



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Table with 5 columns: APPLICATION NO., FILING DATE, FIRST NAMED INVENTOR, ATTORNEY DOCKET NO., CONFIRMATION NO. Includes details for application 11/521,819 filed 09/15/2006 by Ming Laura Xu, attorney docket 8190 / Z-04691, confirmation 1436. Also includes examiner ALIE, GHASSEM, art unit 3724, and notification date 02/14/2013 via electronic mode.

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

centraldoCKET.im@pg.com
mayer.jk@pg.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte MING LAURA XU

Appeal 2010-005368
Application 11/521,819
Technology Center 3700

Before: LINDA E. HORNER, JOHN W. MORRISON, and
HYUN J. JUNG, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MORRISON, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF CASE

Appellant appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from a rejection of claims 1-6. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We reverse.

The claims are directed to blade supports for use in shaving systems. Spec. 1:3. Claim 1, reproduced below, is the sole independent claim and is representative of the claimed subject matter:

1. A supported blade for use in a shaving system, the supported blade comprising:
 - a blade having a sharpened edge and a planar portion; and
 - a blade support having an upper surface and a lower surface, the planar portion of the blade being mounted to a surface of the upper surface of the blade support, and the blade support having a coating on a portion of an outer surface of the blade support wherein said coating consists essentially of aluminum.

REFERENCES

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

Yamada	US 5,857,260	Jan. 12, 1999
Skrobis	US 2005/0268470 A1	Dec. 8, 2005
Van Eibergen Santhagens	US 2007/0124939 A1	Jun. 7, 2007

REJECTIONS

The Examiner made the following rejections:

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Skrobis, Van Eibergen Santhagens (hereafter “Santhagens”), and Yamada.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Santhagens and Yamada.

ANALYSIS

Obviousness over Skrobis, Santhagens, and Yamada

Addressing claims 1-6, the Examiner determines that “it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide Skrobis’ blade support, with the aluminum coating, as taught by Yamada, in order to reduce wear and improve corrosion resistance of the blade support, as taught by Santhagens.” Ans. 4. The Examiner finds that “the outer surface of the blade support 8 [of bent blade 4 of Santhagens] which supports the blade 6 is coated by coatings that reduce wear and improve corrosion resistance.”

Ans. 3-4. Appellant contends that “the Examiner is equating a portion of Santhagens’ bent blade 4 as being a blade support. Additionally, the Examiner redefines the Santhagens blade area as being only an upper area of bent blade 4.” App. Br. 5. Appellant further contends that

one of ordinary skill in the razor arts would not equate a bent blade with a blade having a blade support mounted thereon. Furthermore, the Office does not point to a location in the Santhagens specification where Santhagens discloses that the “blades” and “blade supports” are actually two separate elements that are “mounted” together as recited in Appellant’s Claim 1.

Id.

The Examiner responds that “the blade and blade supports are two parts that are integrated to form a single piece unit. As stated above, the two parts are integrally mounted together. This means the blade and the blade support as two parts are mounted together by molecular bounding or

adhesion.” Ans. 9. It is unclear as to the meaning of “integrally mounted together” and the Examiner makes no finding that the blade is mounted to an upper surface of the support. Therefore, we are persuaded by Appellant’s argument that the Examiner has failed to establish that the portion 8 of the blade 4 is a “blade support” with “the blade being mounted to a surface of the upper surface of the blade support” as required by claim 1. As such, we cannot sustain the obviousness rejection of claims 1-6 over Skrobis, Santhagens, and Yamada.

Obviousness over Santhagens and Yamada

The Examiner finds that “Santhagens also teaches a blade support 4a having an outer surface 8a and a lower surface 8b.” Ans. 4. For the same reasons stated above, we do not agree with the Examiner’s finding that the portion 8 of the blade 4 is a blade support as called for in claim 1. As such, we cannot sustain the obviousness rejection of claims 1-6 over Santhagens and Yamada.

DECISION

For the above reasons, the Examiner’s rejection of claims 1-6 is reversed.

REVERSED

mls