



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.
14/759,769	07/08/2015	Dale William Petty	63253US01; 67097-2143US1	7088
54549	7590	10/02/2020	EXAMINER	
CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS/PRATT & WHITNEY 400 West Maple Road Suite 350 Birmingham, MI 48009			VERDIER, CHRISTOPHER M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3745	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/02/2020	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):

ptodocket@cgolaw.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte DALE WILLIAM PETTY, JAMES P. ALLORE,
JOSEPH T. CAPRARIO, and STEVEN J. BAUER

Appeal 2019-001583
Application 14/759,769
Technology Center 3700

Before ANNETTE R. REIMERS, ARTHUR M. PESLAK, and
ALYSSA A. FINAMORE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

REIMERS, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE¹

Appellant² appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Examiner’s decision to reject claims 1–17. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We AFFIRM IN PART.

CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The claimed subject matter “relates to a method and apparatus for adjusting a center line for a bearing mount relative to a turbine casing utilizing adjustable tie rods.” Spec. ¶ 1, Figs. 2, 3.³ Claims 1, 4, and 7 are independent.

Claim 1 is illustrative of the claimed subject matter and recites:

1. A turbine section comprising:
a turbine housing section including a radially inner case centered on a first axis, and a radially outer case spaced radially outwardly of said inner case, and centered on a second axis, said first and second axes being offset relative to each other; and

¹ We note the Examiner objected to the drawings and some of the dependent claims for informalities. Final Office Action (“Final Act.”) 8–9, dated Jan. 10, 2018. These matters are not appealable, but, rather, are petitionable, and, thus, are not within the jurisdiction of the Board. *See In re Berger*, 279 F.3d 975, 984 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *see also In re Mindick*, 371 F.2d 892, 894 (CCPA 1967). We, therefore, do not address these matters in this Appeal.

² 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 Raytheon Technologies Corporation. *See* Correspondence filed Apr. 23, 2020 (Update to Real Party In Interest). We note that United Technologies Corporation has changed its name to Raytheon Technologies Corporation. *See id.*; *see also* Appeal Brief (“Appeal Br.”) 1, filed July 6, 2018.

³ We refer to paragraph 1 of the originally-filed Specification and Figures 2, 3 of the originally-filed Drawings dated July 8, 2015.

a plurality of tie rods including a threaded nut received on a tie rod, with said plurality of tie rods connecting said inner and outer cases, and said plurality of tie rods being spaced circumferentially about both of said first and second axes, and said plurality of tie rods extending for distinct lengths between said inner and outer cases such that said inner and outer cases are held at a position wherein the first and second axes are offset.

REJECTIONS⁴

- I. Claims 7, 9, 12, and 14–17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for lack of written description.
- II. Claims 2, 5, 7, 10, and 14–17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness.
- III. Claims 1–3, 8, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Durocher (US 2010/0132371 A1, published June 3, 2010).
- IV. Claims 4–6, 11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Durocher and Hurwitz (US 2009/0060704 A1, published Mar. 5, 2009).
- V. Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Durocher and Foulon (US 3,004,388, issued Oct. 17, 1961).
- VI. Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Durocher, Hurwitz, and Foulon.

⁴ The Examiner indicates that the rejection of claims 7, 14, 15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Durocher and the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Durocher and Foulon have been withdrawn. Examiner’s Answer (“Ans.”), dated Oct. 15, 2018. Appellant correctly notes that “the Examiner’s Answer has dropped any prior art rejections of independent claim 7 and its dependents claims.” Reply Brief (“Reply Br.”), filed Dec. 14, 2018.

- VII. Claims 1, 8, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Nash (US 4,571,936, issued Feb. 25, 1986) and Foulon.
- VIII. Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Nash, Foulon, and Honeycutt (US 4,478,551, issued Oct. 23, 1984).
- IX. Claims 4, 6, 11, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Nash, Durocher, Hurwitz, and Foulon.

ANALYSIS

Rejection I – Written Description

Claims 7, 9, 12, and 14–17

Independent claim 7 is directed to a method of adjusting the location of a bearing in a turbine section and includes the claim language “said bearing is at said desired location with said desired position⁵ being such that center axes of said outer turbine case and said bearing are offset.” Appeal Br. 8 (Claims App.).

The Examiner considers the claim language “center axes of said outer turbine case and said bearing are offset” “to add[] new matter,” because the scope of the above-cited claim language “includes the outer turbine case having center axes, and the bearing having center axes. However, the outer turbine case has only one center axis C and the bearing has only one center axis.” Final Act. 10 (emphasis omitted); *see also* Appeal Br. 8 (Claims App.).

⁵ We note that “said desired position” lacks antecedent basis. Appeal Br. 8 (Claims App.). For purposes of this Appeal, we shall interpret this language to mean “a” desired position.

Compliance with the written description requirement set forth in the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 does not require that the claimed subject matter be described identically in the Specification, but the disclosure as originally filed must convey to those skilled in the art that applicant had invented the subject matter later claimed. *In re Kaslow*, 707 F.2d 1366, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 1983). The drawings in an application can be relied upon to show that an inventor was in possession of the claimed invention as of the filing date. *See Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (“[D]rawings alone may be sufficient to provide the ‘written description of the invention’ required by § 112, first paragraph.”).

Appellant’s originally-filed Specification describes that:

it may be desirable that a center line A of the bearing 403 be offset from the center line C [of the outer casing 82] by a distance Thus, as shown in Figure 3, by adjusting the lengths of the tie rods 101, and by tightening the nuts 100 to different extents, the center y of the inner casing 84 can be moved such that its center line A is offset from the center line C of the outer casing 82 defined by a no offset center z.

Spec. ¶ 31, Fig. 3.⁶

Appellant’s originally-filed Specification at paragraph 31 describes and its originally-filed Figure 3 illustrates that each of outer turbine case 82 and bearing 403 have “a single” center axis, not “center axes,” as interpreted by the Examiner. Final Act. 10. *In re Mraz*, 455 F.2d 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1972) (“[T]hings patent drawings show clearly are [not] to be *disregarded*.”) (emphasis in original)).

Consequently, we agree with Appellant that a skilled artisan would understand the originally-filed Specification and drawings to describe that

⁶ *See supra* note 3.

the center axes (i.e., z and y, respectively) of outer turbine case 82 and bearing 403 are offset and, thus, provide written description for the limitation reciting “center axes of said outer turbine case and said bearing are offset.” *See* Appeal Br. 3; *see also* Reply Br. 1; Spec. ¶ 31, Fig. 3.

Each of dependent claims 9, 12, and 16 recites “at least some of the tie rods extend at an angle that is not directly radially inward.” Appeal Br. 8, 9 (Claims App.) (emphasis added). The Examiner determines that the underlined claim language “adds new matter,” because the application as originally-filed does not support the underlined claim language. Final Act. 10. Specifically, the Examiner determines that “the scope of the underlined [claim language] includes all of the tie rods 101 extending at an angle that is not directly radially inward,” “[t]he original [S]pecification does not contain the underlined claim language, and at most, figure 3 of the present application shows that two of the tie rods 101 [sic] extend at an angle that are not directly radially inward.” *Id.* (emphasis added).

Appellant’s originally-filed Specification describes that:

as shown in Figure 3, by adjusting the lengths of the tie rods 101, and by tightening the nuts 100 to different extents, the center y of the inner casing 84 can be moved such that its center line A is offset from the center line C of the outer casing 82 defined by a no offset center z. Thus, the tie rod 112 is tightened to be shorter than it was in the Figure 2 embodiment, as are the tie rods 110 and 111. The tie rods 114 that had been at the center line in Figure 2, now extend at an angle, and are longer than they would have been in the Figure 2 position. The tie rods 116 are also made to be longer. Now, with the adjustment, the center lines A and C are offset between the inner and outer casings 82 and 84.

Spec. ¶ 31, Fig. 3.⁷

⁷ *See supra* note 3.

We agree with Appellant that “[a]t least some[’] *does not specifically recite all*, and [Appellant’s] description of claim 3 does not limit the understanding to ‘only two of eight.’” Reply Br. 1–2 (emphasis added); *see also* Spec. ¶ 31, Fig. 3. We further agree with Appellant that as clearly shown in Figure 3 of the subject application, “tie rods 114 do not extend directly inwardly.” Appeal Br. 3; *see In re Mraz*, 455 F.2d at 1072. As such, because two of the eight tie rods meet the claimed limitation, the original disclosure provides support for the phrase “at least some” in this limitation. *See* Appeal Br. 3; *see also id.* at 8, 9 (Claims App.); Reply Br. 1–2; Spec. ¶ 31, Fig. 3.

As Appellant’s originally-filed Specification and drawings support the claimed elements discussed above, we find that the originally-filed Specification and drawings demonstrate that Appellant was in possession of the claimed subject matter at the time the application was filed. Therefore, we determine that Appellant’s original disclosure satisfies the written description requirement.

Accordingly, for the above reasons, we do not sustain the Examiner’s rejection of claims 7, 9, 12, and 14–17 for lack of written description.

Rejection II – Indefiniteness

Claims 2, 5, and 10

The Examiner determines that for claims 2 and 5 at line 3, “said nut,” it “is unclear if this is meant to refer to all of ‘said nuts’ in line 2, or one of ‘said nuts’ in line 2.” Final Act. 10–11. Claims 2 and 5 depend from claims 1 and 4, respectively. Appeal Br. 7, 8 (Claims App.). Claim 10 depends from claim 2. *Id.* at 9 (Claims App.).

Each of claims 1 and 4 recites “a plurality of tie rods including a threaded nut received on a tie rod.” Appeal Br. 7, 8 (Claims App.). Each of claims 2 and 5 recites “said nuts positioned radially outwardly of said outer case, and said tie rods include a pin head” and “said nut being tightened on said tie rod to adjust the length of said tie rod.” *Id.* (Claims App.).

Upon review of the above-cited claim language, a skilled artisan would understand that “said nuts” and “said tie rods” at respective lines 1 and 2 of claims 2 and 5 refer collectively to “all the nuts” received on “all the tie rods”; whereas, “said nut” and “said tie rod” at line 3 of claims 2 and 5 refer to each “individual nut” received on each “individual tie rod.” *See id.*; *see also* Reply Br. 2.

Accordingly, for the above reasons, we do not sustain the Examiner’s rejection of claims 2, 5, and 10 for indefiniteness.

Claims 7 and 15–17

Independent claim 7 is directed to a method of adjusting the location of a bearing in a turbine section and includes the claim language “said bearing is at said desired location with said desired position⁸ being such that center axes of said outer turbine case and said bearing are off set.” Appeal Br. 8 (Claims App.). Claims 15–17 directly depend from claim 7. *Id.* at 9 (Claims App.).

Similar to that discussed above for the written description rejection, the Examiner considers the claim language “center axes of said outer turbine case and said bearing are offset” to be inaccurate, because the scope of the above-cited claim language “includes the outer turbine case having center

⁸ *See supra* note 5.

axes, and the bearing having center axes. However, the outer turbine case has only one center axis C and the bearing has only one center axis.” Final Act. 11 (emphasis omitted); *see also* Appeal Br. 8 (Claims App.).

Similar to our discussion above concerning the written description rejection, we agree with Appellant that upon review of the Specification and drawings, a skilled artisan would readily recognize that as claimed, the “center axes” represent “a central axis of an outer turbine case and a center axis of a bearing” and not *multiple* center axes being “recited for each of the outer turbine case and the bearing,” as proposed by the Examiner. *See* Reply Br. 1; *see also* Spec. ¶ 31, Fig. 3; Final Act. 11.

Accordingly, for the above reasons, we do not sustain the Examiner’s rejection of claims 7 and 15–17 for indefiniteness.

Claim 14

Similar to independent claims 1 and 4, independent claim 7 recites “said tie rods being secured with nuts between said inner and outer turbine cases.” Appeal Br. 7, 8 (Claims App.). Similar to claims 2 and 5, claim 14, which depends from claim 7, recites “said nuts positioned radially outwardly of said outer case, and said tie rods include a pin head” and “said nut being tightened on said tie rod to adjust the length of said tie rod.” *Id.* at 9 (Claims App.). The Examiner presents the same determinations for claim 14 as those discussed above for claims 2 and 5. *See* Final Act. 11.

Similar to our discussion above for claims 2 and 5, upon review of the above-cited claim language, a skilled artisan would understand that “said nuts” and “said tie rods” at respective lines 1 and 2 of claim 14 refer collectively to “all the nuts” received on “all the tie rods” between the inner and outer turbine cases; whereas, “said nut” and “said tie rod” at respective

lines 3 and 4 of claim 14 refers to each “individual nut” received on each “individual tie rod” between the inner and outer turbine cases. *See* Appeal Br. 9 (Claims App.); *see also* Reply Br. 2.

Claim 14 also recites “said first and second axes.” Appeal Br. 9 (Claims App.). We agree with the Examiner that this phrase lacks antecedent basis and it is not clear from a review of claims 7 and 14 as to what the phrase “said first and second axes” refers. Appeal Br. 8, 9 (Claims App.); Final Act. 11.

As we agree with the Examiner that claim 14’s phrase “said first and second axes” is unclear, we sustain the Examiner’s rejection of claim 14 for indefiniteness.

Rejection III – Anticipation by Durocher

Claims 1–3, 8, and 10

Claim 1 is directed to a turbine section including “a turbine housing section including a radially inner case centered on a first axis, and a radially outer case spaced radially outwardly of said inner case, and centered on a second axis, said first and second axes being offset relative to each other” and “said inner and outer cases are held at a position wherein the first and second axes are offset.” Appeal Br. 7 (Claims App.).

The Examiner finds Durocher teaches a turbine section including “a turbine housing section including a radially inner case formed by 34 centered on an unnumbered first axis, and a radially outer case 30 spaced radially outwardly of the inner case, and centered on an unnumbered second axis, the first and second axes being offset relative to each other.” Final Act. 12. In the Answer, the Examiner cites to paragraphs 24, 32, and 35 in Durocher for a description of “centering of inner case 34, and bearing

housing 50, relative to outer case 30.” *See* Ans. 6–7. Additionally, the Examiner concludes that “[t]hus, there is an offset that occurs between the first and second axes relative to each other, and the centering of the offset originates from the inner case 34 and the outer case 30 being initially held at a position wherein the first and second axes are offset.” Ans. 6.

Durocher explicitly discloses that “spoke casing 32 includes an annular inner case 34 *coaxially disposed within* the outer case 30.” Durocher ¶ 24 (emphasis added), Fig. 3. Consequently, as inner case 34 and outer case 30 of Durocher have a common axis (i.e., coincident axes) that intersect in a straight line, we disagree with the Examiner’s finding that the axis of inner case 34 of Durocher (i.e., the claimed first axis) and the axis of outer case 30 of Durocher (i.e., the claimed second axis) are “initially held at” or “originate from” a position wherein their respective axes are “offset.” *See* Appeal Br. 3 (“While the Examiner states Durocher discloses offset inner and outer cases, it appears to disclose the opposite, [i.e.,] centered cases.”).

Accordingly, for the above reasons, we do not sustain the Examiner’s rejection of claims 1–3, 8, and 10 as anticipated by Durocher.

Rejections IV – VI – Obviousness over Durocher and Hurwitz, Durocher and Foulon, and Durocher, Hurwitz, and Foulon
Claims 4–6, 9, and 11–13

The Examiner’s rejections of claims 4–6, 9, and 11–13 are based on the same unsupported findings discussed above with respect to claim 1. *See* Final Act. 13–17. The Examiner does not rely on the teachings of Hurwitz or Foulon to remedy the deficiencies of Durocher. Accordingly, for reasons similar to those discussed above for claim 1, we do not sustain the

Examiner's obviousness rejections of claims 4–6, 9, and 11–13 over the variously cited prior art references.

Rejection VII – Obviousness over Nash and Foulon

Claims 1, 8, and 9

Appellant argues claims 1, 8, and 9 as a group, and does not present arguments for dependent claims 8 and 9 apart from the arguments presented for the independent claim 1. *See* Appeal Br. 5.⁹ We select claim 1 as representative, and claims 8 and 9 stand or fall with claim 1. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv) (2017).

Appellant contends that “Nash discloses a device wherein elements 108 allow positioning of an entire engine within an outer engine case 104” and “Foulon would suggest nothing with regard to the positioning of a standard engine, and nothing even applicable to the engine of Nash” because, according to Appellant, “Foulon is dealing with problems associated with a particular turbojet/ramjet engine, and nothing within its disclosure would suggest modifying the standard gas turbine engine of Nash.” Appeal Br. 5. Appellant also contends that “Foulon has a reason for offsetting two completely distinct structures from the structure the Examiner proposes to make offset in . . . Nash. The fact that two components somewhere in a gas turbine engine might desirably be held offset does not mean that all components would.” Reply Br. 2.

Appellant's blanket statements do not apprise us of error in the rejection as set forth by the Examiner. In particular, Appellant does not

⁹ We note that claim 1 is missing from Appellant's heading regarding this rejection. Appeal Br. 5. We consider this an inadvertent typographical error.

apprise us of error in the Examiner findings for either Nash or Foulon. Appeal Br. 5; *see also* Reply Br. 2. Nor does Appellant apprise us of error in the Examiner’s reasoning to modify the gas turbine engine of Nash “such that the first and second axes are offset relative to each other, with the plurality of tie rods extending for distinct lengths between the inner and outer cases such that the inner and outer cases are held at a position wherein the first and second axes are offset,” as taught by Foulon, namely, “for the purpose of allowing for adjustment due to thermal expansion at hot temperatures.” Appeal Br. 5; *see also* Reply Br. 2; Final Act. 18–19; Ans. 12–14.

Moreover, in response to Appellant’s contentions, the Examiner provides additional reasoning in the Answer by explaining that “Foulon is directed to a turbojet engine (which is a type of a gas turbine engine) with a ramjet, which experiences similar hot temperatures and thermal expansion at hot temperatures, as the gas turbine engine 100 of the base reference to Nash” and Foulon is applicable to the recitations in claim 1 of “the first and second axes being offset relative to each other with the plurality of tie rods extending for distinct lengths between the inner and outer cases such that the inner and outer cases are held at a position wherein the first and second axes are offset,” . . . “since the use of a known technique to improve similar devices in the same way was held to be an obvious extension of the prior art teachings.” *See* Ans. 13–14 (citing *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 416 (2007)). “If a person of ordinary skill can implement a predictable variation, § 103 likely bars its patentability.” *KSR*, 550 U.S. at 417. Appellant does not provide persuasive evidence or argument to the contrary. *See* Reply Br., *passim*.

In summary, and based on the record presented, we are not persuaded the Examiner erred in rejecting independent claim 1 as unpatentable over Nash and Foulon. Accordingly, we sustain the Examiner's rejection of claim 1. We further sustain the rejection of claims 8 and 9, which fall with claim 1.

Rejection VIII – Obviousness over Nash, Foulon, and Honeycutt
Claim 3

Appellant states that “[i]t is not Appellant’s contention the mounting of a bearing was itself unique. However, the bearing as required by claim 3 must be offset from a centerline of the outer case.” Appeal Br. 6. Appellant concludes that “there is no reason shown in Foulon to modify the bearing of the gas turbine engine of Nash to have this structure.” *Id.*; *see also* Reply Br. 2

Similar to our discussion above for Rejection VII, Appellant’s blanket statements do not apprise us of error in the rejection as set forth by the Examiner. In particular, Appellant does not apprise us of error in the Examiner’s reasoning to modify the gas turbine engine of Nash “such that the first and second axes are offset relative to each other, with the plurality of tie rods extending for distinct lengths between the inner and outer cases such that the inner and outer cases are held at a position wherein the first and second axes are offset,” as taught by Foulon, namely, “for the purpose of allowing for adjustment due to thermal expansion at hot temperatures.” Appeal Br. 6; *see also* Reply Br. 2; Final Act. 18–20; Ans. 12–14.

Neither does Appellant apprise us of error in the Examiner’s finding that “Honeycutt shows a turbine section having a flange 18 positioned within an inner case 42 to mount a bearing 16 for mounting a turbine rotor 14” nor

does Appellant apprise us of error in the Examiner's reasoning to modify the gas turbine engine of Nash and Foulon "such that it includes a flange positioned within the inner case to mount a bearing for mounting a turbine rotor, as taught by Honeycutt. The combination of Nash, Foulon, and Honeycutt results in a center line of the bearing being offset from a center line of the outer case." Final Act. 19–20; *see also* Ans. 14; Appeal Br. 6; Reply Br. 2

Accordingly, for the above reasons, we sustain the Examiner's rejection of claim 3 as unpatentable over Nash, Foulon, and Honeycutt.

*Rejection IX – Obviousness over Nash, Durocher, Hurwitz, and Foulon
Claims 4, 6, 11, and 12*

Appellant argues claims 4, 6, 11, and 12 as a group, and does not present arguments for dependent claims 6, 11, and 12 apart from the arguments presented for the independent claim 4. *See* Appeal Br. 6. We select claim 4 as representative, and claims 6, 11, and 12 stand or fall with claim 4. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv) (2017).

Appellant contends that "[t]he Examiner now proposes to modify Nash with Durocher to have the inner and outer case construction. The Examiner then argues that Hurwitz would suggest adding a gear reduction. Finally, the Examiner argues that Foulon would suggest moving the axes to be offset." Appeal Br. 6; *see also* Reply Br. 2. Appellant concludes that "[t]his rejection is improper for all of the reasons set forth above. Again, nothing within any of these references provides any reason to intentionally offset inner and outer casings." Appeal Br. 6; *see also* Reply Br. 2.

Similar to our discussion above for Rejection VII, Appellant's blanket statements do not apprise us of error in the rejection as set forth by the

Examiner. In particular, Appellant does not apprise us of error in the Examiner's reasoning to modify the gas turbine engine of Nash "such that the first and second axes are offset relative to each other, with the plurality of tie rods extending for distinct lengths between the inner and outer cases such that the inner and outer cases are held at a position wherein the first and second axes are offset," as taught by Foulon, namely, "for the purpose of allowing for adjustment due to thermal expansion at hot temperatures." Appeal Br. 6; *see also* Reply Br. 2; Final Act. 20–23.

Neither does Appellant apprise us of error in the Examiner's findings as to either Durocher or Hurwitz, nor does Appellant apprise us of error in the Examiner's reasoning for further modifying the gas turbine engine of Nash and Foulon to include the teachings of either Durocher or Hurwitz. *See* Appeal Br. 6; *see also* Reply Br. 2; Final Act. 20–23; Ans. 15–16.

In summary, and based on the record presented, we are not persuaded the Examiner erred in rejecting independent claim 4 as unpatentable over Nash, Durocher, Hurwitz, and Foulon. Accordingly, we sustain the Examiner's rejection of claim 4. We further sustain the rejection of claims 6, 11, and 12, which fall with claim 4.

CONCLUSION

In summary:

Claim(s) Rejected	35 U.S.C. §	Reference(s)/Basis	Affirmed	Reversed
7, 9, 12, 14–17	112, first paragraph	Written Description		7, 9, 12, 14–17
2, 5, 7, 10, 14–17	112, second paragraph	Indefiniteness	14	2, 5, 7, 10, 15–17
1–3, 8, 10	102(b)	Durocher		1–3, 8, 10
4–6, 11, 13	103(a)	Durocher, Hurwitz		4–6, 11, 13
9	103(a)	Durocher, Foulon		9
12	103(a)	Durocher, Hurwitz, Foulon		12
1, 8, 9	103(a)	Nash, Foulon	1, 8, 9	
3	103(a)	Nash, Foulon, Honeycutt	3	
4, 6, 11, 12	103(a)	Nash, Durocher, Hurwitz, Foulon	4, 6, 11, 12	
Overall Outcome			1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14	2, 5, 7, 10, 13, 15–17

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 IN PART