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.
90/010,422	02/26/2009	6,009,469	2655-0185	6565

42624 7590 08/25/2009

DAVIDSON BERQUIST JACKSON & GOWDEY LLP
4300 WILSON BLVD., 7TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2009

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

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

DO NOT USE IN PALM PRINTER

(THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS)

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY

SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

MAILED

AUG 25 2009

CENTRAL REEXAMINATION UNIT

EX PARTE REEXAMINATION COMMUNICATION TRANSMITTAL FORM

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NO. *90/010,422*.

PATENT NO. *6,009,469*.

ART UNIT *3992*.

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above identified *ex parte* reexamination proceeding (37 CFR 1.550(f)).

Where this copy is supplied after the reply by requester, 37 CFR 1.535, or the time for filing a reply has passed, no submission on behalf of the *ex parte* reexamination requester will be acknowledged or considered (37 CFR 1.550(g)).

Office Action in Ex Parte Reexamination	Control No. 90/010,422	Patent Under Reexamination 6,009,469	
	Examiner ALEXANDER J. KOSOWSKI	Art Unit 3992	

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

a☒ Responsive to the communication(s) filed on *26 February 2009* . b☐ This action is made FINAL.
c☒ A statement under 37 CFR 1.530 has not been received from the patent owner.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 2 month(s) from the mailing date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in termination of the proceeding and issuance of an *ex parte* reexamination certificate in accordance with this action. 37 CFR 1.550(d). **EXTENSIONS OF TIME ARE GOVERNED BY 37 CFR 1.550(c).** If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.

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

1. ☐ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. ☒ Information Disclosure Statement, PTO/SB/08.
3. ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-474.
4. ☐ ___.

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1a. ☒ Claims *1-3,5,6,8,9 and 14-18* are subject to reexamination.
1b. ☒ Claims *4,7 and 10-13* are not subject to reexamination.
2. ☐ Claims ___have been canceled in the present reexamination proceeding.
3. ☐ Claims ___are patentable and/or confirmed.
4. ☒ Claims *1-3, 5-6, 8-9, 14-18* are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims ___are objected to.
6. ☐ The drawings, filed on ___are acceptable.
7. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on ___has been (7a) ☐ approved (7b)☐ disapproved.
8. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of the priority claim under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a)☐ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None of the certified copies have
   1☐ been received.
   2☐ not been received.
   3☐ been filed in Application No. ___.
   4☐ been filed in reexamination Control No. ___.
   5☐ been received by the International Bureau in PCT application No. ___.
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
9. ☐ Since the proceeding appears to be in condition for issuance of an *ex parte* reexamination certificate except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte* Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
10. ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1) This Office action addresses claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-9, 14-18 of United States Patent Number 6,009,469 (Mattaway et al), for which it has been determined in the Order Granting Ex Parte Reexamination (hereafter the "Order") mailed 3/13/09 that a substantial new question of patentability was raised in the Request for *Ex Parte* reexamination filed on 2/26/09 (hereafter the "Request"). Claims 4, 7, 10-13 are not subject to reexamination.

IDS

2) With regard to the IDS filed 6/11/09:

Where the IDS citations are submitted but not described, the examiner is only responsible for cursorily reviewing the references. The initials of the examiner on the PTO-1449 indicate only that degree of review unless the reference is either applied against the claims, or discussed by the examiner as pertinent art of interest, in a subsequent office action. See Guidelines for Reexamination of Cases in View of In re Portola Packaging, Inc., 110 F.3d 786, 42 USPQ2d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 1997), 64 FR at 15347, 1223 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 125 (response to comment 6).

Consideration by the examiner of the information submitted in an IDS means that the examiner will consider the documents in the same manner as other documents in Office search files are considered by the examiner while conducting a search of the prior art in a proper field of search. The initials of the examiner placed adjacent to the citations on the PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08A and 08B or its equivalent mean that the information has been considered by the examiner to the extent noted above. MPEP § 609 (Eighth Edition, Rev. 5, August 2006).

Regarding IDS submissions MPEP 2256 recites the following: "Where patents, publications, and other such items of information are submitted by a party (patent owner or requester) in compliance with the requirements of the rules, the requisite degree of consideration to be given to such information will be normally limited by the degree to which the party filing the information citation has explained the content and relevance of the information."

Accordingly, the IDS submissions have been considered by the Examiner only with the scope required by MPEP 2256.

With regard to the IDS's filed 8/11/09 and 8/12/09:

These IDS's have been given due consideration. However, that which are not either prior art patents or prior art printed publications have been crossed out so as not to appear reprinted on the front page of the patent.

Rejections

3) The following three rejections are utilized by the examiner below, referencing the proposed prior art listed on pages 4-6 of the Request:

Issue 1: Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-9, 14-18 in view of NetBIOS, RFC 1531, Pinard and VocalChat User's Guide.

Issue 2: Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-9, 14-18 in view of Etherphone, Vin, RFC 1531, Pinard and VocalChat User's Guide.

Issue 3: Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-9, 14-18 in view of VocalChat, RFC 1531 and Pinard.

Claim Rejection Paragraphs

4) ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

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 negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Issue 1

5) Claims 1-3 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by NetBIOS, further in view of RFC 1531.

Referring to **(Claim 1)**, NetBIOS teaches a computer program product for use with a computer system having a display, the computer system capable of executing a first process and connecting to other processes and a server process over a computer network (NetBIOS, pg. 356,

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.