



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.
10/162,701	06/06/2002	Xin Wang	111325-290100	6475
22204	7590	04/17/2008	EXAMINER	
NIXON PEABODY, LLP 401 9TH STREET, NW SUITE 900 WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2128			AUGUSTIN, EVENS J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3621	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/17/2008	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.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/162,701	Applicant(s) WANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Evens J. Augustin	Art Unit 3621	

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

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.
- 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance 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.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18, 28 and 29 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18, 28 and 29 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/20/08
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgements

1. This is in response to an amendment filed on 01/10/2008. Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 10-11, and 13-14 are amended. Claims 28-29 are added. Claims 1-18 and 28-29 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. The United States Patent and Trademark Office has fully considered the applicant's arguments filed on 01/10/2008, but has not found those arguments to be persuasive.

Argument 1: Downs et al., fails to disclose, teach or suggest meta-rights, which allow one or more users or devices to transfer rights or to derive new rights.

Response 1: According to the applicant's specification, meta-rights are the rights that one has to manipulate, modify, or otherwise derive other meta-rights or usage rights. Meta-rights can be thought of as secondary usage rights derived from the primary usage rights (specification, par 21). Content providers (entity(s) that supplies the content), providing (equivalent to generating) usage conditions (equivalent to usage rights) also stipulate that the content stores or distributors also have rights to add or narrow the original usage rights (meta-rights or rights derived from the initial usage rights) (column 21, lines 30-36).

Additionally, state variables can be the number of copies a user is allowed to make (column 59, line 50 or rental terms (column 59, lines 55-60). Content providers and distributors specify the number of plays and local copies allowed for the Content, and whether or not the Content may be recorded to an external portable device (state variable). Downs et al. keep track

of the content's copy/play usage and update the copy/play status (column 20, lines 43-50, column 12, lines 11-12).

Application stands finally rejected.

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 –

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States. . . .

(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 1-18 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Downs et al. (U.S 6226618) (“Downs”).

5. As per claims 1-18 and 28-29, Downs discloses an invention comprising of the following:

A. Content stores or distributors can add or narrow the original usage rights (sub-rights) (column 21, lines 30-36)

B. Content providers set and transmit (equivalent to presenting) the usage conditions to the content stores (column 21, 30-32), which are the first customers or distributors of the content providers.

C. ("obtaining a set of rights associated with an item, said set of rights including a meta-right, wherein the meta-right is provided in digital form, is enforceable by a repository-, and specifies derivable right that can be derived from exercising the meta-right by the rights consumer, a condition that must be satisfied to exercise the meta-right, and a state variable related to the condition, said derivable right being another meta-right or a usage right, whereby the meta-right is distinct from any usage rights specifying how the item can be used and distributed; determining by a repository whether the rights consumer is entitled to exercise the meta-right to derive the derivable right specified by the meta-right;") ---Distributors (first customer) making a request to digital content owners to sale digital content (column 42, lines 65-67, column 43, lines 1-2). The two parties then come to an agreement (column 43, lines 4-5). Inherently, the content provider receives the request - Content providers (entity that supplies the content), providing (equivalent to generating) usage conditions (equivalent to usage rights) - The content providers also stipulate that the content stores or distributors can add or narrow the original usage rights - state variables can be the number of copies a user is allowed to make (column 59, line 50 or rental terms (column 59, lines 55-60). Content providers and distributors specify the number of plays and local copies allowed for the Content, and whether or not the Content may be recorded to an external portable device (state variable). Downs et al. keep track of the content's copy/play usage and update the copy/play status (column 20, lines 43-50, column 12, lines 11-12)

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.