



# 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.
14/595,269	01/13/2015	Christopher Wolf	83479453	9492
28395	7590	06/15/2020	EXAMINER	
BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C./FGTL			SMITH, AARON C	
1000 TOWN CENTER			ART UNIT	
22ND FLOOR			PAPER NUMBER	
SOUTHFIELD, MI 48075-1238			3665	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			06/15/2020	
			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):

docteting@brookskushman.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

*Ex parte* CHRISTOPHER WOLF and MICHAEL W. DEGNER

---

Appeal 2019-005196  
Application 14/595,269  
Technology Center 3600

---

Before JOSEPH A. FISCHETTI, NINA L. MEDLOCK, and  
KENNETH G. SCHOPFER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

SCHOPFER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON REQUEST FOR REHEARING

Appellant<sup>1</sup> requests rehearing of the decision entered April 3, 2020 (“Decision”), which affirmed the Examiner’s rejection of claims 9–11, 13, 15–17, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Appellant contends that we misapprehended or overlooked certain arguments and evidence related to the rejection of the independent claims. Req. Reh’g 2–3. As discussed below, we find no point of law or fact that we overlooked or misapprehended in arriving at our Decision.

---

<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 Ford Global Technologies, LLC. Appeal Br. 2.

## DISCUSSION

Appellant argues that the Decision ignores an explanation provided in the briefs regarding Appellant's argument that the proposed combination would render Holman unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. Req. Reh'g 2. We disagree. In the Decision, we quoted the extent of Appellant's argument on this point. Decision 3–4. We further found that the Appeal Brief did not adequately explain what Holman's intended purpose is, and once properly defined, how it would be incompatible with the combination proposed by the Examiner. *Id.* at 4. We also note that the Appeal Brief did not explain adequately how the quoted portion of Holman related to Appellant's argument. Thus, we adequately addressed the extent of Appellant's argument as it was presented in the briefs.

Appellant now provides emphasis in the quoted portion of Holman and further explanation regarding why the proposed combination would render Holman unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. Yet, Appellant provides no explanation as why such was not previously provided. Based on the record before us, we are not persuaded that the Decision ignored, misapprehended, or overlooked any point of law or fact that was timely raised.

## CONCLUSION

We have carefully reviewed the original Decision in light of Appellant's request, but we find no point of law or fact that we overlooked or misapprehended in arriving at our decision. Therefore, Appellant's request for rehearing is denied.

Outcome of Decision on Rehearing:

<b>Claims Rejected</b>	<b>35 U.S.C. §</b>	<b>Basis/Reference(s)</b>	<b>Granted</b>	<b>Denied</b>
9, 10, 13, 15	103	Holman, Poon		9, 10, 13, 15
11, 16	103	Holman, Poon, Kawano		11, 16
17	103	Holman, Poon, Rosén		17
22	103	Holman, Poon, Official Notice		22
23	103	Holman, Poon, Ostrick		23
<b>Overall Outcome</b>				9–11, 13, 15–17, 22, 23

Final Outcome of Appeal After Rehearing:

<b>Claims Rejected</b>	<b>35 U.S.C. §</b>	<b>Basis/Reference(s)</b>	<b>Affirmed</b>	<b>Reversed</b>
9, 10, 13, 15	103	Holman, Poon	9, 10, 13, 15	
11, 16	103	Holman, Poon, Kawano	11, 16	
17	103	Holman, Poon, Rosén	17	
22	103	Holman, Poon, Official Notice	22	
23	103	Holman, Poon, Ostrick	23	
<b>Overall Outcome</b>			9–11, 13, 15–17, 22, 23	

Appeal 2019-005196  
Application 14/595,269

DENIED