

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opinion in support of the decision being entered today (1) was not written for publication in a law journal and (2) is not binding precedent of the Board.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. 16

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

Ex parte CORNELIS C.A.M. VAN ZON  
and FRANCISCUS W. SIJSTERMANS

---

Appeal No. 1998-0733  
Application 08/489,867<sup>1</sup>

---

ON BRIEF

---

Before KRASS, BARRETT, and DIXON, Administrative Patent Judges.

BARRETT, Administrative Patent Judge.

---

<sup>1</sup> Application for patent filed June 13, 1995, entitled "Television Signal Receiver," which claims the foreign filing priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 of European Patent Office Application 94201797.1, filed June 23, 1994.

Appeal No. 1998-0733  
Application 08/489,867

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is a decision on appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from the final rejection of claims 1-8.

We reverse.

BACKGROUND

The disclosed invention is directed to a television signal receiver in which the television signal is digitized and a plurality of processing operations (sync separation, subcarrier regeneration, etc.) are executed on the digital signal by a central processing unit executing stored control programs. This avoids specially developed integrated circuits with fixed processing power and functionality.

Claim 1, the sole independent claim, is reproduced below.

1. A television signal receiver comprising a plurality of processing means for executing respective processing operations on a received television signal, characterized in that each processing operation is laid down in a control program stored in a memory and in that the plurality of processing means is constituted by a single processing unit which consecutively executes selected ones of the control programs in synchronism with the television signal.

The Examiner relies on the following prior art:

Mogi et al. (Mogi)	4,743,968	May 10, 1988
--------------------	-----------	--------------

Appeal No. 1998-0733  
Application 08/489,867

Claims 1-3 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mogi.

Claims 4 and 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Mogi.

We refer to the Final Rejection (Paper No. 12) and the Examiner's Answer (Paper No. 15) (pages referred to as "EA\_\_") for a statement of the Examiner's position and to the Appeal Brief (Paper No. 14) for a statement of Appellants' arguments thereagainst.

#### OPINION

The claims are grouped to stand or fall together.

Mogi includes a plurality of circuits 4-9 that are controlled by a central processing unit (CPU) 1 via two-wire bus 2. Appellants argue that these processing means are constituted by a plurality of processing circuits, each having its own processing power, instead of a single processing unit executing control programs as claimed. Appellants note that special circuits are what the subject invention seeks to avoid.

The Examiner characterizes the circuits 4-9 in Mogi as a plurality of operations that are controlled by the CPU 1 and

Appeal No. 1998-0733  
Application 08/489,867

finds that the operations must be carried out by sequentially executed control programs stored in the CPU ROM 1 (EA4). Accordingly, the Examiner interprets the plurality of processing means to be the circuits 4-9, the CPU, and the control programs.

It is clear that Mogi does not teach Appellants' disclosed invention. In Appellants' invention, the received television signal (comprised of sound signal SND and composite video signal CVBS) is digitized and operations are performed on it in digital signal processor 4 according to operations stored in memory. In Mogi, special purpose integrated circuits 4-9 perform operations on the television signal under control of the CPU 1; the operations are not performed by the CPU. While there is always a possibility that claims, as presented, may be interpreted in such a way as to read in an unintended manner on the prior art, we do not find that to be the case here.

We agree with Appellants' arguments. Claim 1 requires that the processing means that executes respective processing operations on a received television signal be the single processing unit. In Mogi, the processing means that execute

Appeal No. 1998-0733  
Application 08/489,867

processing operations on the television signal are the separate circuits 4-9, not the CPU. The fact that the circuits 4-9 in Mogi are controlled by the CPU does not mean that the CPU performs the processing operations by executing control programs. Hence, Mogi fails to anticipate the limitations of "a plurality of processing means for executing respective processing operations on a received television signal . . . the plurality of processing means is constituted by a single processing unit which

Appeal No. 1998-0733  
Application 08/489,867

consecutively executes selected ones of the control programs"  
in claim 1. The rejections of claims 1-8 are reversed.

REVERSED

ERROL A. KRASS	)	
Administrative	Patent Judge	)
	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	BOARD OF PATENT
LEE E. BARRETT	)	APPEALS
Administrative	Patent Judge	)
	)	AND
	)	INTERFERENCES
	)	
	)	
JOSEPH L. DIXON	)	
Administrative	Patent Judge	)

Appeal No. 1998-0733  
Application 08/489,867

Corporate Patent Counsel  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
580 White Plains Road  
Tarrytown, NY 10591