



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.
11/416,432	05/02/2006	Robert Erwin Van Den Berg	TS1649 (US)	6802
23632	7590	02/27/2013	EXAMINER	
SHELL OIL COMPANY P O BOX 2463 HOUSTON, TX 77252-2463			AKRAM, IMRAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1725	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/27/2013	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 APPEALBOARD

Ex parte ROBERT ERWIN VAN DEN BERG,
FRANCISCUS GERADUS VAN DONGEN,
THOMAS PAUL VON KOSSAK-GLOWCZEWSKI,
HENRIK JAN VAN DER PLOEG,
and PIETER LAMMERT ZUIDEVELD

Appeal 2011-012139
Application 11/416,432
Technology Center 1700

Before RICHARD TORCZON, LINDA M. GAUDETTE, and
KAREN M. HASTINGS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PER CURIAM.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from the Examiner's rejections of claims 1, 4, 7-15, 17-20, and 22-28. We have jurisdiction over the appeal pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

The rejections maintained on appeal all rely upon Deeke (5,976,203 patented November 2, 1999), Drnevich (US 2006/0070383 A1, published April 6, 2006), and Hilton (5,415,673 patented May 16, 1995) as evidence of

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). (*See*, Ans. 4-9 for full listing of the rejections on appeal; *also*, Br. 3).

Upon consideration of the evidence on this record and each of Appellants' contentions, we determine that the preponderance of evidence on this record supports the Examiner's conclusion that the subject matter of Appellants' sole independent claim 1 is unpatentable over the applied prior art¹. We sustain the above rejections based on the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and rebuttals to arguments expressed by the Examiner in the Answer².

The decision of the Examiner is affirmed.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

AFFIRMED

sld

¹ Appellants only present arguments directed to the features of the sole independent claim 1 (Br. 3, 4). To the extent the features of the dependent claims have been separately rejected and argued, and that claim 1 has been separately rejected using an additional reference, a preponderance of the evidence supports all of the Examiner's rejections (Br. 4; Ans. 5-9).

² No reply brief has been filed.