

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opinion in support of the decision being entered today (1) was not written for publication in a law journal and (2) is not binding precedent of the Board.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. 32

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte WILLIAM R. HAMBURGEN

Appeal No. 96-0979
Application No. 07/979,552¹

ON BRIEF

Before KIMLIN, OWENS and PAK, Administrative Patent Judges.

KIMLIN, Administrative Patent Judge.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Appellant requests reconsideration of our decision of April 30, 1997, wherein we affirmed the examiner's rejection of the appealed claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

¹ Application for patent filed November 18, 1992. According to appellant, this application is a division of Application 07/725,376, filed June 27, 1991, now abandoned; which is a continuation of Application No. 07/542,180, June 22, 1990, now abandoned.

Appeal No. 96-0979
Application No. 07/979,552

Appellant takes issue with our statement in the decision that "[a]ppellant's specification imparts no specific structure to the frame." (Emphasis added.) Appellant responds that the specification describes the frame as "being generally rectangular and having a generally rectangular central opening" (page 1 of Request). However, appellant's argument makes our point precisely, viz., a generally rectangular shape and opening does not amount to a specific structure. Also, it is not apparent to us, as urged in the Request, that frame 11 of specification Figure 1 has a relatively massive body. Furthermore, it is by now well settled that claim language is to be given its broadest reasonable interpretation during prosecution and that specific limitations found in the specification are not to be read into the claims.

Appellant's argument regarding the step of testing the chip for proper electrical operation before installing a heatsink has been adequately addressed in the original decision.

We have reconsidered our decision, as requested by appellant, but we fail to find any error therein. Accordingly, appellant's request is denied with respect to making any change in our decision.

Appeal No. 96-0979
Application No. 07/979,552

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

DENIED

EDWARD C. KIMLIN)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	
)	
)	
)	
TERRY J. OWENS)	BOARD OF PATENT
Administrative Patent Judge)	APPEALS AND
)	INTERFERENCES
)	
)	
CHUNG K. PAK)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	

Appeal No. 96-0979
Application No. 07/979,552

Edward S. Wright
Flehr, Hohbach, Test, Albritton
& Herbert
Four Embarcadero Center
Suite 3400
San Francisco, CA 94111