

First, we note that appellant's definition of "server" appears to be limited to local area networks and how a server may be implemented on that particular network type. Ellis provides evidence, however, that the artisan did not consider the term "server" to be limited to local area networks. See, e.g., Ellis at col. 22, ll. 30-37 (servers operated by Internet Service Providers).

Second, and more important, the present inquiry relates to the broadest reasonable interpretation of "server" consistent with the specification, rather than how the term might be more commonly used in the art. Both the broader definition offered by the examiner and the narrower definition offered by appellant appear to be consistent with appellant's specification. We cannot discard the broader meaning in favor of the narrower. Claims are to be given their broadest reasonable interpretation during prosecution, and the scope of a claim cannot be narrowed by reading disclosed limitations into the claim. See In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027 (Fed. Cir. 1997); In re Zletz, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989); In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404, 162 USPQ 541, 550 (CCPA 1969). Our reviewing court has repeatedly warned against confining the claims to specific embodiments described in the specification. Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303, 1323, 75 USPQ2d 1321, 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc).

Instant claim 1 does not recite the functions of the home network server, but only its location (i.e., in a subscriber's home). The claim is thus broad enough to cover either of a server for a home network and a server on a home network. Appellant could