		AND TRADEMARK OFFICE	UNITED STATES DEPAR United States Patent and ' Address: COMMISSIONER F P. O.Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 223 www.uspto.gov	Trademark Office OR PATENTS
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/249,202	03/21/2003	Roman Chistyakov	ZON-009	7335
			EXAMINER	
RAUSCHENBACH PATENT LAW GROUP, LLC			VO, TUYET THI	
P.O. BOX 387 BEDFORD, M	IA 01730		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2821	
			DATE MAILED: 02/11/200	4

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

GILLETTE 1008

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKE.

Δ

R

М

Δ

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/249,202	CHISTYAKOV, ROMAN
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit
		Tuyet Vo	2821
Period for		nication appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address
THE N - Extens after S - If the p - If NO p - Failure Any re	AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN sions of time may be available under the provision IX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this com- beriod for reply specified above is less than thirty (beriod for reply is specified above, the maximum s a to reply within the set or extended period for repl	is of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a imunication. (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of th	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. INTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) fil	led on 21 March 2003.	
-		2b)⊠ This action is non-final.	
3)	Since this application is in conditior	n for allowance except for formal ma	tters, prosecution as to the merits is
(closed in accordance with the prac	tice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Dispositio	on of Claims		
4)🛛 (Claim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are pending in the	application.	
-	a) Of the above claim(s) is/a		
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)🛛	Claim(s) <u>1-5,7,10-15,17-20,24-27,2</u>	29-32,34-37 and 39-42 is/are rejected	d.
	Claim(s) <u>6,8,9,16,21-23,28,33 and</u>		
	Claim(s) are subject to restr		
Applicatio	on Papers		
9)[] Т	he specification is objected to by the	he Examiner.	
10)🛛 T	he drawing(s) filed on 21 March 20	<u>203</u> is/are: a)⊟ accepted or b)⊠ ot	pjected to by the Examiner.
,	Applicant may not request that any obje	ection to the drawing(s) be held in abeya	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
I	Replacement drawing sheet(s) includin	g the correction is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)🗌 T	he oath or declaration is objected	to by the Examiner. Note the attache	ed Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) 🗌 A	kcknowledgment is made of a claim	n for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)[All b) Some * c) None of:		
		y documents have been received.	
		y documents have been received in a	
:		s of the priority documents have been	n received in this National Stage
		onal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
* Se	ee the attached detailed Office action	on for a list of the certified copies no	t received.
Attachment(s)		
I) 🛛 Notice	of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)
2) 🗌 Notice	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 o		(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
·			

Application/Control Number: 10/249,202 Art Unit: 2821

DOCKE

RM

Page 2

DETAIL ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the electron gun must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claims 7 and 20. No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 42 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 42, line 1, replace "elections" with –electrons—for correcting an typographical error or any appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1- 5, 7, 11-15, 17-20, 25-27, 29-32, 34, 35, 37, 39 and 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bertrand et al. (US Pat. 6,661,178), hereinafter Bertrand.

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Application/Control Number: 10/249,202 Art Unit: 2821

Regarding claims 30-32, 34, 35, 37, 39 and 40-42, Bertrand discloses an apparatus as well as a method for generating plasma with a multiple step ionization process comprising:

means (120, 122) for generating a volume of metastable atoms from a volume of ground state atoms (rare gas 115) and means (125, 150) for raising an energy of the metastable atoms so that at least a portion of the volume of metastable atoms is ionized, thereby generating a plasma with multiple step ionization process (col. 5, lines 31-67 and col. 6, lines 1-7), wherein means (160, 170) for trapping electrons and ions in the volume of metastable atoms.

Regarding claims 1- 5, 7, 11, 18-20 and 25, Bertrand disclose a plasma generator that generates plasma with a multi-step ionization process, comprising:

a feed argon gas source (115) comprising ground state atoms;

an excited/metastable atoms source (120, 122) that is coupled to the feed gas source, the excited/metastable atoms source generating excited atoms from the ground state atoms;

a plasma chamber (170) that is coupled to the excited/metastable atoms source, the chamber confining a volume of excited/metastable atoms generated from the excited/metastable atoms source and

an energy source (125, 150) that coupled to the volume of excited/metastable atoms source for raising an energy of excited/metastable atoms in the volume of excited/metastable atoms is ionized, thereby generating a plasma with a multi-step ionization process, wherein the excited/metastable atoms source comprises a first electrode (125) and a second electrode (150) for generating a discharge that excited the ground state atoms. The excited/metastable atoms source is position outside of the plasma chamber.

Regarding claims 12-15,17, 26, 27 and 29, Bertrand further discloses the excited/metastable atoms generated by the excited/metastable atoms source have a lower ionization energy compared with an ionization energy of the ground state atoms (col. 4); wherein the energy source is chosen from the AC discharge source (Fig. 5). The plasma generated with the multi-step process inherently has a higher plasma density than the plasma that is generated by direct ionization of the ground state atoms.

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Application/Control Number: 10/249,202 Art Unit: 2821

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. 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.

6. Claims 10, 24 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 03(a) as being unpatentable over Bertrand.

Bertrand discloses substantially the claim language except for followings:

the excited atoms source is position inside the plasma chamber and raising the energy of the metastable atoms through X-ray radiation.

It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to assembly the excited atoms source inside of the plasma for spacing benefit, wherein the excited atoms can be exposed under any power source such as X-ray radiation for raising higher energy as long as it suited. Such implementation is considered as a routine skill in the art.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 6, 8, 9, 16, 21-23, 28, 33, 38 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims including any correction for overcome the 112 rejection as noted above.

15.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior fails to disclose a magnet that generates a magnetic field for trapping electrons proximate to the ground state atoms, so as to increase the rate to generate the excited atoms from the ground state as required in claims 6, 22, 33 or increase the rate to generate the higher density of excited atoms from the different pressure of the plasma chamber and the excited atoms source as

DOCKET A L A R M



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.