The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was not written for publication and is not binding precedent of the Board.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte WINSLOW S. BURLESON

Appeal No. 2006-0947
Application No. 09/732,741

ON BRIEF

Before HAIRSTON, KRASS, and MACDONALD, Administrative Patent Judges.

HAIRSTON, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is an appeal from the final rejection of claims 1 through 7, 13 through 18 and 24 through 29.

The disclosed invention relates to a system and method for creating associated commentary for a public bookmark Web page. The associated commentary includes different comments for different groups that will be reviewing the public bookmark Web page.

Claim 1 is illustrative of the claimed invention, and it reads as follows:

1. A system for creating bookmarks of pages found within a network, said pages being displayed on a browser, said system comprising:

a graphic user interface comprising at least one button adapted to automatically add a bookmark address of a page being currently displayed on said browser and associated commentary to a public bookmark Web page, wherein said associated commentary includes different comments for different groups that will be reviewing said public bookmark Web page; and

an automatic page creator adapted to create said public bookmark Web page.

The reference relied on by the examiner is:

Adar et al. (Adar)	6,493,702	Dec. 10, 2002 (filed May 5, 1999)

Claims 1 through 7, 13 through 18 and 24 through 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Adar.

Reference is made to the brief and the answer for the respective positions of the appellant and the examiner.

OPINION

We have carefully considered the entire record before us, and we will reverse the anticipation rejection of claims 1 through 7, 13 through 18 and 24 through 29.

The examiner is of the opinion (answer, page 3) that “Adar discloses that the associated commentary includes different comments for different groups that will be reviewing the public

bookmark web page (column 13, lines 31-65)." As an example, the examiner indicates (answer, page 6) that "a bookmark category of 'Java' is related to the group having an interest in Java programming language group."

The appellant argues (brief, page 8) that:

> [N]one of the drawings or any of the text of Adar reveals the ability to include different comments directed to different groups for each of the bookmarks. It is appellant's position that Adar does not actually provide a comments section, but merely allows the bookmarks to include titles. Further, even if the 'title' section in Adar could be interpreted as a 'commentary' section, Adar does not allow different groups to review different comments with respect to the bookmarks. Instead, all groups viewing a user's public bookmark page (using the system in Adar) will all see the same title, regardless of which group member is viewing the bookmark.

We agree with appellant's argument. All of the groups viewing the bookmark "Java" will only see "Java." Thus, the anticipation rejection of claims 1 through 7, 13 through 18 and 24 through 29 is reversed because Adar does not disclose "different comments for different groups" as required by all of the claims on appeal.

DECISION

The decision of the examiner rejecting claims 1 through 7, 13 through 18 and 24 through 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is reversed.

REVERSED

KENNETH W. HAIRSTON Administrative Patent Judge	)	
ERROL A. KRASS Administrative Patent Judge	)	BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES
ALLEN R. MACDONALD Administrative Patent Judge	)	

KWH/kis

FREDERICK W. GIBB, III
GIBB INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW FIRM, L.L.C.
2568-A RIVA ROAD
SUITE 304
ANNAPOLIS, MD
21401