

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(2) is not binding precedent of the Board.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte MANUEL DEBOND,
R. MICHAEL MOLLOY,
RAMAKRISHNAN NAGARAJAN
and AMELIA A. SCHABEL

Appeal No. 1996-2182
Application 08/171,256¹

ON BRIEF

Before WINTERS and WILLIAM F. SMITH, Administrative Patent Judges, and
MCKELVEY, Senior Administrative Patent Judge.

WILLIAM F. SMITH, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is an appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from the final rejection of claims 2 through 14 and 16, all the claims pending in the application. Upon consideration of the record, we hold that the information contained in the supporting specification of this application and

¹ Application for patent filed December 21, 1993. According to applicants, this application is a continuation of applications 07/996,373, filed December 23, 1992; 07/763,474, filed September 20, 1991; 07/630,376, filed December 18, 1990; and application 07/259,678, filed October 19, 1988 (all abandoned).

Appeal No. 1996-2182
Application 08/171,256

the prior art would enable one skilled in the art to make and use the claimed invention.
Accordingly, we reverse the rejection of claims 2 through 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §
112, first paragraph (enablement).

The decision of the examiner is reversed.

REVERSED

Sherman D. Winters)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	
))	
))	
William F. Smith)	BOARD OF PATENT
Administrative Patent Judge)	APPEALS AND
))	INTERFERENCES
))	
))	
Fred E. McKelvey)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	

WFS/cam

Appeal No. 1996-2182
Application 08/171,256

Eli Lilly & Company
Patent Division/TGP
Lilly Corporate Center
Indianapolis, IN 46285