

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opinion in support of the decision being entered today (1) was not written for publication in a law journal and (2) is not binding precedent of the Board.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. 15

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte JEFFREY D. GELORME, MARTIN J. GOLDBERG,
NANCY C. LABIANCA and JANE M. SHAW

Appeal No. 97-0226
Application No. 08/441,965¹

ON BRIEF

Before PAK, WALTZ, and ROBINSON, Administrative Patent Judges.
PAK, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL


Gelorme et al. (appellants) appeal from the examiner's final rejection of claims 9 through 11 and 16 through 19. Claims 22 through 25 stand withdrawn from consideration by the examiner as being directed to a nonelected invention.

¹ Application for patent filed May 16, 1995. According to appellants, the application is a division of Application No. 08/357,789, filed December 16, 1994; which is a continuation of Application No. 08/122,886, filed July 13, 1993.

Appeal No. 97-0226
Application No. 08/441,965

The claimed subject matter is directed to a process for forming a pattern through using, *inter alia*, a layer of a photosensitive composition containing a polyimide precursor and a complex of a polymerizable carboxylic acid functional compound with a tertiary amino functional group. This subject matter is related to the subject matter embodied in Appeal No. 97-0225, which is directed to a photosensitive composition itself. Claim 9 is illustrative of the subject matter on appeal and reads as follows:

9. A process comprises photosensitive polyimide reactive with complex of a functional function group



for forming a pattern which providing a layer of a composition comprising a precursor, and as a modifier acid polyimide precursor, a polymerizable carboxylic acid compound with a tertiary amino

wherein said complex is represented by the formula:

wherein each of R_1 , R_2 and R_3 is individually selected from the group of alkyl groups, acrylyl and methacryl groups; and R_4 is selected from the

Appeal No. 97-0226
Application No. 08/441,965

;imagewise exposing selected portions of said layer to actinic radiation to cause crosslinking of the exposed portions and removing the unexposed portions of said layer to thereby provide said pattern.

The reference relied upon by the examiner is:

General Chemistry, March et al, Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., New York, 1979, pp 162-163 (hereinafter referred to as "March").


The reference relied upon by appellants is:

Concise Chemical and Technical Dictionary, Third Enlarged Edition, Bennett, Chemical Publishing co., Inc., New York, 1974, page 272 (hereinafter referred to as "Bennett").

The appeal claims stand rejected as follows:

(1) Claims 9 through 11 and 16 through 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to

group of $-\text{CH}=\text{CH}_2$, $-\overset{\text{CH}_3}{\underset{|}{\text{C}}}=\text{CH}_2$, $\text{CH}_2-(\text{NHC}-\overset{\text{O}}{\parallel}{\text{C}}-\text{CH}=\text{CH}_2)_2$ and



Appeal No. 97-0226
Application No. 08/441,965

particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which appellants regard as their invention²; and

(2) Claims 9 through 11 and 16 through 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to provide an enabling disclosure for the subject matter claimed³.

We have carefully reviewed the entire record, including all of the argument advanced by the examiner and appellants in support of their respective positions. This review leads us to conclude that the examiner's rejections are not well founded. Accordingly, we will not sustain the examiner's rejections for essentially those reasons set forth by appellants in their Brief. We add the following primarily for emphasis.

We consider first the examiner's rejection of claims 9 through 11 and 16 through 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In determining whether claim language runs afoul of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §

² The rejections of claims 16, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are included in this rejection.

³ The rejection of claims 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is included in this rejection.

112, we must analyze the definiteness of the language employed in claims not in a vacuum, but always in light of the teachings of the prior art and the application disclosure as it would be interpreted by one possessing the ordinary level of skill in the pertinent art. *In re Sneed*, 710 F.2d 1544, 1548, 218 USPQ 385, 388 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Angstadt*, 537 F.2d 498, 501, 190 USPQ 214, 217 (CCPA 1976). The claims are deemed definite so long as they reasonably apprise one of ordinary skill in the art of their scope. *In re Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d 1354, 1361, 31 USPQ2d 1754, 1759 (Fed. Cir. 1994). We are mindful that the examiner has the initial burden of demonstrating indefiniteness of the claims. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The examiner initially argues (Answer, page 5) that "[t]he linking bonds for the bisacrylamide and bismethacrylamide R₄ groups are not shown in claim 9." Although the linking bonds for two of the four R₄ groups are not shown in claim 9, we are of the view that one possessing ordinary skill in the art would have known that such linking bonds are present in those R₄ groups. The presence of such

Appeal No. 97-0226
Application No. 08/441,965

linking bonds is apparent from a formula which defines the claimed complex. When any one of these R_4 groups is linked to carboxylic acid group of the complex, five bonds will be present on the carbon atom of the carboxylic acid group. Compare Answer, pages 5 and 6, with Brief, page 5. Thus, we conclude that the scope of claim 9 is unambiguous to those skilled in the art.

The examiner, referring to claim 16, also argues that "[i]t is not clear what the claimed compound dimethylaminopropanol methyl methacrylate is." See Answer, page 6. The examiner, however, has not demonstrated that the meaning of the expression "dimethylaminopropanol methyl methacrylate" is not known to those skilled in the art. See Answer, pages 6, 8 and 9. A mere fact that *Chemical Abstract's Registry* does not, mention dimethyl aminopropanol methyl methacrylate would not, by itself, render such an expression indefinite. Note also that the examiner's reference to the nomenclature of dimethylaminopropanol methyl methacrylate at pages 8 and 9 of the Answer further negates

Appeal No. 97-0226
Application No. 08/441,965

the examiner's position that its meaning is not known to those skilled in the art.

Further, the examiner, referring to claims 18 and 19, argue (Answer, page 6) that:

It is not clear what are the reactive groups of the polyimide precursor. It is also unclear on what appellant bases the weight of the reactive group. For example if the reaction takes place at a carboxyl oxygen is the weight of the reactive group only the reacting oxygen, or does it include the carboxyl carbon and any other substituents attached to the carboxyl carbon? If the reactive group is a sidechain of the polyimide precursor does the weight include the entire sidechain or just the atoms which undergo chemical reaction?

The examiner, however, has not demonstrated that reactive groups of the polyimide precursors defined at page 4 of the specification are not known to those skilled in the art. In fact, the examiner recognizes that carboxylic acid groups of the polyimide precursors (the polyamic acids) are reactive groups. See Answer, page 10, together with specification, page 4. Since the weight of reactive groups employed is dependent on the types of reactive groups employed (carboxylic acid groups), we find that one of ordinary skill in the art is fully aware of "what appellant [sic, appellants] bases [sic, base] the weight of the reactive group."

Appeal No. 97-0226
Application No. 08/441,965

We now consider the examiner's rejection of claims 9 through 11 and 16 through 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as lacking an enabling disclosure in the specification for the subject matter claimed. As stated in ***In re Vaeck***, 947 F.2d 488, 496 n. 23, 20 USPQ2d 1438, 1444-1445 (Fed. Cir. 1991):

The first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 requires nothing more than objective enablement. ***In re Marzocchi***, 439 F.2d 200, 223, 169 USPQ 367, 369 (CCPA 1971). How such a teaching is set forth, either by use of illustrative examples or by broad terminology, is irrelevant. ***Id.***

Where applicants' specification contains a description of the manner of making and using the claimed invention in terms corresponding in scope with those of the claims, compliance with the enablement requirement of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C.

§ 112 is **presumed**. ***In re Marzocchi***, 439 F.2d at 223-224, 169 USPQ at 369-370. It is the examiner's burden to present adequate reasons to doubt the objective truth of appellants' statements in the specification. ***Id.*** In presenting adequate reasons, the examiner must take into consideration, ***inter alia***, the amount of guidance or direction presented in the

Appeal No. 97-0226
Application No. 08/441,965

specification, the nature of the claimed invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of one of ordinary skill in the art and the predictability or unpredictability of the art. *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *citing with approval Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546, 547 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1986).

Here, the examiner argues (Answer, page 4) that:

The specification does not teach how to provide R₄ groups in which the carbon atom linking the R₄ group to the carboxyl group has a valence of 5. Typically a carbon atom has a valence of 4. Page 6 of the specification and claim 9 teach the use of R₄ groups which contain carbon atoms with a valence of 5.

In so arguing, the examiner fails to consider the state of the prior art as represented by the prior art reference referred to at page 4 of the Brief. According to appellants, the Bennet reference teaches (Brief, pages 3 and 4) that:

[T]he claimed formula is a complex as stated, and a complex, as would be apparent to those skilled in the art, is a component in which a particular atom is attached to other atoms or groups of atoms to a number in excess of its charge or oxidation number.

This definition explains why the claimed complex has five bonds on the linking carbon atom. The examiner's reliance on

Appeal No. 97-0226
Application No. 08/441,965

the March reference, however, does not negate this teaching. The March reference, for example, shows oxygen having three bonds even though it typically has a valence of two. See page 162. The March reference also indicates that "hydrogen bonding is not present" in every hydrogen containing compound.
Id.

The examiner also argues that "the **specification** does not teach what groups on the polyimide precursor are the reactive groups of the polyimide precursor (emphasis supplied)." See Answer, page 5. By limiting his argument to the specification only, the examiner again ignores the state of the prior art, as well as the relative skill of one of ordinary skill in the art. In this regard, we also note that the examiner acknowledges at page 10 of the Answer that carboxylic acid groups, although not mentioned in the specification, are the reactive groups of the polyimide precursors (polyamic acids).

No period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 CFR § 1.136(a).

REVERSED

Appeal No. 97-0226
Application No. 08/441,965

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-----------------|
| CHUNG K. PAK |) | |
| Administrative Patent Judge |) | |
| |) | |
| |) | |
| |) | |
| |) | BOARD OF PATENT |
| THOMAS A. WALTZ |) | APPEALS |
| Administrative Patent Judge |) | AND |
| |) | INTERFERENCES |
| |) | |
| |) | |
| |) | |
| DOUGLAS W. ROBINSON |) | |
| Administrative Patent Judge |) | |

CKP:lp

Appeal No. 97-0226
Application No. 08/441,965

BURTON A AMERNICK
POLLOCK VANDE SANDE & PRIDDY
1990 M STREET NW
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON DC 20036-3425

Leticia

Appeal No. 97-0226
Application No. 08/441,965

APJ PAK

APJ WALTZ

APJ ROBINSON

DECISION: REVERSED
Send Reference(s): Yes No
or Translation (s)
Panel Change: Yes No
Index Sheet-2901 Rejection(s): _____

Prepared: February 10, 2000

Draft Final

3 MEM. CONF. Y N

OB/HD GAU

PALM / ACTS 2 / BOOK
DISK (FOIA) / REPORT