

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was not written for publication and is not binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 21

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte DANIEL A. BORS, ANN R. HERMES,
JOSEPH M. ROKOWSKI and DAVID G. SPEECE

Appeal No. 1998-3205
Application No. 08/272,438

ON BRIEF

Before WINTERS, ROBINSON and MILLS, Administrative Patent Judges.

WINTERS, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is a decision on appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from the examiner's final rejection of claims 6-10. Claims 1-5 and 11, which are the only other claims remaining in the application, stand withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner as directed to a non-elected invention.

Appeal No. 1998-3205
Application No. 08/272,438

REPRESENTATIVE CLAIM

Claim 6, which is illustrative of the subject matter on appeal, reads as follows:

6. A method for improving the gloss retention on exposure to light of a dried coating formed from a coalescent-free aqueous coating composition comprising forming said coalescent-free coating composition, said composition comprising an aqueous emulsion-polymerized polymeric binder having a glass transition temperature from about -35 °C to about +25 °C, said binder comprising from about 2% to about 20%, by weight based on the weight of said polymeric binder, of at least one copolymerized ethylenically-unsaturated active methylene monomer [emphasis added];
applying said coating composition to a substrate;
drying said coating composition; and
exposing said coating composition to light.

THE REFERENCES

The references relied on by the examiner are:

Bernard	5,278,227	Jan. 11, 1994 (filed October 21, 1992)
Bors et al. (Bors)	5,296,530	Mar. 22, 1994 (filed July 28, 1992)
Smith	3,554,987	Jan. 12, 1971

Appeal No. 1998-3205
Application No. 08/272,438

THE REJECTIONS

Claims 6-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) or (b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Bors, Smith or Bernard.¹

On consideration of the record, we reverse each of these rejections.

DISCUSSION

As stated in In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 708, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1657 (Fed. Cir. 1990), “[r]ejection for anticipation or lack of novelty requires, as the first step in the inquiry, that all the elements of the claimed invention be described in a single reference.” Here, the examiner has not established that Bors describes a “coalescent-free” coating composition as recited in claim 6. Nor has the examiner established that Bors describes a coating composition comprising “an aqueous emulsion-polymerized polymeric binder having a glass transition temperature from about -35°C to about +25°C.”

¹ As the case is briefed before us, the prior art references have been relied on under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) or (b). Smith constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Bernard and Bors do not appear to constitute prior art within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) or 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b). However, these references do appear to constitute prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Appellants have not disputed the examiner’s position that all of the references are prior art to appellants’ invention.

Appeal No. 1998-3205
Application No. 08/272,438

Furthermore, with regard to the § 103 aspect of the rejection, the examiner has not explained how a person of ordinary skill would have been led from “here to there,” i.e., from the composition of Bors to the “coalescent-free” coating composition of appellants comprising “an aqueous emulsion-polymerized polymeric binder having a glass transition temperature from about -35°C to about +25°C.” Therefore, the examiner has failed to establish that Bors constitutes sufficient evidence to support a conclusion of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103. In fact, based on our review of the Bors patent in its entirety, we find that Bors teaches away from a “coalescent-free” coating composition as that term is defined in appellants’ specification, page 4, third full paragraph. Bors states that “useful emulsion polymers will generally have T_g s under 60°C, since these polymers, with sufficient coalescent, will form good quality films at ambient temperatures” (col. 5, lines 59-62). The working examples of Bors disclose coating compositions having relatively high amounts of coalescent.

Likewise, the examiner has not established that Smith describes or suggests appellants’ “coalescent-free” coating composition comprising “an

Appeal No. 1998-3205
Application No. 08/272,438

aqueous emulsion-polymerized polymeric binder having a glass transition temperature from about -35°C to about +25°C.”

We are mindful that when the PTO shows sound basis for believing that the products of the applicant and the prior art are the same, the burden of persuasion shifts and applicant has the burden of showing that they are not. In re Spada, 911 F.2d at 708, 15 USPQ2d at 1658; In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). On this record, however, the examiner has not established a sound basis to justify shifting the burden to appellants to demonstrate that the compositions of Bors or Smith are not the same or substantially the same as that of appellants. It is not enough, as the examiner seems to believe, that the prior art discloses an aqueous emulsion-polymerized polymeric binder containing an amount, by weight, of at least one copolymerized ethylenically-unsaturated active methylene monomer, which embraces the amount recited in appellants' claims. On this record, appellants alone disclose a method for improving the gloss retention on exposure to light of a dried coating formed from a coalescent-free aqueous coating composition containing an

Appeal No. 1998-3205
Application No. 08/272,438

aqueous emulsion-polymerized polymeric binder having a glass transition temperature from about -35°C to about +25°C.

We reverse the examiner's rejection to the extent that it is predicated on Bors or Smith.

Turning now to the Bernard reference, we find that Bernard neither discloses nor suggests a method for improving gloss retention on exposure to light of a dried coating formed from a coalescent-free aqueous coating composition. On the contrary, Bernard is drawn to an entirely different field of endeavor, i.e., providing inherently tacky, emulsion pressure-sensitive adhesive polymers. Furthermore, we agree with appellants that Bernard would not have suggested a polymeric composition comprising a polymer having from about 2% to about 20%, by weight based on the weight of the polymer, of at least one copolymerized ethylenically-unsaturated active methylene monomer as recited in the appealed claims (see Appeal Brief, page 9). Accordingly, Bernard does not constitute sufficient evidence to support a finding of anticipation or a conclusion of obviousness of claims 6-10; we reverse the examiner's rejection to the extent that it is predicated on Bernard.

Appeal No. 1998-3205
Application No. 08/272,438

The examiner's decision rejecting claims 6-10 is reversed.

REVERSED

SHERMAN D. WINTERS)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	
)	
)	
)	BOARD OF PATENT
DOUGLAS W. ROBINSON))	APPEALS AND
Administrative Patent Judge)	
)	INTERFERENCES
)	
DEMETRA J. MILLS)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	

Appeal No. 1998-3205
Application No. 08/272,438

RONALD D. BAKULE
ROHM & HAAS CO.
INDEPENDENCE MALL WEST
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19105

SDW/jlb