

1 The opinion in support of the decision being entered today is *not* binding
2 precedent of the Board

3
4 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

5
6
7 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
8 AND INTERFERENCES

9
10
11 *Ex parte* RODGER WILLIAMS and KENNETH H. GENTRY, JR.

12
13
14 Appeal 2007-0764
15 Application 09/840,469
16 Technology Center 3600

17
18
19 Decided: July 26, 2007

20
21
22 *Before:* TERRY J. OWENS, MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD and HUBERT C.
23 LORIN, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

24
25 CRAWFORD, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

26
27
28 DECISION ON APPEAL

29
30 STATEMENT OF CASE

31 Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) from a final rejection
32 of claims 1, 4 to 9, 11 to 21, and 28 to 33. Claims 2 and 3 have been
33 withdrawn from consideration and claims 10 and 22 to 27 have been
34 canceled. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

1 Appellants invented a system for providing a multiple browser
2 interface which includes a display controller that runs the browser
3 applications for each of a plurality of browsers. (Specification p. 2.)

4 Claim 1 under appeal reads as follows:

- 5 1. A system for providing a multiple browser interface
6 comprising:
7 a) a plurality of displays with associated input devices;
8 and
9 b) a display controller associated with said plurality of
10 displays, said display controller comprising:
11 i) communication electronics for communicating
12 with a server running a control application; and
13 ii) a control system associated with said
14 communication electronics and adapted to:
15 1) run browser applications for each of said
16 plurality of displays;
17 2) receive input from each of said associated
18 input devices and provide the input to the control
19 application; and
20 3) receive instructions for said browser
21 application from the control application; and
22 wherein said display controller is further assigned
23 one Internet Protocol (IP) address and each of the
24 browser applications is assigned a unique port
25 associated with the IP address.
26

27 The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4 to 9, 11 to 21 and 28 to 33 under 35
28 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Coppola in view of Devine and
29 Kohut.
30

1 The prior art relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims on
2 appeal is:

3

Kohut	US 6,338,008 B1	Jan. 8, 2002
Coppola	US 6,360,138 B1	Mar. 19, 2002
Devine	US 6,763,376 B1	Jul. 13, 2004

4

5 The Examiner reasons that Coppola discloses the invention as
6 claimed, except that Coppola does not disclose an integrated customer
7 interface system with a single display controller running a plurality of
8 displays. The Examiner relies on Devine for teaching a single display
9 controller for running a plurality of displays. The Examiner finds that the
10 Frame NAT (Network Address Translator)/Router depicted in Figure 2 of
11 Devine is a display controller running a plurality of displays.

12

13 Appellants contend that Devine does not disclose or suggest a display
14 controller which runs browser applications for each of a plurality of displays
15 and which has an assigned Internet Protocol (IP) address with each of the
16 browser applications having a unique port associated with the IP address.

17

18

ISSUES

19

20

21

22

23

Have Appellants shown that the Examiner erred in finding that Devine discloses a display controller which runs browser applications for each of a plurality of displays and which has an assigned IP address with each of the browser applications having a unique port associated with the IP address?

1 FINDINGS OF FACT

2 Appellants invented a system for providing a multiple browser
3 interface that includes a display controller which runs the browser
4 applications for respective browser displays (Specification p. 7). The
5 display controller ensures that requests for web content are associated with
6 the proper browser display and directs web content to the proper browser
7 display upon receipt from the server (Specification p. 7). The display
8 controller is able to recognize user input from each browser display and
9 determine the particular browser display from which the input came
10 (Specification p. 11). The display controller has a unique IP address and
11 each of the browser applications has a port within the display controller IP
12 address (Specification p. 14).

13 Devine discloses an integrated customer interface system for
14 communications network management which includes a Frame NAT/Router
15 that connects the customer to the public Internet or the Starbucks web server
16 (col. 8, ll. 39 to 48). Devine does not disclose that the Frame NAT/Router is
17 a display controller that runs browser applications. In addition, Devine does
18 not disclose that the Frame NAT/Router has an assigned IP address or that
19 each of the browser applications has a unique port associated with the IP
20 address.

21
22 DISCUSSION

23 The Examiner has a duty of supplying a factual basis for an
24 obviousness rejection. *In re Warner*, 379 F.2d 1011, 1017, 154 USPQ 173,
25 178 (CCPA 1967). The Examiner's conclusion of obviousness in this case

1 lacks factual support for the determination that Devine discloses a display
2 controller that runs browser applications and has an IP address with each of
3 the browser applications having a unique port associated with the IP address.
4 Devine discloses only that the NAT/Router connects the customer to the
5 public Internet or the Starbucks server. In addition, the IP address of the
6 NAT/Router and the relationship to the associated browsers is not disclosed.
7 The foregoing flaw in the Examiner's evidentiary showing finds no cure in
8 the Kohut reference. Accordingly, we shall not sustain the rejection of claim
9 1 and claims 4 to 9, 11 and 12 dependent thereon. Independent claims 13,
10 14, and 20 contain language similar to claim 1 in regard to the display
11 controller. These claims recite a display controller or multiple browser
12 controller which runs browser applications and has a unique IP address. The
13 claims also require that the browser applications have ports associated with
14 the IP address. Therefore, we will not sustain the rejection as to claims 13,
15 14, and 20 and claims 15 to 19, 21, and 28 to 33 dependent thereon.

1 DECISION

2 The decision of the Examiner is reversed.

3

4 REVERSED

5

6

7 jlb

8

9 Withrow & Terranova, P.L.L.C.

10 100 Regency Forest Drive

11 Suite 160

12 Cary, NC 27518