



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.
13/381,456	04/02/2012	Telemaco Melia	LUTZ 201384US01	1061
48116	7590	11/07/2016	EXAMINER	
FAY SHARPE/LUCENT 1228 Euclid Avenue, 5th Floor The Halle Building Cleveland, OH 44115-1843			ULLAH, SHARIF E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2495	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/07/2016	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):

docteting@faysharpe.com  
ipsnarocp@nokia.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

*Ex parte* TELEMACO MELIA  
and  
YACINE EL MGHAZLI

---

Appeal 2015-006296  
Application 13/381,456  
Technology Center 2400

---

Before CARLA M. KRIVAK, HUNG H. BUI, and  
JEFFREY A. STEPHENS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

STEPHENS, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellants<sup>1</sup> seek our review under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Examiner's Final Rejection ("Final Act.") of claims 1–11, which are all the claims pending in the application. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We AFFIRM.

---

<sup>1</sup> The real party in interest is identified as ALCATEL LUCENT. (Br. 1.)

*Claimed Subject Matter*

The invention generally relates to “enhancing a network-based IP mobility management protocol to provide multihoming support.” (Abstract.)

Claim 1, reproduced below, is illustrative:

1. A method for enhancing a network-based IP mobility management protocol to provide multihoming support, said method including providing multihoming support based on multihoming group information, said information identifying a group of interfaces of a Mobile Node (MN) to be managed by a Local Mobility Anchor (LMA) on a Mobile Access Gateway (MAG) demand under a same mobility session.

*Examiner’s Rejection & References*

Claims 1–11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by V. Devarapalli et al., *Multiple Interface Support with Proxy Mobile IPv6*, Internet Engineering Task Force, NETEXT Working Group, Internet-Draft, 1–14, (2009), last visited May 14, 2013, <http://tools.ietf.org/id/draft-devarapalli-netext-multi-interface-support-00.txt> (“Devarapalli”). (Final Act. 4–7.)

ANALYSIS

We have reviewed the Examiner’s rejections in light of Appellants’ arguments that the Examiner erred (Br. 4–7). We note Appellants have not filed a Reply Brief to rebut the findings and conclusions presented in the Examiner’s Answer. We are not persuaded by Appellants’ arguments. We adopt as our own the findings and reasons set forth by the Examiner in the action from which this appeal is taken and as set forth by the Examiner in

the Answer (Ans. 2–6). We highlight and address specific arguments and findings for emphasis as follows.

Appellants argue Devarapalli fails to teach “*multihoming group information, said information identifying a group of interfaces of a Mobile Node (MN) to be managed by a Local Mobility Anchor (LMA) on a Mobile Access Gateway (MAG) demand under a same mobility session,*” as recited in claim 1. (Br. 4–6.) According to Appellants, Devarapalli at most describes a service identifier that identifies only one interface of a Mobile Node’s interfaces, but does not teach information identifying a group of interfaces of the Mobile Node. (Br. 4–5.)

We are not persuaded by Appellants’ arguments, and we agree with the Examiner’s findings that Devarapalli discloses information that identifies a group of interfaces of a Mobile Node to be managed under a same mobility session, as required by claim 1. (Ans. 6; *see also* Final Act. 4, 5 (citing Devarapalli Fig. 3, § 3.3).) The Examiner finds Devarapalli discloses routing to a particular MAG using flow filters that require service identifier information to identify which flow (i.e., over interface if1 or interface if2) is used to send data from the Mobile Node to the MAG. (Ans. 3, 4, 6; *see also* Devarapalli § 3.3.) Thus, Devarapalli’s flow filters and service identifiers “indicate/identify the different interfaces of a mobile node.” (Ans. 6.) We agree with the Examiner that Devarapalli’s flow filters and service identifiers together constitute *information identifying a group of interfaces of a Mobile Node* as required by claim 1. (Ans. 6.)

Appellants contend Devarapalli’s service identifier does not identify “a group of interfaces (plural) of the MN.” Br. 4–5. Rather, “during attachment to MAG1, *the service identifier* identifies what service type to be

delivered *over the interface if1* to the MN. Similarly, during attachment to the MAG2, *a separate service identifier* identifies what service type is to be delivered *over the interface if2* to the MN.” (Br. 4 (emphasis added).)

Appellants assert that “*each service identifier* [of Devarapalli] merely reference [sic] *a single interface* over which an identified service is to be delivered to the mobile node.” (Br. 6 (emphasis added).) Appellants’ Specification teaches a single parameter “mhid” (multihoming group ID) that identifies a group of interfaces (namely, if1 and if2) of the mobile node. (Br. 5 (citing Spec. Fig. 1).) Appellants argue Devarapalli fails to disclose such a multihoming group ID parameter. (Br. 5–6.) Appellants’ argument is not commensurate with the scope of claim 1, which does not recite a single parameter, and broadly recites “information identifying a group of interfaces.” Thus, claim 1 does not preclude the multihoming group information from identifying the group of interfaces through multiple identifiers each corresponding to one interface.

Appellants’ arguments also do not address the Examiner’s specific findings that Devarapalli’s interfaces if1 and if2 are managed under a same mobility session in which the Mobile Node uses the interfaces simultaneously for sending and receiving packets. (Ans. 6; *see also* Final Act. 5 (citing Devarapalli Fig. 3, § 3.3).) We agree with the Examiner’s findings.

For the reasons set forth above, Appellants have not demonstrated Examiner error. Accordingly, we sustain the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Devarapalli.<sup>2</sup> For the same reasons, we

---

<sup>2</sup> Should there be further prosecution, the Examiner may wish to consider whether claim 1 recites a single means or functional step, and is, therefore,

Appeal 2015-006296  
Application 13/381,456

also sustain the rejection of dependent claims 2–11, which are not argued separately with particularity. (Br. 6.)

#### DECISION

We affirm the Examiner’s decision rejecting claims 1–11.

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. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

AFFIRMED

---

not enabled for the scope of the claim. *See* MPEP 2164.08(a); *In re Hyatt*, 708 F.2d 712, 714–715 (Fed. Cir. 1983).