

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was **not** written for publication and is **not** binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 18

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

Ex parte KAZUHIKO MAEDA

---

Appeal No. 2001-2194  
Application No. 08/995,722

---

ON BRIEF

---

Before COHEN, ABRAMS, and McQUADE, Administrative Patent Judges.  
COHEN, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is an appeal from the final rejection of claims 1 through 4, 6, 9, 12, and 13. Claims 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, and 15, the only other claims in the application, stand withdrawn; 37 CFR 1.142(b).

Appellant's invention pertains to a docking unit for mounting a portable computer and to a portable electronic apparatus. A basic understanding of the invention can be derived from a reading of exemplary claims 1 and 12, respective copies of

Appeal No. 2001-2194  
Application No. 08/995,722

which appear in the "APPENDIX OF CLAIMS" of the brief (Paper No. 16).

As evidence of anticipation and obviousness, the examiner has applied the documents listed below:

Bliven et al (Bliven)	5,692,400	Dec. 2, 1997 (filed Mar. 25, 1996)
Yanagisawa et al (Yanagisawa)	5,805,412	Sep. 8, 1998 (filed Oct. 31, 1996)

The following rejections are before us for review.

Claims 1 through 3, 12, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bliven.

Claims 4, 6, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bliven in view of Yanagisawa.

The full text of the examiner's rejections and response to the argument presented by appellant appears in the answer (Paper No. 17), while the complete statement of appellant's argument can be found in the brief (Paper No. 16).

Appeal No. 2001-2194  
Application No. 08/995,722

OPINION

In reaching our conclusion on the issues raised in this appeal, this panel of the board has carefully considered appellant's specification and claims, the applied teachings,<sup>1</sup> and the respective viewpoints of appellant and the examiner. As a consequence of our review, we make the determinations which follow.

The anticipation issue

We do not sustain the rejection of claims 1 through 3, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bliven.

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102 is established only when a single prior art reference discloses, either expressly or under

---

<sup>1</sup> In our evaluation of the applied prior art, we have considered all of the disclosure of each document for what it would have fairly taught one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Boe, 355 F.2d 961, 965, 148 USPQ 507, 510 (CCPA 1966). Additionally, this panel of the board has taken into account not only the specific teachings, but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably have been expected to draw from the disclosure. See In re Preda, 401 F.2d 825, 826, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968).

Appeal No. 2001-2194  
Application No. 08/995,722

principles of inherency, each and every element of a claimed invention. See In re Schreiber, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431 (Fed. Cir. 1997); In re Paulsen, 30 F.3d 1475, 1478-79, 31 USPQ2d 1671, 1673 (Fed. Cir. 1994); In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 708, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1657 (Fed. Cir. 1990); and RCA Corp. v. Applied Digital Data Sys., Inc., 730 F.2d 1440, 1444, 221 USPQ 385, 388 (Fed. Cir. 1984). However, the law of anticipation does not require that the reference teach specifically what an appellant has disclosed and is claiming but only that the claims on appeal "read on" something disclosed in the reference, i.e., all limitations of the claim are found in the reference. See Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp., 713 F.2d 760, 772, 218 USPQ 781, 789 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 465 U.S. 1026 (1984).

Claims 1 through 3 set forth a docking unit for mounting a portable computer comprising, inter alia, a first locking portion and a second locking portion provided on the outer wall of a main body (claim 1) or a first kensington slot and a second kensington slot provided on the outer wall of a main body (claims 2 and 3). Claims 12 and 13 are drawn to a portable electronic apparatus comprising, inter alia, a first locking portion and a second locking portion provided on the outer wall of a main body (claim

Appeal No. 2001-2194  
Application No. 08/995,722

12) or a first kensington slot and a second kensington slot provided on the outer wall of a main body (claim 13).

In concluding that claims 1 through 3, 12, and 13 are anticipated by the Bliven patent, the examiner makes reference therein to a first locking portion or kensington slot 62 and a second locking portion or kensington slot 70 (answer, page 4). However, we find that Bliven teaches an opening 62 in the body 43 of the docking system 40 which is not a locking portion or kensington slot, as now claimed. As we see it, Blevin teaches one kensington lock receptacle or slot 70 in the docking system body 43 (Fig. 5), and one lock receptacle 42 in the computer 41 (Figs. 5 and 8). Since Blevin does not teach first and second locking portions or kensington slots on the outer wall of a docking unit body, the claims at issue are not anticipated thereby. It is for this reason that we cannot sustain the examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Appeal No. 2001-2194  
Application No. 08/995,722

The obviousness issue

We do not sustain the rejection of claims 4, 6, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bliven in view of Yanagisawa.

Like the claims described above, independent claims 4, 6, and 9 also require the feature of first and second kensington slots on the outer wall of a main body (claims 4 and 9) and first and second locking portions on the outer wall of a main body (claim 6), but in conjunction with a PC card slot feature.

We incorporate herein our analysis of the Blevin patent, supra. As to the patent to Yanagisawa, it addresses a docking station wherein operation of a security key 213 (Fig. 4) controls a hook 215 that can inhibit the removal of a notebook computer 100; further, key operation can also inhibit the removal of a PC card from a card slot 331 (column 10, line 32 to column 11, line 9). Collectively considering the applied prior art teachings, we conclude that the teaching of the Yanagisawa reference does not overcome the earlier stated deficiency of the Blevin patent, and with the Blevin disclosure would not have rendered obvious the

Appeal No. 2001-2194  
Application No. 08/995,722

content of appellant's claims 4, 6, and 9. Thus, we cannot sustain the rejection of appellant's claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In summary, this panel of the board has not sustained the rejections on appeal.

The decision of the examiner is reversed.

REVERSED

IRWIN CHARLES COHEN	)	
Administrative Patent Judge	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	BOARD OF PATENT
NEAL E. ABRAMS	)	APPEALS
Administrative Patent Judge	)	AND
	)	INTERFERENCES
	)	
	)	
JOHN P. McQUADE	)	
Administrative Patent Judge	)	

Appeal No. 2001-2194  
Application No. 08/995,722

ICC:pgg  
DOUGLAS W. CAMERON  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
IBM CORPORATION  
P.O. BOX 218  
YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NY 10598