

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opinion in support of the decision being entered today (1) was not written for publication in a law journal and (2) is not binding precedent of the Board.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. 24

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

PAUL R. PATRICK and WALTER WONG

Junior Party,¹

v.

PAUL F. DUNN and DAVID S. McMURTREY

Senior Party,²

Patent Interference No. 103,992

Before Urynowicz, Martin and Crawford, Administrative Patent Judges.

¹ Application 08/668,678 filed June 24, 1996. Accorded the benefit of U.S. Serial No. 08/167,317 filed December 13, 1993, now Patent No. 5,589,996 issued December 31, 1996. Assignors to Seagate Technology.

² Application 08/088,789 filed July 8, 1993, now Patent No. 5,473,230 issued December 5, 1995. Assignors to Maxtor Corporation.

Interference No. 104,026

Crawford, Administrative Patent Judge.

JUDGMENT

In consideration of junior party Patrick's REQUEST FOR ENTRY OF AN ADVERSE JUDGMENT, judgment as to the subject matter of the count, is entered against party Patrick, who is therefore not entitled to a patent containing claims 21-44. As a result, judgment as to the subject matter of the count is awarded to party Dunn, who is entitled to a patent containing claims which correspond to the count, i.e., claims 1-24

PATENT
APPEALS AND

STANLEY M. URYNOWICZ, JR.)
Administrative Patent Judge)
)
)
)
)
JOHN C. MARTIN) BOARD OF
Administrative Patent Judge)
)
)
MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD)
Administrative Patent Judge)
)

INTERFERENCES

Interference No. 104,026

Attorney(s) for Patrick et al.:

Charles L. Gholz
Oblon, Spivak, McClelland,
Maier & Neustadt, P.C.
Fourth Floor
1755 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 22202

Attorney(s) for Dunn et al.:

Michael D. McIntosh et al.
Sheridan, Ross & McIntosh
1700 Lincoln Street, Ste. 3500
Denver, Colorado 80203

Interference No. 104,026