



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.
11/820,445	06/19/2007	Bernd Glatz	20060461-02	2545
22878	7590	02/28/2013	EXAMINER	
Agilent Technologies, Inc. in care of: CPA Global P. O. Box 52050 Minneapolis, MN 55402			THERKORN, ERNEST G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1776	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/28/2013	ELECTRONIC

**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):

IPOPS.LEGAL@agilent.com  
Agilentdocketing@cpaglobal.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL  
BOARD

---

*Ex parte* BERND GLATZ and KARSTEN KRAICZEK

---

Appeal 2012-001811  
Application 11/820,445  
Technology Center 1700

---

Before BRADLEY R. GARRIS, 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 2-4, 8-10, and 16. We have jurisdiction over the appeal pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

The rejections maintained on appeal all rely upon P. van Zoonen (*Trends in Analytical Chemistry*, vol. 11, no. 1, 11-17 (1992)) as evidence of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), or, as evidence of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). (*See*, Ans. 4-14 for full listing of the rejections on appeal; *also*, Br. 2, 3).

Upon consideration of the evidence on this record and each of Appellants' contentions, we find that the preponderance of evidence on this record supports the Examiner's conclusion that the subject matter of Appellants' sole independent claim 16 is anticipated and unpatentable over the applied prior art<sup>1</sup>. We sustain the above rejections based on the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and rebuttals to arguments expressed by the Examiner in the Answer<sup>2</sup>.

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

kmm

---

<sup>1</sup> Appellants mainly presents arguments directed to the features of the sole independent claim 16 (Br. 3-7). To the extent the features of the dependent claims have been separately rejected and argued, we find that the preponderance of the evidence supports all of the Examiner's rejections (*id.*; Ans. 4-14).

<sup>2</sup> No reply brief has been filed.