



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.
15/521,994	04/26/2017	Robert C Brooks	84616174	1078
22879	7590	09/22/2020	EXAMINER	
HP Inc. 3390 E. Harmony Road Mail Stop 35 Fort Collins, CO 80528-9544			FERGUSON, KEITH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2648	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/22/2020	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):

ipa.mail@hp.com
jessica.pazdan@hp.com
yvonne.bailey@hp.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte ROBERT C. BROOKS, ROBIN T. CASTELL,
MONJI G. JABORI, HAROLD MERKEL,
LEE ATKINSON, and CHARLES J. STANCIL

Appeal 2019-003099¹
Application 15/521,994
Technology Center 2600

Before RICHARD M. LEBOVITZ, JASON V. MORGAN, and
JOHN A. EVANS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

EVANS, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This is a decision on appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Examiner's Final rejection of claims 1–3 and 5–13. Appeal Br. 7. We have jurisdiction over the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We REVERSE.

¹ We use the word “Appellant” to refer to “Applicants” as defined in 37 C.F.R. § 1.42(a). The Appeal Brief identifies Hewlett-Packard Development Company, L.P., as the real party in interest. Appeal Br. 3.

Invention

The invention is directed to a method for wireless charge transfer. *See* Abstract. Claims 1, 5, and 11 are independent. Illustrative Claim 1 is reproduced below.

1. A method comprising:

sensing a wireless charging station comprising a wireless charging transmitter and determining a status for a machine based at least in part on the sensing of the wireless charging station, wherein sensing the wireless charging station comprises detecting the wireless charging transmitter of the wireless charging station; and

assisting a process to wirelessly transfer power to the machine, wherein assisting comprises causing the machine to provide guidance to a user of the machine based at least in part on the determined status, wherein assisting the user of the machine with a process to wirelessly transfer power to the machine comprises at least one of the following:

using the machine to provide an indication of a compatibility of a wireless charging standard used by the machine relative to a wireless charging standard used by the wireless charging station;

using the machine to provide an indication of a compatibility of a wireless charging transmitter of the wireless charging station to a wireless charging receiver of the machine, wherein the wireless charging receiver to wirelessly receive power for the machine to charge a battery of the machine or power a function of the machine; and

using the machine to determine and display a status representing a degree to which the machine may be used while being wirelessly charged.

Prior Art

Name²	Reference	Date
Baarman	US 2011/0018360 A1	Jan. 27, 2011
Partovi	US 2012/0146576 A1	June 14, 2012
You	US 2013/0310112 A1	Nov. 21, 2013

Rejections at Issue^{3, 4}

1. Claims 1, 3, and 5–10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)(2) as anticipated by You. Final Act. 2–5.
2. Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over You and Partovi.⁵ Final Act. 6–7.
3. Claims 11–13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over You and Baarman. Final Act. 7–8.

Allowable Subject Matter

² All citations herein to the references are by reference to the first named inventor only.

³ The present application is being examined under the first inventor to file provisions of the AIA. Final Act. 2.

⁴ Throughout this Decision, we refer to the Appeal Brief filed October 17, 2018 (“Appeal Br.”); the Reply Brief filed March 8, 2019 (“Reply Br.”); the Final Office Action mailed June 11, 2018 (“Final Act.”); the Examiner’s Answer mailed January 11, 2019 (“Ans.”); and the Specification filed April 26, 2017 (“Spec.”).

⁵ The Examiner’s rejection recites “Parotic” instead of “Partovi.” We consider this harmless error. Our Opinion recites the inventors name as filed “Partovi.”

Claim 4 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner found it would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Final Act. 8.

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 rejections.

CLAIMS 1, 3, AND 5–10: ANTICIPATION BY YOU Independent Claims 1 and 5 *Transmitter—Receiver Compatibility*

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “using the machine to provide an indication of a compatibility of a wireless charging transmitter of the wireless charging station to a wireless charging receiver of the machine.” Claim 5 recites commensurate limitations.

The Examiner finds You discloses this limitation as where “a numerical value of the electromagnetic waves is equal to or greater than a reference numeral values, an icon notifying that it is harmful to the user may be displayed, e.g., ‘BAD.’” Final Act. 3 (citing You ¶¶ 87–94, 131–34).

Appellant contends You fails to disclose an indication of a compatibility of a wireless charging transmitter to a wireless charging receiver and further fails to disclose using a machine to provide such an indication. Appeal Br. 9. Appellant argues that “[t]he mere strength of a received electromagnetic wave does not represent or indicate the

compatibility of a wireless charging transmitter to a wireless charging receiver.” *Id.*

The Answer merely reproduces the Final Action finding. *See* Final Act. 9. Appellant contends the cited disclosure is not found in the indicated passages of You. Reply Br. 2. Appellant argues You discloses that when the electromagnetic waves may be harmful to a person, an indication may be displayed, but that being harmful to a human is not the same as harmful to a device. *Id.*

We agree with Appellant. We find no disclosure in the cited portions of You of using the machine to provide an indication of a compatibility of a wireless charging transmitter to a wireless charging receiver, as claimed. *See* You, ¶¶ 87–94, 131–134 (cited generally by the Examiner). You discloses the electromagnetic waves may be harmful to a human: “when the numerical value of the electromagnetic waves is equal to or greater than a reference numerical value, an icon notifying that it is harmful to the user may be displayed thereon.” You, ¶ 133 (cited generally by the Examiner). Whether the electromagnetic waves are harmful to humans is not relevant to whether the transmitter and receiver are compatible.

In view of the foregoing, we decline to sustain the rejection of independent claims 1 and 5 and further of dependent claims 3, and 6–10 dependent therefrom.

CLAIM 2: OBVIOUSNESS OVER YOU AND PARTOVI.

Appellant contends claim 2 is patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Appeal Br. 14.

The Examiner does not cite Partovi in connection with the limitation argued above. *See* Ans. 11. In view of the foregoing, we decline to sustain the rejection of claim 2.

CLAIMS 11–13: OBVIOUSNESS OVER YOU AND BAARMAN
Claim 11

Independent claim 11 does not contain recitations relating to the compatibility of the transmitter and receiver that are commensurate with the recitations of independent claims 1 and 5. *See* Appeal Br. 18, 20, Claims App.

Claim 11 recites, *inter alia*:

a controller to: wirelessly communicate with a wireless charging station on which a portable electronic device is disposed, the portable electronic device being physically separated from the apparatus; and based on the wireless communication, determine and indicate a wireless power transfer status of the portable electronic device to a user of the apparatus.

See Appeal Br. 22, Claims App.

Appellant contends You fails to teach a mobile terminal wirelessly communicating with a wireless charging station for purposes of determining and indicating a wire power transfer status of a portable electronic device that is physically separated from the mobile terminal. Appeal Br. 16. Appellant further contends Baarman fails to teach that one of the electronic devices determines, or indicates, a wireless power transfer status of the other electronic device. *Id.*

The Examiner finds You does not disclose a charging station on which a portable electronic device is disposed, the portable electronic device being physically separated from the apparatus. Ans. 12. However, the

Examiner supplements You by finding Baarman teaches multiple separate portable devices disposed on a power transmitter physical separated from the other portable device. *Id.*

The Answer does not address Appellant's contention that the You-Baarman combination fails to teach where a first electronic device determines, or indicates, a wireless power transfer status of a second electronic device.

DECISION

In view of the foregoing, we decline to sustain the rejection of claims 1–13.

CONCLUSION

In summary:

Claims Rejected	35 U.S.C. §	Reference(s)	Affirmed	Reversed
1, 3, 5–10	102	You		1, 3, 5–10
2	103	You, Partovi		2
11–13	103	You, Baarman		11–13
Overall Outcome				1–3, 5–13

REVERSED