

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was not written for publication and is not binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 15

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

Ex parte REMO PARESCHI,  
NATALIE S. GLANCE,  
DANIELE PAGANI,  
JEAN-MARC ANDREOLI,  
STEFANIA CASTELLANI,  
and  
GUNNAR TEEGE

---

Appeal No. 2001-1204  
Application No. 08/971,021

---

ON BRIEF

---

Before HAIRSTON, FLEMING, and SAADAT, Administrative Patent Judges.

HAIRSTON, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is an appeal from the final rejection of claims 1 through 3, 5, 6, 8 through 11, 13 through 16, 18 and 20.

The disclosed invention relates to a method and apparatus for generating a representation of a work process in a memory of a data processing system.

Appeal No. 2001-1204  
Application No. 08/971,021

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

1. A method for generating a representation of a work process in a memory of a data processing system, comprising the steps of:

receiving a first user input and a second user input;

the first user input indicating a first object and a second object; the first object and the second object each having a set of features; the first object specifying an activity for creating a document; the second object specifying a state of the document for initiating the activity;

the second user input indicating a plurality of rules for defining a relationship between the first object and the second object; the plurality of rules including a constraint to be satisfied by a feature of the first object and a feature of the second object in a manner that specifies the activity and the document are duals of each other; and

compiling, in the memory, a grammar representing the work process; said compiling step generating the grammar from the plurality of rules indicated by the second user input.

The references relied on by the examiner are:

Srinivasan	5,548,506	Aug. 20, 1996
Ivanov	5,706,452	Jan. 6, 1998
		(filed Dec. 6, 1995)

Claims 1 through 3, 5, 6, 8 through 11, 13 through 16, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan in view of Ivanov.

Appeal No. 2001-1204  
Application No. 08/971,021

Reference is made to the brief (paper number 13) and the answer (paper number 14) 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 of claims 1 through 3, 5, 6, 8 through 11, 13 through 16, 18 and 20.

Srinivasan discloses an Auto Multi-Project Server 20 (Figures 1 and 2) to implement an organizational process of planning, tracking and managing work-team projects (column 7, lines 6 through 8). The Auto Multi-Project Server 20 is part of an overall Auto Multi-Project Management Process (Figure 1). A project team member (e.g., a program manager) is one of the designated users of the server 20 (column 6, line 64 through column 7, line 7).

The examiner equates (answer, page 3) the priority ranking of projects made by the program manager (column 7, lines 52 through 54) and the change updates provided by task leaders (column 7, lines 57 through 61) to the claimed first user input, the claimed first object specifying an activity for creating a document and the claimed second object for specifying a state of the document for initiating the activity. The examiner

Appeal No. 2001-1204  
Application No. 08/971,021

acknowledges (answer, page 4) that Srinivasan fails to explicitly disclose the claimed "second user input indicating a plurality of rules for defining a relationship between the first object and the second object." The examiner nevertheless concludes (answer, page 4) that "it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have *the second user indicated a plurality of rules for defining the relationship between the first and second object*, because Srinivasan disclose '..... task leaders to provide change updates such as changes in the task duration or estimated completion date.....' (col. 7, ln. 56-58), here the rules were the 'change in updates', and the constraint was the date by which the task was to be completed by such that--*the activity and the document are duals of each other*." The examiner likewise acknowledges (answer, page 4) that Srinivasan fails to disclose the claimed "compiling, in the memory, a grammar representing the work process." Based upon Ivanov's disclosure (column 7, lines 46 and 47) of "entering a workflow graph description **40** into the system," the examiner states (answer, page 4) that "it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Srinivasan and Ivanov and have had the *grammar representing the work process and generated from*

Appeal No. 2001-1204  
Application No. 08/971,021

*the rule of the second user input, because this could be used to*  
*'.....change the organization process of planning, tracking and*  
*management of work-team projects.'* (col. 7, ln. 6-8) as  
Srinivasan discloses."

Appellants argue (brief, page 6) that the examiner's analogy of Srinivasan's teachings to the documents for initiating an activity is misplaced because "Srinivasan at column 7, lines 51-61 does not discuss defining in a 'project plan' two different objects with one object that defines an activity for creating a document and another object that defines a state of the document that initiates the activity." With respect to the teachings of Ivanov, appellants argue (brief, page 7) that "the description in Ivanov of 'entering a workflow graph description' adds little to Srinivasan to render oblivious [sic, obvious] independent claims 1 and 16 with respect to defining objects that specify an activity for creating a document and a document state for initiating the activity." In summary, appellants argue (brief, page 7) that the combined teachings fail to teach "receiving a first user input that indicates a first object that specifies an activity for creating a document, and a second object that specifies a state of the document for initiating the activity; and receiving a second user input that indicates a plurality of

Appeal No. 2001-1204  
Application No. 08/971,021

rules that include a constraint to be satisfied by a feature of the first object and a feature of the second object in a manner that specifies the activity and the document[s] are duals of each other."

Since Srinivasan neither teaches nor would have suggested to the skilled artisan an analogy between the program manager teachings of Srinivasan and the claimed first user input and first and second objects, and the examiner has acknowledged the lack of teachings in Srinivasan pertaining to other claim limitations, we agree with the noted arguments made by the appellants. Thus, the obviousness rejection of the claims on appeal is reversed because of the lack of evidence in the record to support any of the positions made by the examiner.

Appeal No. 2001-1204  
Application No. 08/971,021

DECISION

The decision of the examiner rejecting claims 1 through 3,  
5, 6, 8 through 11, 13 through 16, 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C.  
§ 103(a) is reversed.

REVERSED

KENNETH W. HAIRSTON	)	
Administrative Patent Judge	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	BOARD OF PATENT
MICHAEL R. FLEMING	)	APPEALS AND
Administrative Patent Judge	)	INTERFERENCES
	)	
	)	
	)	
MAHSHID D. SAADAT	)	
Administrative Patent Judge	)	

KWH:hh

Appeal No. 2001-1204  
Application No. 08/971,021

RONALD ZIBELLI  
XEROX CORP.  
XEROX SQ. 20A  
ROCHESTER, NY 14644