

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(2) is not binding precedent of the Board.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. 10

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

PETER D. DICKINSON,

Junior Party,¹

v.

RAYMOND HEIDEL
and
RICHARD E. SNIDER,

Senior Party.²

Patent Interference No. 104,188

JUDGMENT

Before METZ, PATE and MARTIN, Administrative Patent Judges.

¹ Application 07/918,964, filed July 24, 1992. Assignee to International Game Technology, A Corp. Of Nevada.

² Patent No. 5,342,047, granted August 30, 1994, based on Application 07/864,959, filed April 8, 1992. Assignee to Touch Screen Video Gaming Machine.

Interference No. 104,188

PATE, Administrative Patent Judge.

Now comes senior party Heidel et al. with a concession of priority with respect to the subject matter of the count in interference. Under 37 CFR § 1.662(a) such a concession is to be treated as a request for entry of adverse judgment. Accordingly, the following judgment is entered.

Judgment

Judgment in Interference No. 104,188 is hereby entered against the senior party, Raymond Heidel and Richard E. Snyder. Raymond Heidel and Richard E. Snyder are not entitled to a patent containing claims 1 through 5 and 8, which claims correspond to the count in interference. Judgment is entered in favor of Peter D. Dickinson, the junior party. Peter D. Dickinson is entitled to a patent containing claim 53, which claim corresponds to the count in interference.

ANDREW H. METZ

)

Interference No. 104,188

	Administrative Patent Judge)	
)	
)	
)	
PATENT	WILLIAM F. PATE, III)	BOARD OF
	Administrative Patent Judge)	APPEALS AND
)	INTERFERENCES
)	
)	
	JOHN C. MARTIN)	
	Administrative Patent Judge)	

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND
Two Embarcadero Center, 8th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834

Michael B. McMurry
JENNER & BLOCK
One IBM Plaza
Chicago, IL 60611

Interference No. 104,188

WFP/cam