

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

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte GEOFREY S. STRONGIN,
BRIAN C. BARNES, AND RODNEY SCHMIDT

Appeal 2007-1773
Application 10/107,776
Technology Center 2100

Decided: July 27, 2007

Before KENNETH W. HAIRSTON, HOWARD B. BLANKENSHIP,
and JAY P. LUCAS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.
HAIRSTON, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL
STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from the final rejection of claims 29, 30, 32, 36, 37, and 39 to 51. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

Anderson is not concerned with “detecting a rejection, performing the authorization analysis based on the identity of the issuing device, and configuring the subject device to accept the retried memory access request” (Br. 9).

We hereby reverse the rejection of record.

ISSUE

Does Anderson at least teach determining if an additional device is authorized to access a subject device based on the identity of the additional device?

FINDINGS OF FACT

Anderson teaches a system in which an access monitor 28 monitors address signals from a CPU 10. The address signals from the CPU 10 are for a subject device that the CPU seeks access to via the access monitor 28 (col. 7, ll. 43 to 47; col. 8, ll. 3 to 8). The address of the subject device is decoded by the access monitor 28, and the access monitor uses the decoded address to obtain from an associated tag memory the unique tag allocated to that address (col. 7, ll. 47 to 49; col. 8, ll. 8 to 10). The unique tag is used to open a gate associated with the subject device (col. 7, ll. 49 to 53; col. 8, ll. 11 to 16).

PRINCIPLE OF LAW

Anticipation is established when a single prior art reference discloses expressly or under the principles of inherency each and every limitation of

Appeal 2007-1773
Application 10/107,776

the claimed invention. *Atlas Powder Co. v. IRECO, Inc.*, 190 F.3d 1342, 1347, 51 USPQ2d 1943, 1946 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475, 1478-79, 31 USPQ2d 1671, 1673 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

ANALYSIS

As indicated *supra*, the access monitor 28 in Anderson determines if the CPU 10 is authorized to access a subject device based on the address signal of a subject device issued by the CPU. The identity of the CPU is not used to determine access to the subject device.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

Anticipation has not been established by the Examiner for claims 29, 30, 32, 36, 37, and 39 to 51 because Anderson does not use the identity of the CPU to determine access to the subject device.

DECISION

The anticipation rejection of claims 29, 30, 32, 36, 37, and 39 to 51 is reversed.

REVERSED

KIS

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON
10333 RICHMOND, SUITE 1100
HOUSTON, TX 77042