



# 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.
12/891,443	09/27/2010	Michael Tasler	0757-113189	1408
24628	7590	04/27/2012	EXAMINER	
Husch Blackwell LLP Husch Blackwell Sanders LLP Welsh & Katz 120 S RIVERSIDE PLAZA 22ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606			LEE, CHUN KUAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2181	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/27/2012	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**

<b>Application No.</b> 12/891,443	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TASLER, MICHAEL	
<b>Examiner</b> Chun-Kuan Lee	<b>Art Unit</b> 2181	

-- 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 28 December 2011.
- 2a)  This action is **FINAL**.
- 2b)  This action is non-final.
- 3)  An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4)  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**

- 5)  Claim(s) 2-36 is/are pending in the application.  
5a) Of the above claim(s) 14, 17, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 33 and 34 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 7)  Claim(s) 2-13, 15, 16, 18-22, 24, 27, 30-32, 35 and 36 is/are rejected.
- 8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 9)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 10)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11)  The drawing(s) filed on 27 September 2010 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).
- 12)  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**

- 13)  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 Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

1. Applicant's arguments filed 12/28/2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Currently, claims 14, 17, 23, 25, 26, 28-29 and 33-34 are withdrawn and claims 2-13, 15-16, 18-22, 24, 27, 30-32 and 35-36 are pending for examination.
2. In response to applicant's comment with regard to the telephone interview conducted on July 12, 2011 that Applicant respectfully disagrees with the summary of the interview particularly the attempt to reduce the claims to the "inventive concept". The summary states that Applicant indicated an inventive concept with regard to claims of another application. However, these claims are not believed to be relevant as they concern another application and invention. Applicant would like to clarify that much of the interview was merely a discussion to help the understanding of the examiner, but that applicant still relies on the claims as written and as a whole, and does not agree with reducing the claim to an inventive concept. The summary also refers to "the informing for such file transfer characteristics...". Applicant does not understand this statement and therefore disagrees. In addition, the summary states that agreement was reached with regard to "the inventive concept for the instant application." Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant did not and does not agree with recharaterizing the claims to an inventive concept of the summary's indications of invention concepts. It is Applicant's position that the claims as they are set out define the invention, and that it is

Art Unit: 2181

these claims which should be examined. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that each claim of this application be examined as written and as a whole.

As indicated in the interview summary, "... the inventive concept for the instant application is the claims ..." and the explanation with regard to the function of the inventive concept in the interview summary is a clear exemplary interpretation regarding on how the claims can be envisioned; therefore, the examiner is examining each claims as written and as a whole based on the examiner's best understanding on how the claims can be interpreted. If the interpretation is erroneous in any way, the examiner welcomes the applicant's clarification in the subsequent response, as the applicant currently do not offer how the examiner's interpretation of the claims are inaccurate and what is the correct interpretation of the claims.

Additionally, the examiner clearly understood that the summary for the inventive concept regarding to claims of another application (11/467,092) is relevant to the instant application as the examiner did inquire as to how this application differ from the copending application 11/467,092, wherein the applicant indicted that the claims for the instant application are broader as the independent claims for the instant do not require the multiple parallel channels and that the instant application is basically the same concept as the copending application 11/467,092. Furthermore, this was part of the examiner's rational for the double patenting rejection between the instant application and the copending application 11/467,092.

Additionally, with regard to the "... file transfer characteristic ...," applicant's was trying to explain the difference in limitation between the co-pending application

Art Unit: 2181

11/467,092 and the instant application, wherein the "... file transfer characteristic ..." is a claimed limitation of the co-pending application 11/467,092 and not in the instant application. Furthermore, to further clarify, based on the applicant's clarification during the interview conducted on July 12, 2011, "... the information for such file transfer characteristic ..." is part of the process for the host to recognize the connected as a hard drive but it is not necessary/require step, wherein this is one of the embodiments described in the specification.

3. In response to applicant's plurality of arguments with regard to the independent claims 2, 32 and 35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that the resulting combination of the references does not teach/suggest applicant's inventive concept because of the following:

- Hashimoto does not describe execution of an instruction set to establish communication with the host computer as claimed because Hashimoto merely describes a process for detection by the camera of an active connection by monitoring for a signal from the interface, and not the process claimed which is a process in which the analog device processor executes instructions to cause a class identifying parameter (mis-indicative of the class of the device) to be sent to the host computer (i.e. automatically sends mis-identifying information to the host computer);

# 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.