

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was not written for publication and is not binding precedent of the Board.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

---

Appeal No. 2006-1764  
Application No. 10/177,965

---

ON BRIEF

---

Before HAIRSTON, RUGGIERO, and SAADAT, Administrative Patent Judges.

HAIRSTON, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is an appeal from the final rejection of claims 1 through 20.

The disclosed invention relates to a method and system for providing at least a portion of the service history of a processor-based device.

Claim 11 is illustrative of the claimed invention, and it reads as follows:

11. A method for providing at least a portion of the service history of a processor-based device, said method comprising:

receiving information at said processor-based device relating to at least a portion of the service history of said processor-based device;

automatically entering the received information into a data structure; and  
providing from said processor-based device at least one web-based page, said at  
least one web-based page comprising at least a portion of the information entered in said  
data structure.

The references relied on by the examiner are:

Tanaka et al. (Tanaka)	5,986,835	Nov. 16, 1999
Cogger et al. (Cogger)	6,032,184	Feb. 29, 2000
Barford et al. (Barford)	6,587,960	July 1, 2003 (filed Jan. 11, 2000)

Claims 1, 5 through 11, 13 through 16 and 18 through 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cogger.

Claims 2, 3 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cogger in view of Tanaka.

Claims 4 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cogger in view of Barford.

Reference is made to the briefs 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 sustain the anticipation rejection of claims 1, 5 through 11, 13 through 16 and 18 through 20, and sustain the obviousness rejection of claims 2 through 4, 12 and 17.

We agree with the examiner's findings (answer, pages 1, 2, 5 through 7 and 9 through 14) that the limitations of independent claims 1, 11 and 16 read directly on the teachings of Cogger. A trouble ticket is opened in Cogger for service problems with the

processor-based<sup>1</sup> customer workstation 10, and the service history of the processor-based device is received at the processor-based device as a historical record associated with the trouble ticket (column 4, lines 3 through 8 and 27 through 34; column 14, line 63 through column 15, line 2; column 17, lines 17 through 20). The software services resident on the processor-based device permit the maintenance of the trouble ticket and the historical record (column 5, line 59 through column 6, line 4). Any processor-based device service data automatically entered into the fields of the trouble ticket is a data structure of the service history of the processor-based device (column 13, lines 34 through 41). We additionally agree with the examiner's finding (answer, pages 10 and 11) that the processor-based customer workstation provides a web-based page, and that the web-based page comprises at least a portion of the information entered in the data structure (column 7, lines 4 through 30). The claims on appeal do not preclude other system structure (e.g., the web servers 24) (Figure 1) from assisting in the creation of the web-based page<sup>2</sup> at the processor-based customer workstation (brief, pages 7 through 9; reply brief, page 7). Thus, the anticipation rejection of claims 1, 11 and 16 is sustained.

The anticipation rejection of claims 5, 6 and 13 is sustained because we agree with the examiner's finding (answer, page 4) that the software that provides the web-based page at the processor-based customer workstation 10 makes the web-based page accessible to the customer service platform 20a at a remote location (Figure 4).

---

<sup>1</sup> In appellant's disclosure, the processor-based device is either the computer 102 or the storage device 104 (Figure 1; paragraphs 0020, 0030, 0031, 0039, 0058).

<sup>2</sup> Appellant's disclosure states that the web-based page is created by either an embedded web server or by a remotely accessed web server (paragraphs 0033, 0039, 0047, 0055, 0058, 0092).

The anticipation rejection of claims 7 through 10 is sustained because appellant has not provided any patentability arguments for these claims apart from those presented for claim 1.

The anticipation rejection of claims 14 and 15 is sustained because appellant has not presented any patentability arguments for these claims apart from those presented for claim 11.

The anticipation rejection of claims 18 through 20 is sustained because appellant has not presented any patentability arguments for these claims apart from those presented for claim 16.

The obviousness rejection of claim 2 is sustained because appellant has not presented any patentability arguments for this claim apart from those presented for claim 1.

The obviousness rejection of claim 3 is sustained because appellant's argument (brief, pages 15 and 16) that the library apparatus in Tanaka lacks "code for providing the web-based page(s)" is without merit. As indicated supra, the examiner relied on Cogger for such a teaching.

The obviousness rejection of claims 4 and 17 is sustained because we agree with the examiner's finding (answer, page 9) that it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to use a remote management card as taught by Barford in Cogger for the advantage of "remotely testing the system and storing test log data." Appellant's argument (brief, page 17) that "*Barford* fails to teach or suggest that its remote management card comprises 'computer-executable code comprising: code for receiving information ... code for entering the receiving information into a data structure; and code

for providing at least one web-based page....” is without merit because the examiner relied on Cogger for such teachings.

The obviousness rejection of claim 12 is sustained because appellant has not presented any patentability arguments for this claim apart from those presented for claim 11.

DECISION

The decision of the examiner rejecting claims 1, 5 through 11, 13 through 16 and 18 through 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is affirmed, and the decision of the examiner rejecting claims 2 through 4, 12 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is affirmed.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 CFR § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

AFFIRMED

Kenneth W. Hairston )  
Administrative Patent Judge )  
Joseph F. Ruggiero ) BOARD OF PATENT  
Administrative Patent Judge ) APPEALS  
Mahshid D. Saadat ) AND  
Administrative Patent Judge ) INTERFERENCES

KWH/tdl

Appeal No. 2006-1764  
Application No. 10/177,965

Hewlett-Packard Company  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400