



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.
12/949,931 11/19/2010 Jae-Hoon Lee 8071-411 6757

22150 7590 11/02/2016
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 WOODBURY ROAD
WOODBURY, NY 11797

EXAMINER

TRUONG, NGUYEN H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2622

NOTIFICATION DATE DELIVERY MODE

11/02/2016

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):

mail@chauiplaw.com
garramone@chauiplaw.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte JAE-HOON LEE, SEUNG-HWAN MOON,
YONG-SOON LEE, YOUNG-SU KIM, CHANG-HO LEE,
WHEE-WON LEE, JUN-YONG SONG, and YU-HAN BAE

Appeal 2015-004056
Application 12/949,931
Technology Center 2600

Before CARLA M. KRIVAK, MICHAEL J. STRAUSS, and
SHARON FENICK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

KRIVAK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from a Final Rejection of claims 1, 3–13, 17, and 19–22.¹ We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We reverse.

¹ The Examiner noted claims 15, 16, 18, and 23–34 are objected to (Final Act. 4).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellants' invention is directed "to a display panel having a gate driver integrated therein" (Spec. 1:10–11).

Independent claim 1, reproduced below, is exemplary of the subject matter on appeal.

1. A display panel comprising:
 - a display area including a gate line;
 - a gate driver connected to one end of the gate line, the gate driver including a plurality of stages and being integrated on a substrate, wherein the stages receive a clock signal, a first low voltage and a second low voltage, at least one transmission signal from a previous stage, and at least one transmission signal from one of a next stage to output a gate voltage including a first low voltage as a gate-off voltage,
 - a first transistor including a control terminal that receives the at least one transmission signal to the next stage and an input terminal connected to a first node, and
 - a second transistor including a control terminal and an input terminal connected to an output terminal of the first transistor and an output terminal connected to the second low voltage which is not included in the gate voltage.

REFERENCES and REJECTION

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3–13, 17, and 19–22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based upon the teachings of Kim (US 2007/0296681 A1; published Dec. 27, 2007), Huq (US 5,859,630; issued Jan. 12, 1999), and Maekawa (US 6,392,627 B1; issued May 21, 2002).

ANALYSIS

The Examiner finds Kim discloses all the claimed limitations except for the second transistor including an input terminal connected to an output

terminal of a first transistor and an output terminal connected to a second low voltage, but that Huq discloses a transistor connected between a first node and a second low voltage node and “Maekawa discloses a diode-connected transistor . . . connected between a transistor . . . and a negative potential” lower than a potential (Final Act. 6–7).

Appellants contend the Examiner’s combination of Kim, Huq, and Maekawa would not be an obvious combination, particularly as the Examiner refers to the voltages in the cited references as “gate-off voltages”; whereas Appellants claim a gate voltage including a first low voltage as a gate-off voltage and a second low voltage which is not a gate voltage (App. Br. 6). Appellants’ arguments in their Appeal Brief have not been considered by Examiner (Reply Br. 8); rather the Examiner merely states Appellants are arguing limitations not found in the claims, without addressing Appellants’ contentions (Ans. 2). As Appellants’ contentions are reasonable (App. Br. 6–7; Reply 7–8, it would not be obvious to combine Maekawa with Kim and Huq), on the record before us, we do not sustain the Examiner’s rejection of claims 1, 3–13, 17, and 19–22 as obvious over the combination of Kim, Huq, and Maekawa.

DECISION

The Examiner’s decision rejecting claims 1, 3–13, 17, and 19–22 is reversed.

REVERSED