



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.
11/722,003	01/07/2009	Yu Chen Zhou	CN920040036US1	5408
75949	7590	01/15/2015	EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION C/O: VanCott Bagley, Cornwall & McCarthy 36 South State Street Suite 1900 Salt Lake City, UT 84111			TRAN, ELLEN C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2433	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/15/2015	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 YU CHEN ZHOU, LIN MA, LEI MA, and YI MIN GAN

Appeal 2012-004600
Application 11/722,003
Technology Center 2400

Before CARL W. WHITEHEAD, JR., JEFFREY S. SMITH, and
CATHERINE SHIANG, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

SMITH, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This is an appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Examiner’s final rejection of claims 13–28, which are all the claims remaining in the application. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We affirm.

Representative Claim

13. A media streaming apparatus for processing encrypted media content for distribution among multiple computing devices, said media streaming apparatus comprising:
a media player for rendering a decrypted media stream for presentation to a user;
an encryption/decryption module for decrypting a received encrypted media stream upon request;
a media streaming proxy in communication with said media player, other media streaming proxies in other of said multiple computing devices, and said encryption/decryption module, said media streaming proxy forwarding a received encrypted media stream to said encryption/decryption module for decryption and forwarding the decrypted media stream returned from said encryption/decryption module to the media player for rendering.

Prior Art

Jagels	US 2003/0182429 A1	Sept. 25, 2003
Zeng	US 2005/0010963 A1	Jan. 13, 2005
Hartung	US 2005/0172127 A1	Aug. 4, 2005

IBM Response to DVB-CPT Call for Proposals for Content Protection and Copy Management: xCP Cluster Protocol (Oct. 19, 2001) (hereinafter “xCP”).

Examiner's Rejections

Claims 24–28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 13 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hartung and Zeng.

Claims 14–16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hartung, Zeng, and Jagels.

Claims 18, 20, 24, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over xCP and Hartung.

Claims 19 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over xCP, Hartung, and Jagels.

Claims 22, 23, and 25–28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over xCP, Hartung, Jagels, and Zeng.

ANALYSIS

Section 101 rejection of claims 24–28

We sustain the rejection of claims 24–28 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for the reasons given by the Examiner in the Examiner's Answer.

Section 103 rejections of claims 13–28

We adopt the findings of fact made by the Examiner in the Final Rejection and Examiner's Answer. We concur with the conclusions reached by the Examiner in the Examiner's Answer for the reasons given by the Examiner.

We sustain the rejections of claims 13–28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

DECISION

The rejection of claims 24–28 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter is affirmed.

The rejection of claims 13 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hartung and Zeng is affirmed.

The rejection of claims 14–16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hartung, Zeng, and Jagels is affirmed.

The rejection of claims 18, 20, 24, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over xCP and Hartung is affirmed.

The rejection of claims 19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over xCP, Hartung, and Jagels is affirmed.

The rejection of claims 22, 23, and 25–28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over xCP, Hartung, Jagels, and Zeng 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). *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.50(f).

AFFIRMED

mls