



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.
13/652,641 10/16/2012 Satyanarayana T. CM15389 3996

22917 7590 11/23/2016
MOTOROLA SOLUTIONS, INC.
IP Law Docketing
500 W. Monroe
43rd Floor
Chicago, IL 60661

EXAMINER

BAYARD, DJENANE M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2444

NOTIFICATION DATE DELIVERY MODE

11/23/2016

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):

USAdocketing@motorolasolutions.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte SATYANARAYANA T., ANEES ABDULKADER ANAKKOT,
and TYRONE D. BEKIARES

Appeal 2016-001558
Application 13/652,641
Technology Center 2400

Before ALLEN R. MACDONALD, CAROLYN D. THOMAS, and
ADAM J. PYONIN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MacDONALD, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF CASE

Introduction

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from a Final Rejection of claims 1–22. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We reverse.

Exemplary Claim

Exemplary claim 11 under appeal reads as follows (emphasis added):

11. A method for determining a synchronization with respect to multiple presence service subscriptions, the method comprising:

maintaining multiple subscriptions associated with a Watcher;

receiving a subscription information consolidated status update (SICSU) request from a user terminal associated with the Watcher, wherein the SICSU request requests a provision of ***a consolidated status update of multiple subscriptions*** associated with the Watcher; and

in response to receiving the SICSU request, conveying a SICSU notification comprising a first SICSU values, wherein each SICSU value of the SICSU values indicate ***a status of multiple subscriptions*** associated with the Watcher.

Examiner's Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 11 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sekaran et al. (US 7,536,481 B2; May 19, 2009).¹

¹ Separate patentability is not argued for claim 22. Except for our ultimate decision, this claim is not discussed further herein.

The Examiner rejected claims 1–4 and 12–15 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) the combination of Sekaran and Laflamme et al. (US 2008/0214170 A1; Sept. 4, 2008).²

The Examiner rejected dependent claims 5–10 and 16–21 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) the combination of Sekaran, Laflamme, and Ben-Ezra et al. (US 7,814,051 B2; Oct. 12, 2010).³

Appellants' Contentions

1. Appellants contend that the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 11 because:

[Sekaran] fails to teach or otherwise suggest *a single message* is sent/received to send/receive status information of *multiple* subscriptions.

App Br. 6.

Analysis of Sekaran reveals that this reference fails to teach or otherwise suggest that *a single message* is sent/received to send/receive status information of *multiple* subscriptions. This is illustrated in columns 7 and 8 of Sekaran, where *multiple* messages need to be sent to receive presence information for multiple devices.

App Br. 7.

² Separate patentability is not argued for claims 1–4 and 12–15. Rather, Appellants merely repeat (App. Br. 8) for these claims the arguments directed to claim 11. Therefore, the rejections of these claims turn on our decision as to the underlying § 102 rejection of claim 11, and are not further addressed herein.

³ No arguments are presented for claims 5–10 and 16–21. Therefore, the rejections of these claims turn on our decision as to the underlying § 102 rejection, and are not further addressed herein.

Issue on Appeal

Did the Examiner err in rejecting claim 11 as being anticipated because Sekaran fails to disclose the argued limitations?

ANALYSIS

We have reviewed the Examiner's rejections in light of Appellants' arguments (Appeal Brief) that the Examiner has erred.

As to Appellants' above contention 1, we agree with Appellants that Sekaran fails to teach or suggest a consolidated status update of multiple subscriptions wherein each SICSU value of the SICSU values indicate a status of multiple subscriptions. Sekaran, instead, discloses the prior art method of a separate status update for each subscription. *See* Sekaran Fig. 7.

CONCLUSIONS

(1) Appellants have established that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 11 and 22 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

(2) Appellants have established that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1–10 and 12–21 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

(3) On this record, claims 1–22 have not been shown to be unpatentable.

DECISION

The Examiner's rejections of claims 1–22 are reversed.

REVERSED