



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

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/401,811	03/28/2003	Nanchariah Raghu Chalasani	RSW920020109US2 (077)	5929
46320	7590	01/31/2013	EXAMINER	
CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & O'KEEFE, I.L.P.			AFOLABI, MARK O	
STEVEN M. GREENBERG			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
7900 Glades Road			2454	
SUITE 520			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
BOCA RATON, FL 33434			01/31/2013	PAPER

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.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte NANCHARIAH RAGHU CHALASANI, QUDDUS CHONG,
DOLAPO MARTIN FALOLA, AJAMU AKINWUNMI WESLEY, and
ANDREA R. YANIK

Appeal 2010-008737
Application 10/401,811
Technology Center 2400

Before ALLEN R. MacDONALD, JOHN A. EVANS, and HUNG H. BUI,
Administrative Patent Judges.

MacDONALD, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF CASE

Introduction

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from a final rejection of claims 6-15. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

Exemplary Claim

Exemplary claim 6 under appeal reads as follows (emphasis added):

6. In a computing grid, a method for governing autonomic characteristics of a grid hosting infrastructure, the method comprising the steps of:

loading a code base for an invoked Web service and an associated descriptive document;

parsing said descriptive document to identify established service level agreements (SLAs);

further parsing said descriptive document *to identify security assertions*; and,

configuring a monitor coupled to said invoked Web service to govern said invoked Web service *according to* said identified established SLAs and *said identified security assertions*.

Examiner's Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 6-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Adams (US 7,200,657 B2).

Appellants' Contention

Appellants contend that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 6-15 because Adams fails to describe identifying security assertions and configuring according to said identified security assertions. (App. Br. 11-16).

Issue on Appeal

Did the Examiner err in rejecting claims 6-15 as being anticipated because Adams fails to disclose the argued security assertions limitation?

ANALYSIS

We agree with the Appellants' above specifically cited contention.¹
The Examiner has erred in finding that Adams anticipates the claims.

CONCLUSIONS

(1) Appellants have established that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 6-15 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

(2) On this record, claims 6-15 have not been shown to be unpatentable.

DECISION

The Examiner's rejection of claims 6-15 is reversed.

REVERSED

dw

¹ As to Appellants' remaining contentions which we do not reproduce herein, we concur with the Examiner's findings and we disagree with Appellants' conclusions. As to these remaining contentions, we adopt as our own (1) the findings and reasons set forth by the Examiner in the action from which this appeal is taken and (2) the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the Examiner's Answer in response to Appellants' Appeal Brief.