

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL PHILIP KAUFMAN,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-01142
Patent 7,885,981 B2

Before BARBARA A. PARVIS, JENNIFER MEYER CHAGNON, and
ROBERT L. KINDER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

KINDER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review
37 C.F.R. § 42.108

Microsoft Corporation (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 311–19 to institute an *inter partes* review of claims 1–6 (all claims) of U.S. Patent No 7,885,981 B2, issued on February 8, 2011 (Ex. 1001, “the ’981 patent”). Paper 2 (“Pet.”). Michael Philip Kaufman (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 6 (“Prelim. Resp.”). We have authority under 35 U.S.C. § 314 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.4(a).

To institute an *inter partes* review, we must determine that the information presented in the Petition shows “a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.” 35 U.S.C. § 314(a). Having considered both the Petition and the Preliminary Response, we are not persuaded that Petitioner has demonstrated a reasonable likelihood that it would prevail in showing the unpatentability of any of claims 1–6 of the ’981 patent on any alleged ground. Accordingly, we do not institute an *inter partes* review of any claim on the record before us.

I. BACKGROUND

A. The ’981 patent (Ex. 1001)

The ’981 patent is titled “System and Method for Generating Automatic User Interface for Arbitrarily Complex or Large Databases.” Ex. 1001, [54]. The “software system automatically and dynamically generates a fully functional user interface (UI) based upon, and connected directly to, an underlying data model (as instantiated within a relational database management system (RDBMS)).” *Id.* at [57]. The ’981 patent describes generating the UI “from an automated interrogation of the RDBMS,” and also integrating four modes, or mode displays for all tables. *Id.* A full complement of mechanisms may be “integrated directly into the

mode display[] for representing, navigating, and managing relationships across tables, regardless of the complexity of the underlying RDBMS schema.” *Id.* A relational database schema is also described as, for example, a “data model,” which is further explained as a “complement of tables which store data, and the relational links between these tables.” *Id.* at 2:41–48.

An objective of the ’981 patent is “to provide a complete and fully functional user interface (UI) for any arbitrarily complex or large database schema, without any custom software programming.” *Id.* at 3:9–12. To achieve that stated objective, “once a back-end schema has been designed and constructed within the RDBMS, the system can automatically ‘interrogate’ this schema, and ‘absorb’ its structure into an internal cache.” *Id.* at 3:13–16. This structure is later used to develop “a comprehensive application through which the back-end can be operated, and through which all conventional database activities—searching, listing, adding, editing—can be supported, across all base-tables comprising the schema.” *Id.* at 3:19–24. This application “reveals (and enforces) the relational/hierarchical organization among the tables within the back-end via smoothly integrated UI mechanisms which are embedded directly into the base-table screen displays—providing a natural, powerful, and easy-to-use environment for managing complex data relationships and interactions.” *Id.* at 3:26–32.

B. Illustrative Claim

Claim 1, reproduced below, is illustrative of the claims at issue:

1. A method for operating a server comprising a processor for automatically generating an end-user interface for working with the data within a relational database defined within a relational DBMS whose data is stored in machine-readable media and

which is accessible to said server, wherein said relational database comprises a plurality of tables, constraints and relationships stored in said DBMS in accordance with a data model comprising said tables and their column-complements and datatypes, said constraints, and the relationships across said tables, and wherein said relational database may be of any arbitrary size or complexity, said method comprising

(a) providing an output stream from said server, for user display and input devices, defining a user interface paradigm comprising a set of modes for interacting with a given database table, said modes comprising create, retrieve, update and delete, and a corresponding display format for each mode;

(b) causing said server to scan said database and apply a body of rules to determine the table structures, constraints and relationships of said data model, and store representations thereof in machine-readable media accessible to said server; and

(c) causing said server to use said representations to construct a corresponding client application for access through said user display and input devices, wherein said client application provides a connection to said database, provides displays of the table contents of said database for each of said modes in accordance with the display formats of said paradigm, integrates into each said mode display processes for representing, navigating, and managing said relationships across tables, for selecting among said modes, and for navigating across said tables and interacting in accordance the selected mode with the data in the tables that are reached by said navigation, while observing and enforcing relational interdependencies among data across said tables.

Ex. 1001, 377:2–38.

C. Related Proceedings

Petitioner and Patent Owner identify a related litigation in the Southern District of New York involving the '981 patent: *Kaufman v. Microsoft Corp.*, Case No. 16-CV-2880-LTS-SN. Pet. 2; Paper 4, 1.

Petitioner also identifies a related petition (IPR2017-01141) challenging claims 1–6 of the '981 patent. Pet. 2.

D. Real Party-in-Interest

Petitioner certifies that the real party-in-interest for this Petition is Microsoft Corporation. Pet. 2.

E. References

Petitioner relies on the following references:

Reference		Date	Exhibit
Simpson	Alan Simpson et al., <i>Access 2003 All-in-One Desk Reference for Dummies</i>	2003	Ex. 1004
Prague	Cary N. Prague & Michael R. Irwin, <i>Access 97 Bible</i>	1997	Ex. 1005
Kesler	U.S. 7,062,502 B1	Dec. 28, 2001 (filed) June 13, 2006 (issued)	Ex. 1006
Bennett	U.S. 5,615,367	Mar. 25, 1997 (issued)	Ex. 1007

F. Grounds Asserted

Petitioner challenges the patentability of claims 1–6 of the '981 patent on the following two grounds (Pet. 4):

References	Basis	Claims Challenged
Simpson and Prague	§ 103(a)	1–6
Kesler and Bennett	§ 103(a)	1–6

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.