



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

Table with 5 columns: APPLICATION NO., FILING DATE, FIRST NAMED INVENTOR, ATTORNEY DOCKET NO., CONFIRMATION NO.
12/650,683 12/31/2009 Heath STALLINGS 20090137 7721

25537 7590 11/25/2016
VERIZON
PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP
1320 North Court House Road
9th Floor
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909

Table with 1 column: EXAMINER

DAVIS, TONY O

Table with 2 columns: ART UNIT, PAPER NUMBER

2693

Table with 2 columns: NOTIFICATION DATE, DELIVERY MODE

11/25/2016

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):

patents@verizon.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

*Ex parte* HEATH STALLINGS and SOK Y. HWANG

---

Appeal 2015-003106  
Application 12/650,683  
Technology Center 2600

---

Before CAROLYN D. THOMAS, JASON V. MORGAN, and  
MICHAEL M. BARRY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

THOMAS, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellants seek our review under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) of the Examiner's Final Rejection of claims 1–20, all the pending claims in the present application. *See* Claim Appendix. We have jurisdiction over the appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We REVERSE.

The present invention relates generally to text entry for a touch-sensitive display. *See* Abstract.

Claim 1 is illustrative:

1. A computing-device implemented method comprising:
  - displaying, by the computing device, an application display window,
    - the application display window including a screenshot of text, and
    - the application display window being to receive a handwriting input from a user of the computing device;
  - detecting, by the computing device, a touch within the application display window on a surface of a touch screen of the computing device,
    - the touch corresponding to the handwriting input;
  - displaying, by the computing device, an enlarged window based on detecting the touch within the application display window,
    - the enlarged window including an enlarged view of a portion of the text of the application display window;
  - receiving, on the surface of the touch screen, a touch path input within the enlarged window;
  - recognizing, by the computing device, that the touch path input has been removed from the enlarged window;
  - determining, by the computing device, that the touch path input has been removed for a time period exceeding a particular touch removal interval; and
  - displaying, on the touch screen, the application display window, including the touch path input, after the enlarged window has been removed.

Appellants appeal the following rejections:

R1. Claims 1–12 and 14–20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto (US 6,088,481, July 11, 2000) and Baird (US 2001/0018812 A1, Jan. 27, 2011); and

R2. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Okamoto, Baird, and Tiphane (US 5,805,161, Sept. 8, 1998).

## ANALYSIS

**Issue:** Did the Examiner err in finding that Okamoto and Baird collectively teach or suggest displaying an enlarged window, based on detecting the touch, within the application display window, as set forth in independent claims 1, 11, and 19?

Appellants contend that Okamoto’s “handwriting display area DA ‘cannot be seen on the actual screen.’ Therefore, handwriting display area DA cannot correspond to the [displaying of an] ‘enlarged window’” (App. Br. 9). Appellants further contend that “there is no teaching or suggestion in this passage of BAIRD that input error correction area 245 is displayed based on detecting a touch within text box 235” because the “input error correction area 245 is always part of touchscreen display 110” (App. Br. 11).

In response, the Examiner finds that Okamoto’s figures 9A–E “illustrate displaying an enlarged window based on detecting touch” (Ans. 11). The Examiner further finds that “the claim limitation of displaying an enlarged window including a portion of text is extremely vague . . . . The handwriting window is the window that will be enlarged” (Ans. 14). We disagree with the Examiner.

First, we note, as a matter of claim construction, that claim 1 requires *displaying . . . an enlarged window based on detecting the touch within the application display window* (see claim 1). In other words, claim 1 requires **displaying** an enlarged window **based on** detecting the touch. The ordinary and usual meaning of “displaying” is providing visual information.

*Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, p. 365 (9th Edition 1990). The Examiner finds that Okamoto's handwriting display area "DA" teaches the aforementioned limitation (*see* Ans. 14; *see also* Final Act 2).

However, we agree with Appellants that Okamoto's "handwriting display area DA 'cannot be seen on the actual screen.' Therefore, handwriting display area DA cannot correspond to the [displaying an] 'enlarged window' . . ." (*see* App. Br. 9). For example, Okamoto discloses "[a]lthough the handwriting display area DA is shown by a dotted line in FIGS. 4A to 6, this dotted line cannot be seen on the actual screen" (8:24–27). In other words, although Okamoto's handwriting display area DA is functionally generated when writing is started and is set to a prescribed size (*see* Okamoto, 8:14–16), the dotted line shown in the figures that surrounds the handwriting display area DA is not actually *displayed* as an enlarged window.

The Examiner fails to rebut Appellants' contention that Okamoto's handwriting display area DA is not actually seen on the screen. We are, therefore, constrained by the record before us to find that the Examiner erred in rejecting independent claims 1, 11, and 19, which all include the argued limitation. Because this issue is dispositive regarding our reversal of independent claims 1, 11, and 19, we need not address Appellants' separate arguments regarding these claims nor the rejection of the dependent claims. Accordingly, we will not sustain the Examiner's obviousness rejections of claims 1–20.

Appeal 2015-003106  
Application 12/650,683

DECISION

We reverse the Examiner's §103(a) rejections of claims 1–20 (R1 and R2).

REVERSED