



# 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.
11/847,474	08/30/2007	Michael B. Sewell	20060539USNP-XER1427US01	2193

62095                      7590                      03/08/2016  
FAY SHARPE / XEROX - ROCHESTER  
1228 EUCLID AVENUE, 5TH FLOOR  
THE HALLE BUILDING  
CLEVELAND, OH 44115

EXAMINER
----------

MCLEAN, NEIL R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2676

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/08/2016

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* MICHAEL B. SEWELL, MARCIN CHOLKOWSKI,  
NATALIA VERSHININA, WAYNE RUDGE, REBECCA MALLABAND,  
ASIF QURESHI, ERROLL ELLISTON, GREGORY C. SOSINSKI,  
EDWARD J. SOLCZ, and CHRISTIAN G. MIDGLEY

---

Appeal 2013-008463  
Application 11/847,474  
Technology Center 2600

---

Before JOSEPH L. DIXON, JAMES R. HUGHES, and ERIC S. FRAHM,  
*Administrative Patent Judges.*

FRAHM, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION ON APPEAL

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This is a decision on appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) of a final rejection of claims 1–15 and 17–27. Claims 16 and 28 were canceled by after final amendment (Advisory Act. mailed April 26, 2013, p.1 ¶ 14). Therefore, only claims 1–15 and 17–27 are before us on appeal. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b). We reverse.

1. A printing system comprising:

a first printer including a first print engine and a first processor which controls the operation of the first print engine;

a scanner which scans a hardcopy document and generates image data therefrom, the scanner being associated with the first printer for communicating the image data to the first printer;

a second printer, operable independently of the first printer, which is communicatively linked to the first printer, the second printer including a second print engine and a second processor which controls the operation of the second print engine; and

the first printer including a graphical user interface, through which user selections for scanning hardcopy documents with the scanner and for printing the scanned images are communicated to the first processor;

the first processor having a first mode of operation in which a print job derived from the image data is printed on the first print engine and a second mode of operation in which a print job is exported to the second printer for printing on the second print engine, at least one of the first and second modes of operation being invoked at least in part by user interaction with the graphical user interface.

## ANALYSIS

We have reviewed Appellants' arguments in the Appeal Brief (Appeal Br. 7–14) and the Reply Brief (Reply Br. 7–16) that the Examiner's rejection (*see* Final Act. 4–13) of claims 1–15 and 17–27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe (US 2005/0259287 A1; published Nov. 24, 2005) and Fujishige et al. (US 2005/0012953 A1; published Jan. 20, 2005) is in error, and the Examiner's response to Appellants' arguments in the Appeal Brief (Ans. 2–6).

Although we agree with the Examiner that (i) Watanabe discloses first and second printers with first and second processors and print engines (Ans. 4; Final Act. 4–5; Advisory Act. mailed April 26, 2013, p. 2); and (ii) Fujishige discloses a graphical user interface (Fig. 4) and a scanning application 415 in Figure 5A capable of sending data to a printer processor 10 (*see* Fujishige ¶ 50) (Ans. 2; Final Act. 5; Advisory Act. mailed April 26, 2013, p. 2), we concur with Appellants' assertions (*see* Appeal Br. 7–8) that the Examiner has not rationally articulated how/why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellants' invention would combine the collective teachings and/or suggestions of Watanabe and Fujishige as claimed in order to export a print job from the first printer to the second printer using a graphical user interface as claimed.

Based on the foregoing, we find that the Examiner has not properly established factual determinations and articulated reasoning with a rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness for independent claims 1, 6, 15, and 27, resulting in a failure to establish a *prima facie* of obviousness. We also agree with Appellants' contention (Appeal Br. 4–6)

that Watanabe and Fujishige, whether taken singly or in combination, fail to disclose first and second printers each having corresponding print engines and processors, wherein the first processor has first and second modes of operation including exporting a print job from the first printer to the second printer using a graphical user interface, as recited in each of independent claims 1 (and claims 2–5 and 7–14 depending therefrom), 6, 15 (and claims 17–26 depending therefrom), and 27.

Accordingly, we do not sustain the Examiner’s rejection of independent claims 1, 6, 15, and 27, as well as corresponding dependent claims 2–5, 7–14, and 17–26 depending respectively therefrom.

#### CONCLUSION

The Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1–15 and 17–27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Watanabe and Fujishige.

#### DECISION

The Examiner’s rejection of claims 1–15 and 17–27 is reversed.

REVERSED