



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/952,138	09/14/2001	Nicholas J. Pappas	700704.0001	4121

21832 7590 06/30/2003
CUMMINGS AND LOCKWOOD
GRANITE SQUARE
700 STATE STREET
P O BOX 1960
NEW HAVEN, CT 06509-1960

EXAMINER


LIANG, REGINA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2674

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/952,138	PAPPAS, NICHOLAS J. 	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Regina Liang	2674	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>3,6</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 12, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification merely discloses "decorative and/or distinctive aesthetic features may be advantageously incorporated into the design and/or fabrication of the laptop stand" (page 25, lines 11-13, page 26, lines 13-14). The specification does not disclose at least one of the keyboard unit, the ancillary computer system and the display screen includes a decorative treatment as is now claimed in claims 12, 16.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 13, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kikinis et al (US. PAT. NO. 5,708,840 hereinafter Kikinis).

As to claim 13, Figs. 5 and 41 of Kikinis discloses a computer system comprising a first processing unit (keyboard unit) positioned within a first system base, a second processing unit (μ PDA) positioned within a second system base, a display screen (104 or 1407) for displaying computer-generated images, the display screen pivotally and rotatably mounted with respect to the keyboard unit (see Figs. 5 and 41, and col. 30, lines 36-40), and the display screen communicating with a port for selectively receiving informational transmissions from the keyboard unit and the μ PDA (col. 10, line 13 to col. 11, line 47 for example).

As to claim 17, Kikinis teaches the keyboard unit and the display screen define a laptop computer, and the μ PDA define an ancillary computer system and is selected from a personal digital assistant, a palmtop computer, a hand-held computer or a pocket computer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 1-3, 8, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis.

As to claim 1, Figs. 5 and 41 of Kikinis teaches the port (105) positioned proximate the side wall of the keyboard base. Kikinis differs from the claim in that the port is not positioned

proximate the front wall of the keyboard base. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kikinis to position the port proximate the front wall of the keyboard base, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70.

As to claim 2, Kikinis teaches a central processing unit mounted within the keyboard unit (col. 30, lines 49-50).

As to claim 3, Kikinis teaches the display screen is a flat screen unit.

As to claim 8, Kikinis teaches the ancillary computer system (μ PDA) is selected from a group consisting of a personal digital assistant, a palmtop computer, a hand-held computer and a pocket computer.

As to claim 9, it is inherent the laptop computer of Kikinis having at least one stop for limiting rotational motion of the display screen relative to the keyboard base such that the laptop computer is opened as shown in Figs. 5 and 41.

7. Claims 4, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis in view of Lee et al (US. PAT. NO. 6,317,315 hereinafter Lee).

As to claims 4, 14, Kikinis does not disclose the mounting assembly detachably joins the display screen to the keyboard base. However, Fig. 1 of Lee teaches the notebook computer including a keyboard base (1) and a display screen (2) mounted detachably on the keyboard base. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the mounting assembly of Kikinis to detachably joins the display screen to

the keyboard base as taught by Lee thus allowing the user to either attach or remove the display unit to or from the keyboard unit.

As to claims 5 and 15, Fig. 3 of Lee teaches the computer system comprising a stand, wherein the display screen is detachable from the keyboard base and pivotally mountable in the stand.

8. Claims 6, 10, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis in view Nobuchi (US. PAT. NO. 5,873,554).

As to claim 6, Kikinis does not disclose the mounting assembly permits angular motion of the display screen relative to the keyboard base of at least 180° . However, Figs. 1 and 7 Nobuchi teach a laptop computer comprising a mounting assembly (rotary shaft member 8) permits angular motion of the display screen relative to the keyboard base of at least 180° (col. 8, lines 65-67). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the mounting assembly of Kikinis to permits rotation of the display screen relative to the keyboard base of at least 180° as taught by Nobuchi such that the display screen can be turned over to present the information displayed on the display to those other than the operator.

As to claim 10, 11, Fig. 1, 3, 4, 6, and 9 of Nobuchi teaches the mounting assembly includes a turret (8) as claimed.

9. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis and Nobuchi as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Kim.

Kikinis as modified by Nobuchi does not disclose the mounting assembly includes a spring-loaded alignment elements mounted in the keyboard base. However, Kim teaches the mounting assembly includes a spring-loaded alignment elements (26, 28 in fig. 1) mounted in the keyboard base. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the mounting assembly of Kikinis as modified by Nobuchi to have a spring-loaded alignment elements as taught by Kim so as to provide elastically supported by the spring member for the mounting assembly.

10. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis in view of Honda (US. PAT. NO. 6,392,873).

Kikinis does not disclose at least one of the keyboard unit, the ancillary computer system and the display screen includes a decorative treatment. However, Honda teaches a computer system having decorative strips provided on the sides of the display screen housing (col. 9, line 41 to col. 10, line 10). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kikinis's computer system to have a decorative treatment since the decorative strips serve as accent color, accentuating the shape of the sides of screen housing so as to enhance the overall appearance of the computer system components.

11. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis and Lee as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Honda.

Kikinis as modified by Lee does not disclose at least one of the keyboard unit, the ancillary computer system and the display screen includes a decorative treatment. However,

Honda teaches a computer system having decorative strips provided on the sides of the display screen housing (col. 9, line 41 to col. 10, line 10). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer system Kikinis as modified by Lee to have a decorative treatment since the decorative strips serve as accent color, accentuating the shape of the sides of screen housing so as to enhance the overall appearance of the computer system components.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Flack et al (US. PUB. NO. 2002/0024506) in Fig. 13 teaches a hand held computer in conjunction with a laptop and desktop computer.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Regina Liang whose telephone number is (703) 305-4719. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe, can be reached on (703) 305-4709.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:


Application/Control Number: 09/952,138
Art Unit: 2674

Page 8

(703) 872-9314, (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.


REGINA LIANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2674

RL

Notice of References Cited	Application/Control No. 09/952,138	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination PAPPAS, NICHOLAS J.	
	Examiner Regina Liang	Art Unit 2674	Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
	A	US-5,708,840	01-1998	Kikinis et al.	708/105
	B	US-6,317,315	11-2001	Lee et al.	361/681
	C	US-6,392,873	05-2002	Honda, Masami	361/681
	D	US-2002/0024506	02-2002	Flack et al.	345/169
	E	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.