

Exhibit 2

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

I. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

II. Claims 1,5-8,10,11,15-18,20,21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Apperson et al.

As per claims 1,11,21, and 22, Apperson et al discloses of providing executable code (downloadable) with privilege request code that indicates (fetches) a set of privileges or privilege categories that the executable code (downloadable) may try to perform on the client machine (one or more references to a component). The distributing authority digitally signs (performs a function) the executable code and the privilege request code and provides a certificate (generated downloadable ID) that can be traced by a client to a known certifying authority (col. 2, lines 43-53). Also recited by Apperson et al of providing executable code (downloadable) with privilege request code that indicates (fetches) a set of privileges or privilege categories (first and all components referenced) that the executable code (downloadable) may try to perform on the client machine (one or more references to a component)(col. 2, lines 43-47). The teachings of Apperson et al are silent in disclosing that the executable code (downloadable) does not include any references. The examiner hereby asserts that it is obvious for the teachings of Apperson et al to make use of this feature. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to include or exclude components in executable code (downloadable). The governing factor would be the intent of the executable code (downloadable) and