

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opinion in support of the decision being entered today (1) was not written for publication in a law journal and (2) is not binding precedent of the Board.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. 11

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte DAVID P. LAUGHLIN

Appeal No. 95-3254
Application 08/029,492¹

ON BRIEF

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

THOMAS, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

¹ Application for patent filed March 11, 1993.

Appeal No. 95-3254
Application 08/029,492

Appellant has appealed to the Board from the examiner's final rejection of claims 1 to 31, which constitute all the claims in the application.

Representative claim 1 is reproduced below:

1. A system comprising:

a base portion containing a central processing unit;

a lid portion containing a display coupled to the central processing unit and a projector for projecting video information from the central processing unit; and

a hinge connecting the lid portion to the base portion.

The following references are relied on by the examiner:

Rabeisen	4,371,893	Feb. 01, 1983
Maeser et al. (Maeser)	4,803,652	Feb. 07, 1989
Araki	5,091,873	Feb. 25, 1992
Mohler et al. (Mohler)	5,160,919	Nov. 03, 1992
Saito ² (Japanese patent publication)	01-237592	Sep. 22, 1989

Claims 1 to 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, in the following manner. Araki alone is relied upon as to claims 1 to 4, 7, 10, 12 and 14. Araki in view of Maeser is relied upon as

² Our understanding of this reference is based upon a translation provided by the Scientific and Technical Information Center of the Patent and Trademark Office. A copy of the translation is enclosed with this decision.

Appeal No. 95-3254
Application 08/029,492

to claims 11 and 13, while Araki in view of Mohler is relied upon by the examiner to reject claims 15, 16, 20, 21, 24, 27, 30 and 31. In another rejection the examiner has relied upon the combination of teachings from Araki, Mohler and Maeser as to claims 28 and 29. Araki and Rabeisen are used to reject claims 5, 6 and 17, with the addition of Mohler as to claims 22 and 23. The examiner has relied upon Araki in view of Mohler, further in view of Saito as to claims 25 and 26, with the further addition of Maeser and Rabeisen as to claims 18 and 19. Finally, Araki and Saito are relied upon to reject claims 8 and 9.

Rather than repeat the positions of the appellant and the examiner, reference is made to the brief and the answer for the respective details thereof.

OPINION

We reverse all rejections of the claims on appeal.

Turning first to the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in light of Araki alone, this claim requires "a lid portion containing a display coupled to the central processing unit and a projector for projecting video information from the central processing unit." We agree with appellant's view that this limitation is not taught or suggested in Araki.

The above quoted limitation requires a display and a projector. Araki provides only an LCD display 3. The fluorescent lamp 6 is a light source for the front lighted LCD display panel 3. However, the fluorescent lamp 6 does not project any information let alone video information from any source. Thus, there is no information projected from the central processing unit as claimed as well by the fluorescent lamp 6. It is only the liquid crystal display 3 that displays information from the word processor 1, which we conclude the artisan would have recognized would have inherently included a central processing unit. Araki's device also does not include within any single element, the claimed lid portion, both a display and a projector of any kind.

The remaining independent claims contain a similar limitation as just quoted with respect to claim 1. Independent claims 18 and 19 contain a similarly recited lid portion with the display and projector for respectively projecting video information and images. The lid portion of independent claim 20 contains a display and a projector for displaying images from the central processing unit. Finally, independent claim 31 also recites the removable lid having a display portion and an

Appeal No. 95-3254
Application 08/029,492

adjacent projector portion which projects images from the central processing unit.

As to these deficiencies, the examiner's combination of Araki and Mohler does not cure at least this defect as to independent claims 20 and 31. Turning to independent claims 18 and 19, the examiner has combined all five references relied upon in the answer in an effort to reach the subject matter of these claims. It is difficult to follow and understand the examiner's reasoning as to any rationale, motivation or line of reasoning why the artisan would have found it obvious to have combined

the teachings and suggestions of each of the respective references in any manner let alone in the manner claimed to reach the subject matter of independent claims 18 and 19 on appeal. In any event, we find that none of the five references relied upon to reject claims 18 and 19 or any combination of these references would have led the artisan to have formed a single lid portion with a liquid crystal display, the lid portion further having a projector for projecting either video information from the central processing unit or projecting images from the central processing unit as claimed.

Appeal No. 95-3254
Application 08/029,492

In view of the foregoing, the decision of the examiner
rejecting claims 1 to 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is reversed.

REVERSED

JAMES D. THOMAS
Administrative Patent Judge

JERRY SMITH
Administrative Patent Judge

MICHAEL R. FLEMING
Administrative Patent Judge

Paul W. Martin
AT&T Global Information Solutions
Law Department, ECD-2
101 W. Schantz Avenue
Dayton, OH 45479-0001

)
)
)
)
) BOARD OF PATENT
) APPEALS AND
) INTERFERENCES
)
)
)