



# 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.
10/412,666	04/14/2003	Axel Doerwald	12946-003	4262
1059	7590	03/08/2010	EXAMINER	
BERESKIN AND PARR LLP/S.E.N.C.R.L., s.r.l. 40 KING STREET WEST BOX 401 TORONTO, ON M5H 3Y2 CANADA			FISHER, PAUL R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3689	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/08/2010	PAPER

**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.

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2  
3  
4 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
5 AND INTERFERENCES  
6

7  
8 *Ex parte* AXEL DOERWALD and  
9 JOSEPH SMIRLIES  
10

11  
12 Appeal 2009-006268  
13 Application 10/412,666  
14 Technology Center 3600  
15

16  
17 Decided: March 5, 2010  
18

19  
20 Before LINDA E. HORNER, ANTON W. FETTING, and  
21 BIBHU R. MOHANTY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.  
22 FETTING, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

23 DECISION ON APPEAL  
24

1

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

2

3

4

Axel Doerwald and Joseph Smirlies (Appellants) seek review under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) of a final rejection of claims 1, 3-11, 13-17, 19-24, and 26-29, the only claims pending in the application on appeal.

5

6

We have jurisdiction over the appeal pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

7

## SUMMARY OF DECISION<sup>1</sup>

8

We REVERSE.

9

## THE INVENTION

10

11

12

The Appellants invented a method and system for enhancing customer loyalty by providing customer-specific information to a weigh station at which the customer is being served. Specification ¶¶ 0001.

13

14

15

An understanding of the invention can be derived from a reading of exemplary claims 1, 9, 14, and 17, which are reproduced below [bracketed matter and some paragraphing added].

16

17

18

19

1. A system for enhancing customer loyalty, the system comprising:

[1] an input module for receiving customer identification information for identifying a customer;

---

<sup>1</sup> Our decision will make reference to the Appellants' Appeal Brief ("App. Br.," filed October 15, 2008) and Reply Brief ("Reply Br.," filed January 12, 2009), and the Examiner's Answer ("Ans.," mailed November 12, 2008), and Final Rejection ("Final Rej.," mailed April 15, 2008).

1 [2] a weigh station comprising a weigh scale for determining  
2 a weight of a product, and a weigh station display for  
3 displaying information;

4 [3] a storage module for storing a plurality of customer  
5 profiles for a plurality of customers wherein each customer in  
6 the plurality of customers has an associated customer profile;

7 [4] an information retrieval module for receiving the  
8 customer identification information from the input module and  
9 for, when the customer is in the plurality of customers,  
10 retrieving the associated customer profile, the information  
11 retrieval module being linked for communication with the  
12 storage module and the input module; and,

13 [5] an information processing means for, when the customer  
14 is in the plurality of customers, providing associated customer-  
15 specific information based on the associated customer profile to  
16 the weigh station display, the information processing module  
17 being linked for communication with the weigh station display  
18 and the information retrieval module; wherein the customer-  
19 specific information comprises, for each customer in the  
20 plurality of customers, a unique associated customer identifier,  
21 and the associated customer-specific information comprises  
22 associated reward information, and the associated reward  
23 information specifies at least one of an associated coupon and  
24 an associated discount to be provided to the customer.

25

26 9. The system as defined in claim 8 further comprising a point-  
27 of-sale station for obtaining associated purchase information  
28 from the customer and for transmitting the associated purchase  
29 information to the server, wherein the point-of-sale station is  
30 connected to the server for communication therewith, and the  
31 customer profile updating means is operable to update the  
32 associated customer profile for the customer based on the  
33 associated purchase information.

34

35 14. The system as defined in claim 13, wherein each weigh  
36 station comprises an associated information receiving module

1 for receiving product identification information for the product,  
2 and is operable to transmit the product identification  
3 information for the product and the weight of the product to the  
4 information processing module; and, the associated value is  
5 based on the associated customer profile, the product  
6 identification information and the weight of the product.

7

8 17. A method for providing customer-specific information for  
9 a customer to a weigh station, the method comprising:

10 a) obtaining customer identification information for  
11 identifying a customer to be served at the weigh station;

12 b) storing a plurality of customer profiles for a plurality  
13 of customers wherein each customer in the plurality of  
14 customers has an associated customer profile; and,

15 c) when the customer is in the plurality of customers,  
16 retrieving the associated customer profile for the customer  
17 using the customer identification information and providing  
18 associated customer-specific information based on the  
19 associated customer profile to a weigh station display, wherein  
20 the associated customer profile comprises, for each customer in  
21 the plurality of customers, a unique associated customer  
22 identifier, the customer-specific information comprises  
23 associated reward information, and the associated reward  
24 information specifies at least one of an associated coupon and  
25 an associated discount to be provided to the customer.

26

27

## THE REJECTIONS

28

The Examiner relies upon the following prior art:

McCall et al. US 6,321,984 Nov. 27, 2001

29

Peter Bacque, *Weighty Issue High-Tech Checks Let Truckers Pass  
30 Inspection Quickly*, Richmond Times Dispatch, January 11, 2001, at C1.

31



- 1           01. Bacque is directed to an intelligent transportation system  
2           (Bacque 1:1).
- 3           02. The system comprises radio transponders to identify trucks, in-  
4           pavement electromagnetic sensors, high-speed weigh-in-motion  
5           scales set into the pavement, and a computerized vehicle database  
6           (Bacque 2:1). The database indicates to station operators whether  
7           a truck's credentials/taxes are paid and the safety record of the  
8           company running the truck (Bacque 2:2). If a truck gets a clean  
9           bill of health, the in-cab notification antenna messages the truck's  
10          transponder to signal for a green light (Bacque 3:4). If the truck is  
11          overweight or if taxes for the truck have not been paid, the  
12          transponder signals for a red light (Bacque 3:5).
- 13          03. As trucks approach the weigh station, an antenna reads the  
14          truck's two-way radio transponder and identifies the truck's  
15          transponder's unique serial number like the Virginia Smart Tag  
16          toll collection system (Bacque 2:4). The truck meanwhile runs  
17          over the weigh-in-motion scale to collect the weight of the truck  
18          and the transponder identification is associated to the collected  
19          weight (Bacque 2:5-6).

20          *McCall*

- 21          04. McCall is directed to a promotional system utilized in  
22          conjunction with a fuel dispenser that will allow promotional  
23          discounts and other marketing type offerings to be provided to a  
24          consumer based on the customer's purchasing habits (McCall  
25          1:13-17).



1 particular machine or apparatus, or (2) it transforms a particular article into a  
2 different state or thing.” *Id.* at 954 (citations omitted). The court explained  
3 that “the use of a specific machine or transformation of an article must  
4 impose meaningful limits on the claim’s scope to impart patent-eligibility”  
5 and “the involvement of the machine or transformation in the claimed  
6 process must not merely be insignificant extra-solution activity.” *Id.* at 961-  
7 62 (citations omitted).

### 8 *Obviousness*

9 A claimed invention is unpatentable if the differences between it and  
10 the prior art are “such that the subject matter as a whole would have been  
11 obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill  
12 in the art.” *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 406 (2007); *Graham*  
13 *v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 13-14 (1966).

14 In *Graham*, the Court held that that the obviousness analysis is  
15 bottomed on several basic factual inquiries: “[1] the scope and content of  
16 the prior art are to be determined; [2] differences between the prior art and  
17 the claims at issue are to be ascertained; and [3] the level of ordinary skill  
18 in the pertinent art resolved.” *Graham*, 383 U.S. at 17. *See also KSR*, 550  
19 U.S. at 406. “The combination of familiar elements according to known  
20 methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable  
21 results.” *KSR*, 550 U.S. at 416.

1 ANALYSIS

2 *Claims 17, 19-24, and 26-29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being*  
3 *directed towards non-statutory subject matter*

4 The Examiner found that claims 17, 19-24, and 26-29 recite a method  
5 claim of purely mental steps, not tied to another statutory class. Ans. 2-3.  
6 The Appellants contend the claimed method recites the steps of providing  
7 customer information to the weigh station display, where customer  
8 information is associated with reward information that specifies a coupon to  
9 be provided to the customer and that these steps cannot be performed purely  
10 mentally since there is no way to provide a coupon without the coupon being  
11 physically inputted into the weigh station display. Reply Br. 8.

12 We agree with the Appellants. Claims 17, 19-24, and 26-29 recite  
13 process or method steps that must be evaluated under the threshold machine-  
14 or-transformation test set forth in *Bilski*. See *Bilski*, 545 F.3d at 954.  
15 Independent claim 17 recites a method for providing information to a weigh  
16 station. Claim 17 further requires that the weigh station include a weigh  
17 scale and a weigh station display, where customer specific information is  
18 provided to the weigh station display. That is, claim 17 recites a manner of  
19 entering data to a weigh station and displaying the inputted information. As  
20 such, claim 17 requires a specific structure that captures, stores, and displays  
21 specific data. This specific structure ties the recited method to a particular  
22 machine, in that the method recites how to operate a weigh station with a  
23 weigh station display. Since there is a particular machine required, claim 17  
24 satisfies the machine prong of the machine-or-transformation test and the  
25 transformation prong need not be evaluated.

1        Thus, we cannot say that claims 17, 19-24, and 26-29 should be rejected  
2 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject  
3 matter. We appreciate the Examiner's analysis and identifying the issues for  
4 us in this instance. This is one of those cases where looking at the claim as a  
5 whole may lead to a different conclusion than analysis of the parts.

6

7                    *Claims 1, 3-11, 13-17, 19-24, and 26-29 rejected under 35 U.S.C.*  
8                    *§ 103(a) as unpatentable over Bacque and McCall*

9        The Appellants contend that there is no valid reason that would have  
10 prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the  
11 elements, as per claims 1, 3-8, 13, and 16. *See App. Br. 11-13 and Reply Br.*  
12 *6-7.* The Appellants further contend that there is no reason to look to  
13 McCall to modify Bacque to include the feature recited in claim 9 and its  
14 dependent claims 10 and 11. *App. Br. 14-15.*

15        We agree with the Appellants. Bacque is concerned with a weigh station  
16 system that collects weight information as truck operators pass through the  
17 weigh station. FF 01-03. Bacque fails to describe coupon or reward  
18 information to be provided to the customer, as acknowledged by the  
19 Examiner. Ans. 6. The Examiner looks to McCall to describe this feature.  
20 Ans. 6. Although McCall does describe coupon and reward information  
21 based on customer specific transaction history (FF 04-05), McCall is not  
22 concerned with any aspect of a weigh station or weigh station display.  
23 Furthermore, McCall does not attempt to solve any problem that would be  
24 associated with the input, computation, and display of any customer specific  
25 information as it relates to an intelligent weigh station system. Therefore, a

1 person with ordinary skill in the art would not look to McCall to describe  
2 reward and coupon information when considering solutions to weigh station  
3 problems. As such, there is no evidence to support the combination of  
4 Bacque and McCall, and the Examiner failed to establish a prima facie case  
5 of obviousness. While the Examiner set the issue up well for us, in this case,  
6 we must conclude that the reasons the Examiner articulated were based  
7 solely on impermissible hindsight. The idea of applying promotional  
8 techniques generally used in commercial sales transactions to modifying  
9 behavior in the use of a weigh station requires more creativity than one of  
10 ordinary skill would generally exhibit.

11 Since this issue is dispositive as to the rejections against these claims, we  
12 need not reach the remaining arguments raised by the Appellants against  
13 these rejections.

14 Thus, we cannot say that claims 1, 3-11, 13-17, 19-24, and 26-29 should  
15 be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Bacque and  
16 McCall. As with the first rejection, we appreciate the Examiner's analysis  
17 and identifying the issues for us in this instance. Again, this is one of those  
18 cases where looking at the claim as a whole leads to a different conclusion  
19 than analysis of the parts.

20

21

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

22 Claims 17, 19-24, and 26-29 are directed to a statutory method under 35  
23 U.S.C. § 101.

1        Claims 1, 3-11, 13-17, 19-24, and 26-29 are not unpatentable under 35  
2 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Bacque and McCall.

3

4

#### DECISION

5        To summarize, our decision is as follows.

- 6        • The rejection of claims 17, 19-24, and 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as  
7        being directed towards non-statutory subject matter is not sustained.
- 8        • The rejection of claims 1, 3-11, 13-17, 19-24, and 26-29 under 35  
9        U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Bacque and McCall is not  
10       sustained.

11

12

13

#### REVERSED

14

15

16

17       mev

18

19       Address

20       BERESKIN AND PARR LLP/S.E.N.C.R.L., s.r.l.  
21       40 KING STREET WEST  
22       BOX 401  
23       TORONTO ON M5H 3Y2 CA CANADA