



# 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.
14/653,162	06/17/2015	Koen De Schepper	LUTZ 202030US01	7982
48116	7590	02/13/2020	EXAMINER	
FAY SHARPE/NOKIA 1228 Euclid Avenue, 5th Floor The Halle Building Cleveland, OH 44115-1843			SLOMS, NICHOLAS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2476	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/13/2020	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):

Nokia.IPR@nokia.com  
docketing@faysharpe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

*Ex parte* KOEN DE SCHEPPER and RUDI VAN TILBURG

---

Appeal 2019-000276  
Application 14/653,162  
Technology Center 2400

---

Before BRYAN F. MOORE, BETH Z. SHAW, and SCOTT B. HOWARD,  
*Administrative Patent Judges.*

SHAW, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION ON APPEAL

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 134(a), Appellant<sup>1</sup> appeals from the Examiner's decision to reject claims 1–8, 10–13, and 16–18. *See* Final Act. 1. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We AFFIRM.

---

<sup>1</sup> We use the word Appellant to refer to “applicant” as defined in 37 C.F.R. § 1.42. Appellant identifies the real party in interest as Alcatel Lucent. Appeal Br. 1.

CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The claims are directed to a method for supporting data-communication, a related system, and related devices. Claim 1, reproduced below, is illustrative of the claimed subject matter:

1. A method for supporting data-communication between a first communications module and a second communications module over a communications link between said first communications module and said second communications module, wherein said method comprises:
  - said first communications module setting up a temporary network applying at least one network connection parameter in the setting up of said temporary network; and
  - visually presenting data-communication supporting information, said data-communication supporting information comprising said at least one network connection parameter and data-communication specific data; and
  - said second communications module reading said visually presented data-communication supporting information; and
  - said second communications module connecting to said temporary network of an access point of said first communications module applying said at least one network connection parameter retrieved from said data-communication supporting information; and
  - starting a first application at said first communications module and a second application at said second communications module said first and said second application requiring a data-communication over said temporary network between said access point of said first communications module and said second communications module said first and said second application being uniquely identified by said data-communication specific data.

## REFERENCES

The prior art relied upon by the Examiner is:

Name	Reference	Date
Buddhikot	US 2003/0051140 A1	March 13, 2003
Chong	US 2006/0000910 A1	Jan. 5, 2006
Gallo	US 2006/0276211 A1	Dec. 7, 2006
Ryerson	US 2012/0210001 A1	Aug. 16, 2012

## REJECTIONS

In the Answer, the Examiner withdrew the rejections of claim 7 under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. §§ 112 first and second paragraphs. Ans. 3–5.

Claims 1–4, 7, 12, 13, and 16–18 are rejected under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buddhikot, Ryerson, and Chong. Final Act. 4.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buddhikot, Ryerson, Chong, and Gallo. Final Act. 7

Claims 8, 10, and 11 are rejected under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buddhikot and Chong. Final Act. 8.

## OPINION

Appellant generally states, without more, that none of the cited references teach a “temporary” network being set up as claimed. Appeal Br. 9. We are not persuaded by this argument because, as the Examiner finds, Buddhikot teaches a mobile node 22 accesses a home network 26 via a foreign network 12. Ans. 5. The setting up of the connection between the mobile node and the foreign network in Buddhikot teaches the establishment of a temporary network, because the connectivity is not permanent. *Id.* The

Appeal 2019-000276  
Application 14/653,162

connectivity is not permanent because the mobile node moves and relies on access capabilities from the foreign network while it is away from the home network. *Id.* at 6 (citing *Buddhikot* ¶ 20). In the absence of sufficient evidence or line of technical reasoning to the contrary, we find no reversible error.

Next, Appellant argues the references fail to teach the “visual display and reading” of data-communication information as claimed. Appeal Br. 8. The Examiner finds, and we agree, that Chong describes mobile unit devices (MUs 40) equipped with optical scanning capability such as a bar code readers or cameras used for obtaining network configuration information. Ans. 6 (citing Chong ¶ 21, Abstract). The Examiner also points out that Appellant’s Specification describes the claimed retrieving means or reader is implemented as a camera or code scanner. *Id.* (citing Spec. page 4, lines 5-7 and page 9, lines 30-33).

Appellant argues that the barcodes of Chong do not uniquely identify both the first and second applications, and that nothing in *Buddhikot* uniquely identifies both first and second applications. Appeal Br. 8-9. The disputed limitation in claim 1 recites, “said first and said second application being uniquely identified by said data-communication specific data.” Ans. 6. *Buddhikot* teaches communication information including “an identifier, which may be unique to a specific [access point] AP, or unique to a specific installation/application.” *Buddhikot* ¶ 22. Additionally, Chong also teaches reading information to identify a relevant application for the initiation of network configuration. Ans. 6 (citing Chong ¶ 55 (“network setup commands”)); *see also* Chong, Abstract. Thus, we agree with the Examiner that both *Buddhikot* and Chong teach the disputed limitation of “said first

Appeal 2019-000276  
Application 14/653,162

and said second application being uniquely identified by said data-communication specific data.”

As the Examiner points out, Appellant makes multiple arguments against the references individually. Ans. 7. For example, Appellant argues Buddhikot does not teach “the visual display and/or reading of any information or data that uniquely identifies both first and second applications that are to be started in first and second communication modules, respectively.” Appeal Br. 8. Yet, as the Examiner finds, and as discussed above, Chong teaches the “visual display and reading” of data-communication information as claimed. Ans. 6. The test for obviousness is not whether the claimed invention is expressly suggested in any one or all of the references, but whether the claimed subject matter would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art in light of the *combined teachings* of those references. *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 425 (CCPA 1981). The issue is not whether Buddhikot, Ryerson, or Chong teaches the limitations recited in claim 1, but whether the combined teachings render claim 1 obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art, and Appellant does not address that combination.

For these reasons, we are not persuaded of error in the Examiner’s rejection of claim 1 under § 103. Accordingly, we sustain the rejection of claim 1. For the same reasons, we sustain the rejections of claims 2–4, 7, 12, 13, and 16–18, for which Appellant presents the same or essentially the same arguments. *See* Appeal Br. 10–13.

## CONCLUSION

The Examiner’s rejections are affirmed.

DECISION SUMMARY

<b>Claims Rejected</b>	<b>35 U.S.C. §</b>	<b>Reference(s)/Basis</b>	<b>Affirmed</b>	<b>Reversed</b>
1-4, 7, 12, 13, 16-18	103	Buddhikot, Ryerson, Chong	1-4, 7, 12, 13, 16-18	
5, 6	103	Buddhikot, Ryerson, Chong, Gallo	5, 6	
8-11	103	Buddhikot, Chong	8-11	
<b>Overall Outcome:</b>			1-8, 10-13, 16-18	

TIME PERIOD FOR RESPONSE

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