

THIS OPINION WAS NOT WRITTEN FOR PUBLICATION

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today (1) was not written for publication in a law journal and (2) is not binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 22

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

Ex parte JOHN D. LA LONDE,  
CRAIG A. MAC DONNELL,  
and DAVID CUCUZELLA

---

Appeal No. 97-0055  
Application 08/430,111<sup>1</sup>

---

ON BRIEF

---

Before HAIRSTON, FLEMING and GROSS, Administrative Patent Judges.

HAIRSTON, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is an appeal from the final rejection of claims 22 through 40.

The disclosed invention relates to a computerized method of producing instructions for

---

<sup>1</sup> Application for patent filed April 27, 1995. According to appellants, this application is a continuation of Application 08/179,639, filed January 10, 1994.

assembling a product that has components.

Claim 31 is illustrative of the claimed invention, and it read as follows:

31. A method, performed by a computer, for assembling a product having components, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) providing one or more abstract assembly steps for assembling the product, the abstract assembly steps containing variable portions for assembling the product with potentially different configurations, the variable portions including variable parameters capable of representing different component information;

(b) obtaining a configuration model corresponding to a requested configuration of the product, the configuration model including one or more of the component information lines corresponding to one or more components utilized in the requested configuration; and

(c) applying the configuration model to the abstract assembly steps provided for assembling the product by inserting component information from the component information lines into the variable parameters of the variable portions of the abstract assembly steps to produce one or more assembly instructions for assembling the product to have the requested configuration.

The reference relied on by the examiner is:

Sakamoto et al. (Sakamoto)	5,341,304	Aug. 23, 1994
		(effective filing date Apr. 23, 1991)

Claims 22 through 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sakamoto.

Claims 22 through 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sakamoto.

Reference is made to the brief and the answer for the respective positions of the appellants and

the examiner.

### OPINION

All of the rejections are reversed.

The examiner's rationale (Answer, pages 3 and 4) for making the two rejections is as follows:

As per method claims 22 and 31, the appellant's [sic] step of providing is taught by Sakamoto's production process administration system. Within Sakamoto's system a plurality of correction stations are provided with CRT display devices to correct automobiles being assembled and manufactured. The appellant's [sic] use of text information and computer graphics images is taught by Sakamoto's disclosure of figure 5 which shows a graphical image and a textual message area. Note that the correction controller 70 displays the correction operations to be performed (see column 18). The appellant's [sic] machine readable instructions for the computer to display images how to assemble the components is taught by Sakamoto's disclosure of finding imperfections in the automobile and displaying them as shown in figure 5. The appellant's [sic] obtaining step is taught by the reference data employed in the system of Sakamoto. Defects are detected by the system which are not within proper guidelines and need to be corrected. The appellant's [sic] applying step is taught by the use [sic] Sakamoto reference in the manual correction of assembly errors found by the system in manual correction of the errors. The appellant's [sic] limitation that variable parameters are capable of representing different component information is taught by Sakamoto's disclosure of displaying the type of part depending upon the type of automobile being manufactured and the type of defect (see figure 5 and column 9 line 45-column 10 line 8).

We agree with the examiner that Sakamoto's production process administration system is devoted to "finding imperfections in the automobile and displaying them as shown in figure 5." We also agree with the examiner that in Sakamoto "a plurality of correction stations are provided with CRT display devices to correct automobiles being assembled and manufactured." We can not take issue

with the examiner's conclusions that Sakamoto's "figure 5 . . . shows a graphical image and a textual message area," the correction controller 70 "displays the correction operations to be performed," "reference data [is] employed in the system of Sakamoto," "[d]efects are detected by the system which are not within proper guidelines and need to be corrected," and Sakamoto displays "the type of part depending upon the type of automobile being manufactured and the type of defect." On the other hand, we fail to see the relevance of such teachings in Sakamoto to the claimed method of applying a configuration model of a product to variable parameters of abstract assembly steps for assembling the product to thereby produce one or more assembly instructions for assembling the product based upon the component information that was inserted into the abstract assembly steps. According to the appellants (Brief, page 18), "[s]uch [assembly] instructions are created automatically by the computer by resolving the abstract assembly steps based on the configuration model." Nothing of the sort is taught by or would have been suggested by Sakamoto. In summary, we agree with appellants (Brief, page 18) that "claims 22-40 are both novel and nonobvious over Sakamoto."

Appeal No. 97-0055  
Application 08/430,111

DECISION

The decision of the examiner rejecting claims 22 through 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and claims 22 through 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is reversed.

REVERSED

KENNETH W. HAIRSTON )  
Administrative Patent Judge )  
)  
)  
)  
) BOARD OF PATENT  
MICHAEL R. FLEMING ) APPEALS  
Administrative Patent Judge ) AND  
) INTERFERENCES  
)  
)  
)  
ANITA PELLMAN GROSS )  
Administrative Patent Judge )

Appeal No. 97-0055  
Application 08/430,111

VINCENT B. INGRASSIA  
MOTOROLA INC.  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
P.O. BOX 10219  
SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85271-0219

KWH/dal