IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re: Reexam of U.S. Patent No.	Confirmation No.: 5785
8,036,988 (D'Agostino)	Group Art Unit: 3992
Control Number: 90/012,517	Examiner: Hotaling, John M.
Filed: March 15, 2011	Docket Number: 253.005

For: **System and Method for Performing Secure Credit Card Transactions**

***

Patent Owner's Response to Non-Final Rejection Mailed September 11, 2013

Mail Stop: *Ex Parte* Reexamination
Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Commissioner:

In reply to the Non-Final Rejection dated September 11, 2012, Patent Owner, John D'Agostino submits this Response and requests confirmation of all claims.

Table of Contents begins on page 2.

Listing of Claims begins on page 4.

Listing of Appendices begins on page 15.

Remarks begin on page 16.

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LISTING OF CLAIMS....4

LISTING OF APPENDICES....15

REMARKS....16

I. INITIAL REMARKS....16

A. Reexamination summary and claim status....16

B. Summary of Patent Owner initiated interview....16

C. D'Agostino explicitly referenced Cohen to the examiner for consideration....17

D. Reexamination was ordered solely on the "one or more merchants" claim language and not on the "single merchant" claim language of claims 21 and 23-30....19

II. ANALYSIS AND REBUTTAL OF CLAIM REJECTIONS....19

A. The rejection of claims 1-10 and 13-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is improper because Cohen is only available under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)....19

B. Claims 1-10 and 13-38 are not anticipated by Cohen because Cohen fails to identically teach every element of the claims....21

1. Claims 1-10, 13-20, 22, and 31-38 are not anticipated by Cohen because a particular type of charge limitation is not a merchant limitation, a merchant type limitation cannot be made before any particular merchant is identified, and one or more merchants is a finite number of merchants....22

i. A type of charge limitation is not a number of merchants limitation because it does not limit use to any number of merchants at all....23

ii. A type of charge limitation does not necessarily operate to create a merchant type limitation....23

iii. Even if Cohen discloses a merchant type limitation this limitation cannot be created before any particular merchant is identified....24

iv. It is unreasonable to interpret the one or more merchant claim language to include an entire specific industry of merchants....25

2. Claims 21 and 23-30 are not anticipated because Cohen does not disclose the single merchant limitation being included in the payment category prior to any particular merchant being identified as the single merchant....28

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

i. A one or more merchants limitation does not anticipate a single merchant limitation 29

ii. Cohen requires identification of a particular store in advance at the time of customization 30

iii. The Requester constructively conceded Cohen does not anticipate the single merchant claim language 31

C. Claims 11 and 12 are nonobvious over Cohen 32

III. CONCLUSION 32

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 34

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

LISTING OF CLAIMS

1 (original). A method of performing secure credit card purchases, said method comprising:

a) contacting a custodial authorizing entity having custodial responsibility of account parameters of a customer's account that is used to make credit card purchases;

b) supplying said custodial authorizing entity with at least account identification data of said customer's account;

c) defining at least one payment category to include at least limiting a number of transactions to one or more merchants, said one or more merchants limitation being included in said payment category prior to any particular merchant being identified as one of said one or more merchants;

d) designating said payment category;

e) generating a transaction code by a processing computer of said custodial authorizing entity, said transaction code reflecting at least the limits of said designated payment category to make a purchase within said designated payment category;

f) communicating said transaction code to a merchant to consummate a purchase within defined purchase parameters;

g) verifying that said defined purchase parameters are within said designated payment category; and

h) providing authorization for said purchase so as to confirm at least that said defined purchase parameters are within said designated payment category and to authorize payment required to complete the purchase.

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

2 (original). The method of claim 1 further comprising the step of designating at least one of said one or more merchants subsequent to generating said transaction code.

3 (original). The method of claim 1 wherein said step of communicating the transaction code to a merchant to consummate said purchase within defined purchase parameters further comprises designation of said merchant as one of said one or more merchants.

4 (original). The method of claim 1 wherein said step of generating said transaction code further comprises said customer obtaining said transaction code.

5 (original). The method of claim 1 further comprising generating a transaction code which reflects at least one of a plurality of said payment categories.

6 (original). The method of claim 1 further comprising defining at least one payment category to include amount parameters for a cost of one or more purchases.

7 (original). The method of claim 1 further comprising defining at least one payment category to include time parameters during which the purchase can be completed.

8 (original). The method of claim 1 further comprising defining at least one payment category to include limiting said transaction code to a single transaction for a purchase within a predetermined period of time.

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts

Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research

With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips

Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS
Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS
Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.