

# Exhibit L

Attorney's Docket No.: FIN0008-DIV1 *PATENT*

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In Re Patent Application of:	)	
	)	Examiner: Ponnoreay Pich
David Gruzman	)	
Yuval Ben-Itzhak	)	Art Unit: 2435
	)	
Application No: 12/814,584	)	
	)	
Filed: June 14, 2010	)	
	)	
For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR	)	
INSPECTING DYNAMICALLY	)	
GENERATED EXECUTABLE	)	
CODE	)	
	)	

Mail Stop AMENDMENT  
Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

**UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111**

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated June 28, 2011,  
applicants respectfully request that the above-identified application be  
amended as follows.

*"a transmitter for transmitting **the input** to the security computer for inspection, **when the first function is invoked**", and*

*"a receiver for receiving an indicator from the security computer whether it is safe to invoke **the second function** with **the input**"*

are neither shown nor suggested in Albrecht.

In rejecting claim **1** on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has cited Albrecht, paragraphs [0047] – [0049] as disclosing all of the above features. Applicants respectfully submit that none of the emphasized features are shown or suggested in Albrecht, as evidenced by the following arguments. MPEP 2143.03 states that

"All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CPA 1970).

**I. Albrecht does not show or suggest the claimed invocation of a first function.**

Indeed, invocation of the electronic files, as interpreted in the framework of Albrecht, is performed at clients 2 of FIG. 1, whereas paragraphs [0047] – [0049] of Albrecht relate to protected systems 4 and virus scanning server 7 of FIG. 1. Neither of these latter computers actually invokes the electronic files.

In distinction, the claimed content processor invokes the first function.

**II. Albrecht does not show or suggest the claimed transmitting an input of a first function to a security computer.**

<b>Notice of Allowability</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	12/814,584	GRUZMAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	PONNOREAY PICH	2435	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--**

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to 10/5/11.

2. ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.

3. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 1-12.

4. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some\*    c) ☐ None    of the:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.  
**THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.**

5. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.

6. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS ( as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.

(a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review ( PTO-948) attached

1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_.

(b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_.

**Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).**

7. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

**Attachment(s)**

1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08), Paper No./Mail Date ____ 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material	5. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413), Paper No./Mail Date ____ 7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Amendment/Comment 8. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance 9. <input type="checkbox"/> Other ____
--	---

/Ponnoreay Pich/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2435	
---	--

Application/Control Number: 12/814,584  
Art Unit: 2435

Page 4

11. (currently amended) The non-transitory computer-readable storage medium of claim 10 wherein the program code causes the computer device to dynamically generate the input variable prior to transmitting the input variable for inspection.

12. (currently amended) The non-transitory computer-readable storage medium of claim 10 wherein the input variable includes a call to an additional function, and wherein the modified input variable includes a call to a modified additional function instead of the call to the additional function.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: Claims 1 and 3 are allowed over the prior art because applicant's arguments submitted on 10/5/11 were persuasive. Claim 6 is allowed over the prior art because the prior art does not teach modification of the input variable after the security computer determines calling a function with the input variable may not be safe and the modified input variable being used to call a second function. In a typical prior art anti-virus system and method, if an input variable is determined to not be safe, the input variable is either deleted or quarantined rather than be used to call another function after some sort of modification to the input variable. Claim 10 is allowed for similar reasons as claim 6. The remaining claims are allowed over the prior art due to dependency.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably