

have amended the claim consistent with how appellant wants the claim to be interpreted. “An essential purpose of patent examination is to fashion claims that are precise, clear, correct, and unambiguous. Only in this way can uncertainties of claim scope be removed, as much as possible, during the administrative process.” In re Zletz, F.2d 893 at 322, 13 USPQ2d at 1322.

Ellis teaches that the PCs that provide processing power may reside on home network systems (e.g., col. 17, ll. 22-40). Given the examiner’s broad but reasonable interpretation of instant claim 1, Ellis provides support for the examiner’s finding of anticipation.

Moreover, Ellis at column 8, line 59 through column 9, line 20 describes the types of computers that may be considered PCs in the context of the disclosure. The personal computers are described as including “network computers,” which would seem to include both of conventional server and client computers on the home network systems described elsewhere in Ellis. In this regard, we note that appellant’s disclosed Home Network Server 101 is “of conventional design.” (Spec. ¶ 23.)

While Ellis is not purported to teach providing the processing services of PC servers for home network systems to the exclusion of PC clients on the systems, we observe that instant claim 1 does not preclude access to the resources of client PCs on a home network.