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.
12/307,813	01/07/2009	Alwin Rogier Martijn Verschueren	2006P01816WOUS	5661

138325 7590 01/31/2019

PHILIPS LIGHTING HOLDING B.V.
465 Columbus Avenue
Suite 330
Valhalla, NY 10595

EXAMINER
LAM, VINH TANG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2628	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/31/2019	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):

kim.larocca@signify.com
jo.cangelosi@signify.com
Gigi.Miller@signify.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte ALWIN ROGIER MARTIJN VERSCHUEREN[1]

Appeal 2017-006016
Application 12/307,813
Technology Center 2600

Before ROBERT E. NAPPI, JEAN R. HOMERE, and NATHAN A. ENGELS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

NAPPI, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is a decision on appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Examiner's Final Rejection of claims 1 through 10, which constitute all the claims pending in this application. App. Br. 2. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We reverse.

---

[1] According to Appellant, the real party in interest is Koninklijke Philips N.V. App. Br. 2.

INVENTION

The invention is directed to a display device comprising an array of pixels and a plurality of first and second electrodes each supplying a separate common signal to each pixel. Abstract.

Claim 1 is illustrative of the invention and is reproduced below.

> 1. A display device, comprising an array of rows and columns of pixels, the array comprising:
>
> a commonly controlled plurality of first electrodes for supplying a first common drive signal to each pixel of the array, each first electrode extending through or alongside a row of pixels for supplying the common drive signal to the pixels of the row, wherein the plurality of first electrodes are connected together to supply said common drive signal;
>
> a commonly controlled plurality of second electrodes for supplying a second common drive signal different from the first common drive signal to each pixel of the array, each second electrode extending through or alongside a row of pixels for supplying the second common drive signal to the pixels of the row, wherein the plurality of second electrodes are connected together to supply said second common drive signal; and
>
> a plurality of pixel addressing electrodes for supplying data to the pixels to control optical appearances of the pixels; and wherein at least the first and second pluralities of electrodes are arranged on a common substrate.

REJECTIONS AT ISSUE[2]

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (US 2003/0090614 A1, published May 15, 2003). Final Act. 2–8.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim and Johnson et al. (US 2009/0027328 A1, Jan. 29, 2009). Final Act. 8–10.

The Examiner has rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim and Inoue et al. (US 2003/0218593 A1, published Nov. 27, 2003). Final Act. 10–11.

The Examiner has rejected claims 8 through 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim, Johnson and Kishi (US 2003/0231162 A1, published Dec. 18, 2003). Final Act. 11–13.

ANALYSIS

We have reviewed Appellant's arguments in the Briefs, the Examiner's rejection, and the Examiner's response to Appellant's arguments. Appellant's arguments have persuaded us of error in the Examiner's anticipation rejection.

Appellant argues the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 1 is in error for several reasons. App. Br. 4 through 9. The dispositive issue presented by these arguments is, did the Examiner err in finding that Kim

---

[2] Throughout this Decision, we refer to the Appeal Brief ("App. Br.") filed October 18, 2016, the Reply Brief ("Reply Br.") filed February 28, 2017, the Final Office Action ("Final Act.") mailed May 17, 2016, and the Examiner's Answer ("Ans.") mailed December 30, 2016.

teaches, a commonly controlled plurality of first electrodes supplying a first common drive signal to each pixel of the array and a commonly controlled plurality of second electrodes for supplying a second common drive signal, different from the first common drive signal, to each pixel in the array?

The Examiner finds that Kim teaches a first driving signal (GC1 in Fig. 21 and CK of first shift register, 161 in Fig 22) on a plurality of first electrodes (odd gate lines GL1 to GL_{n+1} in Fig. 22). Final Act. 3, Answer 3–5. Further the Examiner finds that Kim a second driving signal (GC2 in Fig. 21 and CK of second shift register, 171 in Fig 22) on a plurality of second electrodes (even gate lines GL2 to GL_{n-1} in Fig.22). Final Act. 3, Answer 3–5. Further, the Examiner considers that the driving signal GC1 is applied to all pixels as it is applied as is directly applied to the odd pixels via the odd gate lines and applied to and input of the SCR2 (of the second shift register 171, see Fig. 22) which connects to the even gate lines and even pixels. Answer 5–8.

We disagree with the Examiner's findings. While we concur with the Examiner that Kim teaches two separate electrode lines and two separate driving signals, we disagree that the two separate driving signals are applied to each pixel in the array. Kim identifies in paragraph 162, that the odd number pixels are connected to the odd gate lines and the even number of pixels are connected to the even gate lines. Thus, the signal GC1 is not applied to all pixels via the odd gate lines GL1 to GL_{n+1}, and the signal GC2 is not applied to all pixels via lines GL2 to GL_{n-1}. We do not agree with the Examiner's finding that the connections of CG1 to the even SRCs and GC2 to the odd SCRs, meets the claimed applying the signal to every pixels. Answer 5–8. This finding does not show GC2 being applied to the first row

of odd pixels, and is relying use of the even gate lines, GL2 to $GL_{n-1,}$ to carry the odd gate signal GC1 which does not meet the disputed limitation of claim 1. Because Appellant has shown at least one reversible error in the Examiner's rejection, we need reach Appellant's remaining arguments. Accordingly, we do not sustain the Examiner's anticipation rejection of independent claim 1, or of dependent claims 2, 5, and 6.

Appellant argues the obviousness rejections of dependent claims 3, 4, and 7 through 10 are in error as the additional references do not cure the deficiencies noted in the anticipation rejection. The Examiner has not shown limitation of claim 1 disputed in the anticipation rejection is obvious in light of the teachings of the references cited in the obviousness rejection. Accordingly, we do not sustain the Examiner's obviousness rejections of claims 3, 4, and 7 through 10.

DECISION

We reverse the decision of the Examiner to reject claims 1 through 10.

REVERSED