



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
95/001,788	10/18/2011	Victor Larson	077580-0146	5823
23630	7590	09/26/2012	EXAMINER	
McDermott Will & Emery 600 13th Street, NW Washington, DC 20005-3096			FOSTER, ROLAND G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3992	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/26/2012	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



**DO NOT USE IN PALM PRINTER**

(THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS)

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
717 NORTH HARWOOD  
SUITE 3400  
DALLAS, TX 75201

**Transmittal of Communication to Third Party Requester  
*Inter Partes* Reexamination**

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NUMBER 95/001,788.

PATENT NUMBER LARSON ET AL.

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3900.

ART UNIT 3992.

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above-identified reexamination proceeding. 37 CFR 1.903.

Prior to the filing of a Notice of Appeal, each time the patent owner responds to this communication, the third party requester of the *inter partes* reexamination may once file written comments within a period of 30 days from the date of service of the patent owner's response. This 30-day time period is statutory (35 U.S.C. 314(b)(2)), and, as such, it cannot be extended. See also 37 CFR 1.947.

If an *ex parte* reexamination has been merged with the *inter partes* reexamination, no responsive submission by any *ex parte* third party requester is permitted.

**All correspondence** relating to this *inter partes* reexamination proceeding should be directed to the **Central Reexamination Unit** at the mail, FAX, or hand-carry addresses given at the end of the communication enclosed with this transmittal.

<b>ACTION CLOSING PROSECUTION (37 CFR 1.949)</b>	Control No.	Patent Under Reexamination
	95/001,788	LARSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	ROLAND FOSTER	3992

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

**Responsive to the communication(s) filed by:**

Patent Owner on 29 March, 2012

Third Party(ies) on 25 June, 2012

Patent owner may once file a submission under 37 CFR 1.951(a) within 2 month(s) from the mailing date of this Office action. Where a submission is filed, third party requester may file responsive comments under 37 CFR 1.951(b) within 30-days (not extendable- 35 U.S.C. § 314(b)(2)) from the date of service of the initial submission on the requester. **Appeal cannot be taken from this action.** Appeal can only be taken from a Right of Appeal Notice under 37 CFR 1.953.

**All correspondence** relating to this inter partes reexamination proceeding should be directed to the **Central Reexamination Unit** at the mail, FAX, or hand-carry addresses given at the end of this Office action.

**PART I. THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:**

1.  Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892
2.  Information Disclosure Citation, PTO/SB/08
3.  \_\_\_\_\_

**PART II. SUMMARY OF ACTION:**

- 1a.  Claims 1-60 are subject to reexamination.
- 1b.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are not subject to reexamination.
2.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ have been canceled.
3.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are confirmed. [Unamended patent claims]
4.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are patentable. [Amended or new claims]
5.  Claims 1-60 are rejected.
6.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are objected to.
7.  The drawings filed on \_\_\_\_\_  are acceptable  are not acceptable.
8.  The drawing correction request filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is:  approved.  disapproved.
9.  Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119 (a)-(d). The certified copy has:
  - been received.  not been received.  been filed in Application/Control No \_\_\_\_\_
10.  Other \_\_\_\_\_

## ACTION CLOSING PROSECUTION

### **1. Introduction**

This Office action addresses claims 1-60 of United States Patent No. 7,418,504 B2 (the "Larson" patent), for reexamination was granted in the Order Granting *Inter Partes* Reexamination (hereafter the "Order"), mailed December 29, 2011.

A non-final Office action accompanying said Order was also mailed December 29, 2011 rejecting all original claims 1-60 of the Larson patent (the "non-final Office action").

The patent owner responded by filing arguments and associated evidence on March 29, 2012 (the "Response").

The third party requester responded by filing Comments to the Patent Owner's Response on June 25, 2012 (the "Comments"). In the Comments, the third party requester responded to the patent owner's arguments.

The examiner has carefully considered the arguments and evidence provided in both the patent owner's Response and in the third party requester's Comments. Based on consideration of the entire record, the third party requester's arguments and evidence are deemed more persuasive. See the "Response to Arguments" section for further explanation. All prior rejections are

Art Unit: 3992

maintained. Accordingly, this Office action is made an “**Action Closing Prosecution.**” See 37 CFR 1.949, MPEP 2671.02. See also the “conclusion” section to this Office action.

## **2. Prior Art Rejections**

### **2.A. Issues Raised in the Request**

A total of ten references, in certain combinations, have been asserted in the Request as providing teachings relevant to the claims of the Larson patent.

Solana, E. et al., “Flexible Internet Secure Transactions Based on Collaborative Domains,” Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 1361, at 37-51 (1997), attached to the Request as Exhibit X1 (“Solana”).

U.S. Patent No. 6,557,037 to Provino, attached to the Request as Exhibit X2 (“Provino”).

U.S. Patent No. 6,496,867 to Beser, attached to the Request as Exhibit X3 (“Beser”).

Atkinson, R., IETF RFC 2230, “Key Exchange Delegation Record for the DNS,” November 1997, attached to the Request as Exhibit X4 (“RFC 2230”).

Eastlake, D. et al., IETF RFC 2538, “Storing Certificates in the Domain Name System (DNS),” March 1999, attached to the Request as Exhibit X5 (“RFC 2538”).

Kent, S. et al., IETF RFC 2401, “Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol,” November 1998, attached to the Request as Exhibit X6 (“RFC 2401”).

Eastlake, D. et al., IETF RFC 2064, “Domain Name System Security Extensions,” January 1997, attached to the Request as Exhibit X7 (“RFC 2065”).

Postel, J. et al., IETF RFC 920, “Domain Requirements,” October 1984, attached to the Request as Exhibit X8 (“RFC 920”).

Guttman, E. et al., IETF RFC 2504, “Users’ Security Handbook,” February 1999, attached to the Request as Exhibit X9 (“RFC 2504”).

# 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.