or prioritize contact-specific or general attributes.

For this teaching, Examiner also cites Olliphant, Paragraph 62, in which he chooses terms such as never, rarely, often which Applicants submit are vague, and sufficiently imprecise. At Examiner's suggest Applicants, have added to the claims, prioritizing both the general and specific sets of attributes to a numerical priority level in order to more clearly and distinctly define priority over Olliphant.

In addition, Appellants also submit that this prioritization in Paragraph 62 relates to the User/Inviter prioritizing his contacts/invitees data, and is not suggestive of any prioritization of invitee-specific attributes by the invitee.

O'Sullivan fails to make up for the above deficiencies of the basic Olliphant reference. At best O'Sullivan describes the inviter of a planned meeting of many people e.g. a seminar prioritizes his potential invitees into groups having different priority levels based on the relative significance of the individuals assigned to group levels of corresponding significance. We have an excellent argument that O'Sullivan does not suggest our invention. O'Sullivan does not suggest any done by the invitee, particularly prioritizing anything. In O'Sullivan, it is the inviter who does the prioritizing. As O'Sullivan's Abstract indicates an interface is provided for a scheduling user (inviter) to prioritize prospective attendees for a seminar. The attendees (invitees) do not do any prioritizing nor do the attendees determine an attendee-specific set of meeting attributes. Paragraph 8 in O'Sullivan, cited by Examiner, relates to the same scheduling user (inviter) prioritizing prospective attendees for a seminar.

Accordingly, Appellants submit that even when the Olliphant and O'Sullivan references would be combined, the combination of references still would not teach or suggest, under 35 USC 103(a), the creation of a set of invitee-specific set of attributes by an invitee, and the prioritization of such a set of invitee-specific set of attributes by the invitee.

Dependent Claims 2-8, 10-12, and 14-20, as amended, are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C.103(a) over Olliphant (US2010/0293029) in view of O'Sullivan (2006/271419), further in view of Doss et al. (2004/0093290).

Applicants submit that they have established hereinabove the patentability of independent claims 1, 9, and 13 over Olliphant. Claims 2-8, 10-12, and 14-20 which respectively depend from the independent claims cover combinations with elements in addition to combinations in the claimed element of independent claims 1, 9, and 13. Even if it be conceded that Doss does disclose such additional elements, claims 2-8, 10-12, and 14-20 are submitted for the reasons set forth above for the patentability of independent claims 1, 9, and 13.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the Board is respectfully requested to:

- Reverse the rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 USC 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter.

- Reverse the rejection of claims 1, 9, and 13 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Olliphant (US2010/093029) in view of O'Sullivan (US2006/0271419).

- Reverse the rejection of Claims 2-8, 10-12, and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olliphant (US2010/093029), in view of O'Sullivan (US2006/0271419), further in view of Doss (US2004/0093290).

Respectfully submitted,

J. B. Kraft 04/03/2013
J. B. Kraft
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 19,226
(512) 567-4732

Please send all correspondence to:

J. B. Kraft, Attorney
710 Colorado St., No. 5C
Austin TX 78701

VIII. Appendix - Claims

1. In a network of computer controlled user interactive display stations, a method for the scheduling of meetings on the calendars of invitee users comprising:

prompting an inviter, at a sending display station, to enter into an invitation a predetermined set of general attributes for the scheduled meeting;

enabling each invitee to predetermine a set of invitee-specific attributes applicable to each invitation; and

enabling each invitee to prioritize each predetermined general attribute and each invitee-specific attribute to a numerical priority level to determine the priority of said meeting on the invitee's calendar.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein said inviter is prompted, via an interactive displayed dialog to enter values for each of the predetermined set of general attributes.

3. The method of claim 2, wherein each of said invitees is enabled to determine the priority of said meeting on the invitee's calendar based upon said attribute values entered by the inviter.

4. The method of claim 3, wherein:

each of said invitees is prompted via an interactive displayed dialog to enter values for each of the invitee-specific attributes; and

each of said invitees is enabled to determine the priority of said meeting on the invitee's calendar based upon a correlation of said attribute values entered by the inviter with said values entered by said invitees for said invitee-specific attributes.

5. The method of claim 4 wherein:

there is a 1 to 23 hour time of day differential between any of the inviter and invitees to a telecommunication meeting;

there is an predetermined general time of day attribute; and

each of invitees is enabled to predetermine an invitee-specific attribute prioritized to preclude a meeting scheduled on invitee's calendar when said time of day attribute has invitee-specified values.

6. The method of claim 4 wherein:

said inviter is associated with an organization;

a scheduling invitee applying said set of invitee-specific attributes is a work-from-home employee of said organization; and

said set of invitee-specific attributes include attributes related to home related responsibilities of said employee.

7. The method of claim 1 wherein:

one of said predetermined set of general attributes relates to number of invitees; and

at least one of the invitee-specific attributes involves the value of said inviter attribute related to number of attendees.

8. The method of claim 1 wherein:

one of said predetermined set of general attributes relates to type of meeting being scheduled; and

at least one of the invitee-specific attributes involves the value of said type of meeting attribute.

9. A computer controlled system, for the scheduling of meetings on the calendars of invitee users in a network of computer controlled user interactive display stations, comprising:

a processor; and

a computer memory holding computer program instructions which when executed by the processor perform the method comprising:

prompting an inviter, at a sending display station, to enter into an invitation an predetermined general set of attributes for the scheduled meeting;

enabling each invitee to predetermine a set of invitee-specific attributes applicable to each invitation; and

enabling each invitee to prioritize each predetermined general attribute and each invitee-specific attribute to a numerical priority level to determine the priority of said meeting on the invitee's calendar.

10. The system of claim 9, wherein the performed method prompts inviter, via an interactive displayed dialog to enter values for each of the predetermined set of general attributes.

11. The system of claim 10, wherein the performed method enables each of said invitees to determine the priority of said meeting on the invitee's calendar based upon said attribute values entered by the inviter.

12. The system of claim 11, wherein the performed method prompts each of said invitees via an interactive displayed dialog to enter values for each of the invitee-specific attributes; and

enables each of said invitees to determine the priority of said meeting on the invitee's calendar based upon a correlation of said attribute values entered by the inviter with said values entered by said invitees for said invitee-specific attributes.

13. A computer usable storage medium having stored thereon a non-transitory computer readable program for the scheduling of meetings on the calendars of invitee users in a network of computer controlled user interactive display stations, wherein the computer readable program when executed on a computer causes the computer to:

prompt an inviter, at a sending display station, to enter into an invitation a predetermined set of general attributes for the scheduled meeting;

enable each invitee to predetermine a set of invitee-specific attributes applicable to each invitation; and

enable each invitee to prioritize each inviter-predetermined general attribute and each invitee-specific attribute to a numerical priority level to determine the priority of said meeting on the invitee's calendar.

14. The computer usable medium of claim 13, wherein the computer program when executed prompts the inviter, via an interactive displayed dialog to enter values for each of the predetermined set of general attributes.

15. The computer usable medium of claim 14, wherein the computer program when executed enables each of said invitees to determine the priority of said meeting on the invitee's calendar based upon said attribute values entered by the inviter.

16. The computer usable medium of claim 15, wherein the computer program when executed:

prompts each of said invitees via an interactive displayed dialog to enter values for each of the invitee-specific attributes; and

enables each of said invitees to determine the priority of said meeting on the invitee's calendar based upon a correlation of said attribute values entered by the inviter with said values entered by said invitees for said invitee-specific attributes.

17. The computer usable medium of claim 16, wherein
there is a 1 to 23 hour time of day differential
between any of the inviter and invitees to a
telecommunication meeting;

there is an predetermined time of day attribute; and
the computer program when executed enables each of
invitees to predetermine an invitee-specific attribute
prioritized to preclude a meeting scheduled on invitee's
calendar when said time of day attribute has invitee-
specified values.

18. The computer usable medium of claim 16, wherein:
said inviter is associated with an organization;
a scheduling invitee applying said set of invitee-
specific attributes is a work-from-home employee of said
organization; and

said set of invitee-specific attributes include
attributes related to home related responsibilities of said
employee.

19. The computer usable medium of claim 13, wherein:
one of said predetermined set of general attributes
relates to number of invitees; and

at least one of the invitee-specific attributes
involves the value of said inviter attribute related to
number of attendees.

20. The computer usable medium of claim 13, wherein:
 one of said predetermined set of general attributes
relates to type of meeting being scheduled; and
 at least one of the invitee-specific attributes
involves the value of said type of meeting attribute.

IX. Evidence Appendix

There was no evidence presented in the prosecution of the present Application.

X. Related Proceedings Appendix

There are no proceedings related to the present proceedings.