

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opinion in support of the decision being entered today (1) was not written for publication in a law journal and (2) is not binding precedent of the Board.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. 26

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte MASATOSHI KIMURA

Appeal No. 97-1638
Application 08/371,446¹

ON BRIEF

Before URYNOWICZ, KRASS and JERRY SMITH, Administrative Patent Judges.

URYNOWICZ, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This appeal is from the final rejection of claims 2-15, all the claims pending in the application.

¹ Application for patent filed January 11, 1995. According to appellant, this application is a continuation of Application 08/091,195, filed July 14, 1993, now abandoned.

The invention pertains to an assembly of electronic parts. Claims 2 and 4 are illustrative and read as follows:

2. An electronic apparatus comprising:

an electronic circuit portion comprising:

a plurality of IC cards, each card having a depth of 86mm, a width of 54mm and a thickness of between about 3mm and about 16mm said plurality of IC cards being arranged in function block units, each function block unit performing a separate function of the electronic apparatus, at least one of the function block units including a solid state disk card and an OS/application card;

a plurality of connectors for detachably mounting said IC cards; and

a mother board having a bus section including a main bus (high-speed bus) and an input/output bus (low-speed bus), which are independent of each other, for electrically connecting said plurality of IC cards to each other, said plurality of IC cards including a bus interface card for interfacing between the input/output bus and the main bus;

input means electrically connected to the electronic circuit portion for inputting information to said electronic circuit portion; and

display means electrically connected to the electronic circuit portion.

4. A disk drive-free notebook computer comprising:

a display;

a main body portion having a keyboard on a top surface thereof;

an electronic circuit portion comprising:

a plurality of IC cards arranged in function block units, each function block unit performing a separate function, said plurality of IC cards having a width of about 54mm, a depth of about 56mm and a thickness between about 3mm and about 16mm; and

a mother board including a plurality of first connectors disposed in rows for detachably mounting said plurality of IC cards, a plurality of second connectors for connecting the keyboard and the display section, and a bus section for electrically connecting each of said plurality of IC cards, the keyboard, and the display section to each other, said electronic circuit portion being disposed within the main body in such a way that each IC card is externally mountable.

The references relied upon by the examiner as evidence of obviousness are:

Ogawa	4,722,065	Jan. 26, 1988
Mitchell et al. (Mitchell)	4,924,355	May 08, 1990
Lunsford et al. (Lunsford)	5,036,481	July 30, 1991
Le et al. (Le)	5,038,308	Aug. 06, 1991
Aldous et al. (Aldous)	5,183,404	Feb. 02, 1993
Hsu	5,426,564	June 20, 1995
		(effective filing date Sep 30, 1991)
Stewart et al. (Stewart)	5,440,448	Aug. 08, 1995
		(effective filing date Jun 22, 1992)
Yeh	5,497,464	Mar . 05, 1996
		(effective filing date Nov 01, 1991)
Kawamura	0 201 628	Nov. 20, 1986
(European Patent Application)		

Claims 2, 6, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Mitchell, Lunsford, Le or Ogawa in view of Stewart, Hsu or Aldous.

Claims 3, 7, 11 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Mitchell, Lunsford, Le or Ogawa in view of Stewart, Hsu or Aldous and Kawamura.

Appeal No. 97-1638
Application 08/371,446

Claims 4, 5, 8 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Yeh.

The respective positions of the examiner and the appellant with regard to the propriety of these rejections are set forth in the final rejection (Paper No. 18) and the examiner's answer (Paper No. 24) and the appellant's brief (Paper No. 23).

Opinion

We will not sustain the rejection of claims 2, 6, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The examiner has not addressed appellant's argument that the above claims distinguish over the cited references in the recitation of a solid-state disk card and an OS/application card. Furthermore, appellant argues that it has not been shown in the rejection that any of the prior art references teaches or suggests IC cards detachably mounted to a mother board having a main bus and an input/output bus separated by a bus interface card. The examiner's position that Mitchell, Lunsford, Le and Ogawa disclose electronic devices which "...should have mother boards" having a main bus and an input/output bus is not supported by evidence. Even if it were presumed the prior art suggests the use of a mother board, there is no showing that it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed bus interface card on the board.

We will not sustain the rejection of claims 3, 7, 11 and 15 because the prior art has not been shown to teach or suggest a solid state disk card, an OS/application card or a mother board having a main bus and an input/output bus which are independent of each other.

Lastly, we will not sustain the rejection of claims 4, 5, 8 and 12-14 over Yeh. Appellant is correct that the reference does not disclose or suggest a mother board having a plurality of connectors disposed in rows for detachably mounting a plurality of IC cards. The assemblies illustrated in Figures 1 and 3 of Yeh show no mother board to which IC cards positioned within memory card slots 110 and 111 are detachably mounted. The examiner's position at page 6 of the answer that "it would have been obvious that the IC cards are electronically coupled to the mother board via the connectors" is not supported by evidence.

REVERSED

STANLEY M. URYNOWICZ, JR.)
Administrative Patent Judge)
)
)
) BOARD OF PATENT
ERROL A. KRASS) APPEALS AND
Administrative Patent Judge) INTERFERENCES
)
)
)

Appeal No. 97-1638
Application 08/371,446

JERRY SMITH)
Administrative Patent Judge)

Appeal No. 97-1638
Application 08/371,446

LEYDIG, VOIT and MAYER
STE. 300
700 THIRTEENTH STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005