



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/449,413	05/24/95	HARVEY	5634.170

021967
HUNTON AND WILLIAMS
1900 K STREET N.W.
WASHINGTON DC 20006

PHILLIPS

EXAMINER
LUTHER, D

ART UNIT
2699

PAPER NUMBER
16

DATE MAILED: 01/18/01

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

Commissioner of Patents and Trademark

Notice of Abandonment

Application No.
08/449,413

Applicant(s)
Harvey et al

Examiner
William Luther

Group Art Unit
2699



This application is abandoned in view of:

- applicant's failure to timely file a proper response to the Office letter mailed on _____.
- A response (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission of _____) was received on _____, which is after the expiration of the period for response (including a total extension of time of _____ month(s)) which expired on _____.
- A proposed response was received on _____, but it does not constitute a proper response to the final rejection.
(A proper response to a final rejection consists only of: a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; a Notice of Appeal; or the filing of a continuing application under 37 CFR 1.62 (FWC)).
- No response has been received.
- applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee within the statutory period of three months from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance.
- The issue fee (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission of _____) was received on _____.
- The submitted issue fee of \$ _____ is insufficient. The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$ _____.
- The issue fee has not been received.
- applicant's failure to timely file new formal drawings as required in the Notice of Allowability.
- Proposed new formal drawings (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission of _____) were received on _____.
- The proposed new formal drawings filed _____ are not acceptable.
- No proposed new formal drawings have been received.
- the express abandonment under 37 CFR 1.62(g) in favor of the FWC application filed on _____.
- the letter of express abandonment which is signed by the attorney or agent of record, the assignee of the entire interest, or all of the applicants.
- the letter of express abandonment which is signed by an attorney or agent (acting in a representative capacity under 37 CFR 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application.
- the decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences rendered on _____ and because the period for seeking court review of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claims.
- the reason(s) below:
See attached.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	vi
1. BACKGROUND: THE PORTFOLIO	1
a. <u>The Primary Examiner Reserves the Right to Provide Further Information</u> <u>Regarding Applicants' Course of Conduct</u>	3
2. STATEMENT OF PUBLIC INTEREST	4
a. <u>Applicants' Targets: Courts, Industry, and Licensees</u>	4
3. THE LEGAL MYTH	7
4. FINAL NOTICE OF NON-RESPONSIVE AMENDMENT	9
a. <u>Initial Notice from the Primary Examiner</u>	10
b. <u>Between September 1996 and October 1997, Applicants Relied Primarily on the</u> <u>1981 Specification, Contrary to the Requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 120</u>	10
c. <u>Applicants Were Notified In Court As to the Proper Specification Under</u> <u>35 U.S.C. § 120. Furthermore, Applicants Failed to Bring Such</u> <u>Notification to the Attention of the U.S.P.T.O., Contrary to M.P.E.P.</u> <u>2001.06(c)</u>	11

d.	<u>Applicants' Pattern of Improperly Identifying the Wrong Written Description In the Current Prosecution Began On or After Applicants Received Repeach for Improper Identification of Written Description In Court</u>	13
e.	<u>The Principal Counsel's Parenthetical Remarks in Application No. 08/113,329 Misinterpret In Re Bauman</u>	13
f.	<u>Applicants Have Misled the U.S.P.T.O. In Other Instances</u>	14
g.	<u>Applicants Received Prior Notice in Court that Any Lapse By The Examiner Does Not Exculpate Counsel</u>	15
h.	<u>1995: The Weather Channel Litigation, The Doctrine of Laches, Inequitable Conduct and The Principal Counsel</u>	17
i.	<u>Applicants' Overall Conduct Has Caused Unjustifiable and Prejudicial Delay in Prosecution</u>	18
	i. <u>The Number of Claims Filed By Applicants Is Unwarranted</u>	19
	ii. <u>I.D.S. References Are Inappropriate and Irrelevant</u>	19
	iii. <u>Applicants' Preliminary Amendment Submissions Were Untimely. Furthermore, Applicants' Counsel's Request To Delay Prosecution Was Unreasonable</u>	20
	iv. <u>Applicants Have Filed Substantially Duplicate Claims in Different Applications. Furthermore, Applicants Failed to Make a Good Faith Effort, Contrary to M.P.E.P. 2001.06(b)</u>	20
	v. <u>Interview of June 16, 1999</u>	22
	(1) <u>Applicants' Principal Counsel Threatened to Seek a Writ of</u>	

	<u>Mandamus</u>	22
	(2) <u>Applicants Consistently Violated M.P.E.P. 2001.06(b)</u>	24
	(3) <u>DIRECTV “Overlays” Appear to Have Been a Target</u>	25
vi.	<u>Applicants have Acted Contrary to 37 C.F.R. § 10.85(a)(4),(5), and (6)</u>	26
	(1) <u>Applicants have Misguided the Examining Corps</u>	27
vii.	<u>Applicants Did Not Possess The Claimed Invention</u>	28
	(1) <u>Applicants Did Not Possess Downloading Software</u>	29
viii.	<u>Applicants Failed to Timely Complete the Alleged Consolidation Agreement</u>	31
5.	<u>APPLICANTS MAY EITHER OWE FEES, OR BE DUE A REFUND</u>	31
	a. <u>Applicants Have Perpetuated Small/Large Entity Confusion</u>	31
	b. <u>There Are No Apparent Differences in Subject Matter for Large/Small Inventions</u>	32
	c. <u>Applicants’ Subject Matter Groupings Do Not Appear to Justify a Fee Discrepancy</u>	32
	d. <u>The Payment Record Demonstrates Discrepancies Within the Same Grouping</u> .	33
	e. <u>Erroneous Fee Payments Would Violate the Alleged Agreement to Consolidate</u>	34
	f. <u>Applicants’ Counsel Has Been Aware of Fee Discrepancies Since 1995</u>	34
	i. <u>Applicants Were Required to Update Small Entity Status</u>	34

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.