



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.
13/509,873	06/11/2012	Duncan P. Bathe	3000-US-0026(IKA0011-00US	8620
48394	7590	05/23/2013	EXAMINER	
SERVILLA WHITNEY LLC 33 WOOD AVE SOUTH SECOND FLOOR, SUITE 210 ISELIN, NJ 08830			TSAI, MICHAEL JASPER	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3771	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/23/2013	ELECTRONIC

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.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket@dsiplaw.com
jescobar@dsiplaw.com
lmurphy@dsiplaw.com

Applicant-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 13/509,873	Applicant(s) BATHE ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael Tsai	Art Unit 3771	

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

- (1) Michael Tsai. (3) Rory Alegria.
(2) Justine Yu. (4) Erika Senska.

Date of Interview: 14 May 2013.

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: 2,4,5,7 and 9.

Identification of prior art discussed: Peters et al. (7,114,510), Zaitso et al. (2002/0013551), Fine (2011/0240019).

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...)

See Continuation Sheet.

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

/Michael Tsai/
Examiner, Art Unit 3771

/Justine R Yu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3771

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant provided an explained that the communication of the valve and the control module is meant to act as a safety mechanism to ensure that the proper gas is being delivered to a patient. Applicant further explained that the device claimed is able to communicate with each other frequently to ensure the proper gas and concentrations are being distributed by the control module. Applicant argued that the Peters reference disclosed a valve that communicated billing information and tracked patient treatment and provided no safety feature. Applicant further argued that the valve of Peters did not communicate with a control module that directly provided gas to a patient. However, Examiner noted that the Peters reference was able to track the treatment and send information to a main computer which in turn allows for the development of treatment protocols and that ventilators are known to have computers. Additionally, Examiner noted that the Peters reference disclosed the gas data stored and transmitted by the memory included gas identification (col.5, lines 45-55). No agreement was reached regarding whether or not Peters disclosed the communication of gas data to a control module. However, Examiner proposed to Applicants to amend the claims to specifically recite the functional language of the control module and the valve to have two way communication for automatically detecting whether or not the correct gas is being distributed to the patient in order to further define the claimed invention over the applied art. Applicant agreed to make amendments to the claims to include the functional language of the two way communication of the valve and the control module. Applicant proposed to amend the second instances of "a control module" in claim 7 and 9 to overcome the 112, second paragraph rejection stated in the office action mailed 3/15/2013. Examiner agreed that such an amendment would overcome the 112, second paragraph rejection. Additionally, Applicant agreed to file a terminal disclaimer for the present application in order to overcome the double patenting rejection as stated in the office action mailed 3/15/2013. Applicant further provided a proposed replacement sheet (see attachment) in order to overcome the drawing objections to FIG. 1. Examiner noted that the labeling of the boxes as shown on the proposed replacement sheet for FIG 1 would overcome the drawing objections, but there was an additional box within the control module that appeared to be unlabeled. Applicant took note of the additional unlabeled box and agreed to further amend FIG. 1.