

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opinion in support of the decision being entered today (1) was not written for publication in a law journal and (2) is not binding precedent of the Board.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 GREG P. FITZPATRICK, ABDOLREZA SALASHOUR,
and MARVIN L. WILLIAMS

Appeal No. 96-2242
Application No. 08/083,242¹

ON BRIEF

Before THOMAS, HAIRSTON, and FLEMING, Administrative Patent Judges.

HAIRSTON, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is an appeal from the final rejection of claims 1 through 18. In an Amendment After Final (paper number 6), claim 1 was amended.

The disclosed invention relates to a method and apparatus for presenting an object in a data processing system.

¹ Application for patent filed June 25, 1993.

Appeal No. 96-2242
Application No. 08/083,242

Claim 1 is illustrative of the claimed invention, and it reads as follows:

1. A method of presenting an object in a data processing system, said presentation being with a presentation device, said data processing system having a user interface that is separate from said presentation device, comprising the steps of:

a) displaying a representation of said object on said user interface;

b) providing said object with attributes that are relevant to the presentation of said object;

c) determining from an input provided by way of said displayed object representation on said user interface if said object is to be presented; and

d) transforming said object into a displayable format in accordance with said attributes and providing said transformed object to said presentation device if said object is to be presented.

The reference relied on by the examiner is:

Norden-Paul et al. (Norden-Paul) 5,247,611 Sept. 21, 1993

(effective filing date Sept. 15, 1989)

Claims 1 through 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Norden-Paul.

Reference is made to the brief and the answer for the respective positions of the appellants and the examiner.

OPINION

Appeal No. 96-2242
Application No. 08/083,242

We have carefully considered the entire record before us, and we will reverse the obviousness rejection.

In the grounds of the rejection of claim 1 (Answer, pages 2 and 3), the examiner broadly refers to the system console 85 in Norden-Paul (Figure 1) for the step of "displaying a representation of said object," to the bedside workstations in Norden-Paul (Figure 1) for the step of "providing said object with attributes that are relevant to the presentation of said object," to column 5, line 12 to column 6, line 4 of Norden-Paul for the step of "determining of [sic, if] said object is to be presented," and to Figures 4 through 7 of Norden-Paul for the step of "transforming said object into a displayable format." According to the examiner (Answer, page 4), the patient monitoring equipment 8, 10, 28 and 30 of Norden-Paul are "equivalent to the claimed 'user interface,'" the patient forms are "equivalent to the claimed 'object,'" and the network administration terminal 85 "can be viewed as a 'user interface' which transfers the data to the 'representation device' as claimed."

We agree with appellants' argument (Brief, pages 5 and 6) that:

Appeal No. 96-2242
Application No. 08/083,242

Norden-Paul teaches a network of computers that is used for displaying patient records, such as medications administered and a patient's physiological parameters (heart rate, etc.). Norden-Paul focuses on providing a type of patient record that is flexible enough to meet the needs of the medical staff. This is accomplished by allowing the cells in a record to be of variable size so as to contain more or less data.

We do not, however, agree with appellants' argument (Brief, page 6) that "Norden-Paul does not teach displaying a representation of an object on a user interface, and determining from an input provided by way of the displayed object representation on the user interface if the object is to be presented by a presentation device that is separate from the user interface." If medical advice is prepared on a form or "object" at the system console 85 for presentation or display at only the nurse's workstation, then the user of the system console can type in the address of the nurse's workstation on the form to prevent the medical advice from being displayed at the bedside workstations. An address typed on the form or "object" is an "attribute" of both the form or "object" and the nurse's workstation. Thus, we do not agree with appellants' argument (Brief, page 7) that Norden-Paul

Appeal No. 96-2242
Application No. 08/083,242

does not "provide the objects with attributes that are relevant to the presentation of the object" (Brief, page 7).

With respect to the claimed "transforming" of the "object into a displayable format in accordance with said attributes," we do not agree with the examiner's unsupported conclusion (Answer, page 5) that the "attributes which are used . . . can be found in Norden-Paul['s] network administration system." Norden-Paul is completely silent as to such a display transformation attribute. We are not aware of any necessity for such a transformation in the Norden-Paul system, and the examiner has not provided any line of reasoning addressing this point. For this reason, we agree with appellants' argument (Brief, page 7) that "Norden-Paul does not teach this, as there is no suggestion of transforming the object before providing the object to a presentation device."

Based upon the foregoing, the obviousness rejection of all of the claims on appeal is reversed because they are all directed to transforming the object into a displayable format in accordance with an attribute.

Appeal No. 96-2242
Application No. 08/083,242

DECISION

The decision of the examiner rejecting claims 1 through
18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is reversed.

REVERSED

JAMES D. THOMAS)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	
)	
)	
)	
)	BOARD OF PATENT
KENNETH W. HAIRSTON)	APPEALS
Administrative Patent Judge)	AND
)	INTERFERENCES
)	
)	
)	
MICHAEL R. FLEMING)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	

Appeal No. 96-2242
Application No. 08/083,242

Geoffrey A. Mantooth
WOFFORD, FAILS, ZOBAL & MANTOOTH
110 West Seventh Street
Suite 500
Fort Worth, TX 76102

JENINE GILLIS

Appeal No. 96-2242
Serial No. 08/083,242

Judge HAIRSTON

Judge THOMAS

Judge FLEMING

Received: 12/12/98

Typed: 12/12/98

DECISION: REVERSED

Send Reference(s): Yes No
or Translation(s)

Panel Change: Yes No

3-Person Conf. Yes No

Remanded: Yes No

Brief or Heard

Group Art Unit: 2772

Index Sheet-2901 Rejection(s):

Acts 2: _____

Palm: _____

Mailed:

Updated Monthly Disk (FOIA): _____

Updated Monthly Report: _____