

# EXHIBIT 2029

<b>Applicant-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	11/112,990	MCNALLY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	MATTHEW BROPHY	2191	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) MATTHEW BROPHY. (3) Micheal Fabiano.  
(2) Lewis Bullock. (4) Keith McNally.

Date of Interview: 14 October 2011.

Type:  Telephonic  Video Conference  
 Personal [copy given to:  applicant  applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes  No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Issues Discussed 101 112 102 103 Others  
(For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 103-127.

Identification of prior art discussed: Cupps, Kavesky, Micros, et al.

**Substance of Interview**

(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

The Applicant, Applicant's representative, examiner and SPE met to discuss possible allowable subject matter in the case. The Applicant gave an overview of the invention and history of the case. The Applicant explained the secondary factors evidence submitted to the office as evidence of non-obviousness. The Applicant described the claim amendment made in reponse to the November 2010 interview. In the interview, the applicant described the function of the menu generation system creating cascaded graphical user interface screens which are adaptable to different sized handheld devices. The applicant explained how the secondary factors show non-obviousness. The examiners asked the applicant about several features of the invention.

**Applicant recordation instructions:** The formal written reply to the last Office action must include the substance of the interview. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, applicant is given a non-extendable period of the longer of one month or thirty days from this interview date, or the mailing date of this interview summary form, whichever is later, to file a statement of the substance of the interview

**Examiner recordation instructions:** Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recordation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

Attachment