



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/331,002	06/14/1999	MICHAEL TASLER	2055/101	1117

24283 7590 12/18/2001

PATTON BOGGS  
PO BOX 270930  
LOUISVILLE, CO 80027

EXAMINER

DU, THUAN N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2182

DATE MAILED: 12/18/2001

7

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

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)



**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-16 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
4. Claim 13 recites the limitation "the hard disk" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***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 negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admission of prior art [AAPA] and McNeill, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,499,378).
7. Regarding claims 1, 5, 6, 12 and 13, AAPA teaches an interface for communication between a host device and a transmit/receive device comprising:

a processor [Application's specification, p. 3, line 8];  
a memory [Application's specification, p. 3, line 9];  
a first connecting device for interfacing the host device with the interface device via a multi-purpose interface of the host device [Application's specification, p. 3, lines 1-3];  
a second connecting device for interfacing the interface device with the data transmit/receive device [Application's specification, p. 3, lines 9-12].

AAPA teaches the host device communicates with the interface device by means of an interface-specific driver installed in the host device. AAPA does not teaches the interface device receiving an inquiry from the host device as to type of device is attached and responding to the host that it is an I/O device customary in a host device, whereupon the host device communicates with the interface device by means of the driver for the I/O device customary in a host device.

McNeill, Jr. et al. teaches an interface device responds to the host inquiry command as to the type of device attached to the multi-purpose interface (SCSI interface) of the host device [col. 2, lines 39-44; col. 5, lines 14-15 and 23-31], whereupon the host device communicates with the interface device by means of the driver for the I/O device customary in a host device [col. 3, lines 23-30; col. 5, lines 59-64].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of AAPA and McNeill, Jr. et al. because it would enhance the system by allowing the host device communicates with a transmit/receive device, through an interface device, by means of the standard driver in the host device instead of installing a device-specific driver into the host device.

Art Unit: 2182

8. Regarding claims 2, 7-11, McNeill, Jr. et al. teaches the device drivers for I/O drivers customary in a host device comprise a hard disk driver, and the signal indicates to the host device that the host device is communicating with a hard disk [col. 5, lines 33-39].

9. Regarding claim 3, McNeill, Jr. et al. teaches the system including a buffer for buffering data to be transferred between two systems [col. 5, lines 52-54].

10. Regarding claims 4 and 14, McNeill, Jr. et al. teaches the communication is between a host and a SCSI device (SCSI target computer) [abstract]. Therefore, the host and the device must have SCSI interfaces.

11. Regarding claims 15 and 16, since they recite method of operating of the apparatus defined in the apparatus claims, they are rejected accordingly based on the rejection of the apparatus claims.

### *Conclusion*

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuan N. Du whose telephone number is (703) 308-6292 or via e-mail, [thuan.du@uspto.gov](mailto:thuan.du@uspto.gov). The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 9:00 AM - 5:30 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas C. Lee can be reached on (703) 305-9717.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

# 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.