

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opinion in support of the decision being entered today (1) was not written for publication in a law journal and (2) is not binding precedent of the Board.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. 20

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte HARRISON L. FREEMAN,
THOMAS M. HOAG,
and RICHARD G. MUSTAIN

Appeal No. 1995-3501
Application No. 07/927,788¹

ON BRIEF

Before SCHAFER, BARRETT, and CRAWFORD, Administrative Patent Judges.

CRAWFORD, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is a decision on appeal from the examiner's final rejection of claims 87 through 92, which are all of the claims

¹ Application for patent filed August 10, 1992. According to appellants, this application is a continuation of Application 07/325,601, filed March 20, 1989, now abandoned.

pending in this application. Claims 1 through 86 have been canceled.

The appellants' invention relates to a computer system that includes a write once read mostly ("WORM") volume and a path volume reference ("PVR") table which is stored on magnetic storage. An understanding of the invention can be derived from a reading of exemplary claim 87, which appears in the appendix to the appellants' brief.

The prior art

The prior art reference of record relied upon by the examiner in rejecting the appealed claims is:

Miki et al. (Miki)	5,040,110	Aug. 13, 1991
		(filed Oct. 28, 1988)

The rejection

Claims 87 through 92 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Miki.

Rather than reiterate the conflicting viewpoints advanced by the examiner and the appellants regarding the above-noted

rejections, we make reference to the answer (Paper No. 29, mailed December 13, 1994) for the examiner's complete reasoning in support of the rejections, and to the brief (Paper No. 28, filed September 15, 1994) for the appellants' arguments thereagainst.

OPINION

In reaching our decision in this appeal, we have given careful consideration to the appellants' specification and claims, to the applied prior art reference, and to the respective positions articulated by the appellants and the examiner. As a consequence of our review, we make the determinations which follows.

Appellants' invention is a computer system which includes a WORM. The files are organized on the WORM into path directory groups 130 which contain a plurality of path directory blocks each of which contains location information that points to the file directory groups 140 associated with that path (see Specification at page 13; Figure 3). Each file

directory group 140 includes a plurality of file directory blocks (Specification at page 15). Each file directory block contains a plurality of file directory entries. Each file directory entry contains location information that points to a data file (Specification at page 15).

The WORM volume 110 is complemented by the use of a magnetic storage 240 which stores a PVR table (Specification at page 7; Figure 3). The PVR table contains a PVR record for each path (Specification at page 7). The PVR record buffers file directory entries as new data files are written to the WORM.

Therefore, when a user wishes to read a data file from the WORM, there is no need to search the path directory group or the file directory group on the WORM to locate the data file if the file directory entry is still in the PVR table (Specification at page 7). The PVR record also includes the address of the next file directory group to be written and the address of the previous file directory group. The specification refers to this storing of the address of the next and previous file directory group as "chaining" and further discloses:

If a file directory group runs out of space to store any more file directory entries for its path, a new file directory group is allocated. The last block of the old file directory group points to the first block of the new file directory group, and vice versa. This doubly linked chain permits searching the file directory groups having a common path either backwards or forwards. This technique also allows for an unlimited number of data files per path on the WORM volume, subject only to the physical space limitations of the WORM volume. [Specification at page 6.]

The specification discloses that the PVR table contains the address of the next file directory group and the address of the previous file directory group, if any, for the path to allow chaining of all file directory groups per path (Specification at pages 19 and 20).

The examiner is of the opinion that the Path Table of Miki disclosed in Figures 7D and 8C is a PVR table as recited in claims 87 and 90. In this regard the examiner is of the opinion that what Miki calls directory files i.e. AAA, BBB, CCCCC, and A to K are file directory groups. However, directories AAA, BBB, CCCCC, and A to K do not comprise a path name and a plurality of file directory blocks each of which contain a plurality of file directory entries (See Figures 7B

and 7C which depict file directories BBB and E). Rather, Miki discloses a system of directories and subdirectories (Col. 6, lines 21 to 39).

In addition, claim 87 requires pointers in the PVR table which point to the previous and next file directory groups to be written on the WORM. There are no such pointers disclosed in Miki. Although Miki's path table does include all of the addresses of the directories listed, there is no pointer to designate the previous or next file directory. As such, even if Miki's directories could be considered file directory groups, Miki still would not disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 87 and 90 because the path table of Miki does not include pointers to the next and previous file directory groups so that the file directory groups are chained thereby facilitating easy searching of the file directory groups in the forward and backward direction.

In view of the foregoing, we will not sustain the examiner's rejection of claims 87 and 91 or claims 88, 89, and 92 dependent therefrom.

The decision of the examiner is reversed.

REVERSED

RICHARD E. SCHAFER)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	
)	
)	
)	
)	BOARD OF PATENT
LEE E. BARRETT)	APPEALS
Administrative Patent Judge)	AND
)	INTERFERENCES
)	
)	
)	
MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	

MEC/dal

Appeal No. 1995-3501
Application No. 07/927,788

Page 8

ANDREW J. DILLON
FELSMAN, BRADLEY, GUNTER
and DILLON, LLP
2600 CONTINENTAL PLAZA
777 MAIN STREET
FORT WORTH, TEXAS 76102