



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.
14/804,067	07/20/2015	Jitendra SHAH	83548453	4744
28395	7590	09/27/2019	EXAMINER	
BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C./FGTL 1000 TOWN CENTER 22ND FLOOR SOUTHFIELD, MI 48075-1238			NGUYEN, CUONG H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3665	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/27/2019	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):

docteting@brookskushman.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte JITENDRA SHAH, CHRISTIAN RESS,
and STEFAN WOLTER

Appeal 2018-008298
Application 14/804,067
Technology Center 3600

Before JOHN C. KERINS, EDWARD A. BROWN, and
FREDERICK C. LANEY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

KERINS, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON REQUEST FOR REHEARING

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant¹ has filed a Request for Rehearing (“Request”) under 37 C.F.R. § 41.52, of our Decision dated June 7, 2019 (“Decision”), affirming the rejection of claims 1, 3–8, 10–15, and 17–20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

¹ Appellant is the Applicant, Ford Global Technologies, LLC, identified in the Appeal Brief as the real party in interest. Appeal Br. 2.

Requests for Rehearing are limited to points that Appellant believes have been misapprehended or overlooked by the Board. 37 C.F.R. § 41.52(a)(1).

Appellant asserts that the Board committed clear error in “ignor[ing] the limitation ‘responsive to input at the device matching the code stored by the device, transmitting the code from the device to the vehicle such that the vehicle unlocks.’” Request 2 (emphasis omitted). Appellant takes issue with the reliance in the Decision on paragraph 98 of Zhou² as disclosing this limitation, arguing that “nothing in Zhou suggests that, once the cryptographic key is input to the external device 606, the external device 606 transmits the cryptographic key to robot 602 or copter 608.” *Id.* Instead, Appellant postulates that, in Zhou, the external device 606 itself, or an off-site server in communication with the external device, validates the cryptographic key, and then external device 606 sends an unlock command, and not the cryptographic key, to robot 602. *Id.*

Appellant provides no citation to any part of Zhou evidencing that its version of the processing of the cryptographic key input to external device 606 actually takes place, and we find none. In stark contrast, paragraph 98 in question explicitly states that “the customer would be able to *present the robot 602 with the cryptographic key . . . by entering it via the external device 606.* The presented cryptographic key is validated and . . . the robot **602** unlocks the mail or goods **604.**” Zhou ¶ 98 (emphasis added). This disclosure evidences that it is the cryptographic key itself, and not merely

² US 2014/0254896 A1, published Sept. 11, 2014.

Appeal 2018-008298
Application 14/804,067

some unlock command that is presented to, and thus received by, robot 602, via a communication device in the form of external device 606.

Appellant's Request has been considered, but fails to apprise us of any point or points misapprehended or overlooked, and thus provides no reason to change the Decision. The Request is therefore denied.

REHEARING DENIED