

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. 13

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

**Ex parte** TOM L. SORENSEN

---

Appeal No. 1999-0299  
Application No. 08/353,413

---

ON BRIEF

---

Before BARRETT, RUGGIERO, and DIXON, **Administrative Patent Judges**.  
DIXON, **Administrative Patent Judge**.

**DECISION ON APPEAL**

This is a decision on appeal from the examiner's final rejection of claims 1-4, which are all of the claims pending in this application.

We REVERSE.

## BACKGROUND

The appellant's invention relates to a vertically configured video projection system. The system orients the video projectors 90 degrees from the conventional projectors and reorients the video signals to compensate for the rotation so that the projectors may be mounted in a cabinet along a wall. An understanding of the invention can be derived from a reading of exemplary claim 1, which is reproduced below.

1. A video projection system comprising:  
a housing;  
a video chassis in said housing;  
three video projection CRTs in said housing;  
means on said video chassis for developing deflection signals for each of said CRTs;  
individual yokes mounted on the necks of said CRTs; and  
means supporting said housing with said CRTs vertically aligned, said yokes being positioned on said necks such that an offset horizontal display is produced on a projection surface positioned forwardly of said vertically aligned CRTs.

The prior art reference of record relied upon by the examiner in rejecting the appealed claims is:

Kline

4,352,124

Sep. 28, 1982

Appeal No. 1999-0299  
Application No. 08/353,413

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kline.

Rather than reiterate the conflicting viewpoints advanced by the examiner and the appellant regarding the above-noted rejections, we make reference to the examiner's answer (Paper No. 10, mailed Oct. 17, 1996) and the supplemental examiner's answer (Paper No. 12, mailed Feb. 4, 1997) for the examiner's complete reasoning in support of the rejections, and to the appellant's brief (Paper No. 9, filed Aug. 6, 1996) and reply brief (Paper No. 11, filed Nov. 15, 1996) for the appellant's arguments thereagainst.

### **OPINION**

In reaching our decision in this appeal, we have given careful consideration to the appellant's specification and claims, to the applied prior art reference, and to the respective positions articulated by the appellant and the examiner. As a consequence of our review, we make the determinations which follow.

From our review of the Kline reference, we agree with appellant that Kline alone does not teach or suggest the vertical alignment and horizontal offset of the individual

Appeal No. 1999-0299  
Application No. 08/353,413

projectors as recited in the language of claim 1. We find that the examiner's reliance upon columns 8 and 10 of Kline is in error and that the "off axis mode" does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Rather, this merely teaches the horizontal placement of the projectors on opposite sides of the middle projector for symmetry and projecting from the ceiling to the flat screen. Due to the examiner's reliance on Kline to teach or suggest the vertical alignment of the projectors, the examiner has not provided evidence or a separate line of reasoning for such a configuration. Since no line of reasoning is established by the examiner and the prior art does not provide such a motivation, the examiner has not established a **prima facie** case of obviousness, and we cannot sustain the rejection of claims 1-4.

Appeal No. 1999-0299  
Application No. 08/353,413

**CONCLUSION**

To summarize, the decision of the examiner to reject claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §  
103 is reversed.

REVERSED

LEE E. BARRETT	)	
Administrative Patent Judge	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
JOSEPH F. RUGGIERO	)	BOARD OF PATENT
Administrative Patent Judge	)	APPEALS AND
	)	INTERFERENCES
	)	
	)	
	)	
JOSEPH L. DIXON	)	
Administrative Patent Judge	)	

JLD:clm

Appeal No. 1999-0299  
Application No. 08/353,413

Patent Department  
Zenith Electronics Corp.  
1000 Milwaukee Ave.  
Glenview , IL 60025