

# EXHIBIT

# 1013



# 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.
10/034,197	12/28/2001	Sanchaita Datta	3003.2.9A	7746
23484	7590	02/02/2012	EXAMINER	
OGILVIE LAW FIRM 2552 South Wilshire Circle SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84109			NGUYEN, THU HA T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2453	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/02/2012	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):

JOHN@OGILVIELAWFIRM.COM  
john.ogilvie@comcast.net

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

*Ex parte* SANCHAITA DATTA and RAGULA BHASKAR

---

Appeal 2011-010799  
Application 10/034,197  
Technology Center 2400

---

Before LANCE LEONARD BARRY, JEAN R. HOMERE, and STEPHEN  
C. SIU, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

SIU, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL  
STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This is a decision on appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the  
Examiner's rejection of claims 22-40. Claims 1-21 have been cancelled.  
We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

The disclosed invention relates generally to routing information over  
multiple independent parallel private networks (Spec. 1).

Independent claim 22 reads as follows:

22. A controller which controls access to multiple independent networks in a parallel network configuration, the controller comprising:

a site interface connecting the controller to a site by a single logical connection;

at least two network interfaces connecting the controller to respective independent parallel networks; and

a packet path selector which selects between the network interfaces to split a message from the site between the networks by concurrently sending different packets of the message over different network interfaces without requiring firewall usage;

whereby the controller uses multiple networks to concurrently carry different pieces of a given message so that unauthorized interception of message packets on fewer than all of the networks used to carry the message will not provide the total content of the message.

The Examiner relies upon the following references as evidence in support of the rejections:

Pearce	US 5,910,951	Jun. 8, 1999
Kitai	US 5,948,069	Sep. 7, 1999
Goldszmidt	US 6,195,680 B1	Feb. 27, 2001
Albright	US 6,209,039 B1	Mar. 27, 2001
Dutta	US 6,546,423 B1	Apr. 8, 2003

Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the Examiner rejects claims 33, 35, and 40 as being anticipated by Kitai.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner rejects as unpatentable:

- a) claims 22, 24, 25, and 29 over Kitai and Dutta;
- b) claims 23, 28, and 30-32 over Kitai, Dutta, and Albright;

- c) claims 26 and 27 over Kitai, Dutta, and Goldszmidt;
- d) claim 34 over Kitai and Albright;
- e) claims 36, 37 and 39 over Kitai and Pearce; and
- f) claim 38 over Kitai, Pearce, and Albright.

### ISSUE

Did the Examiner err in rejecting claims 22-40?

### FINDING OF FACT

Kitai discloses “parallel communication” in which “data in the buffer **6030** is divided into three blocks of data for every segment length” (col. 14, ll. 36-37) and distributed over multiple communication paths “to the buffers **6031**, **6032**, and **6033**” (col. 14, l. 38 and Fig. 17) and further sent on “communication path **6110** respectively through the communication paths **6012**, **6013**, and **6014**” (col. 14, ll. 48-50 and Fig. 17).

### PRINCIPLES OF LAW

In rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102, “[a] single prior art reference that discloses, either expressly or inherently, each limitation of a claim invalidates that claim by anticipation.” *Perricone v. Medicis Pharm. Corp.*, 432 F.3d 1368, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (citation omitted).

The question of obviousness is resolved on the basis of underlying factual determinations including (1) the scope and content of the prior art,

# 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.