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.
11/768,729	06/26/2007	Kenneth P. Weiss	W0537-7006	3536

7590   06/29/2011

John N. Anastasi
c/o Lowrie, Lando & Anastasi, LLP
Riverfront Office Park, One Main Street
Cambridge, MA 02142

EXAMINER
DADA, BEEMNET W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2435	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/29/2011	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.

APPLE 1112

-- 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 <u>3</u> 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 <u>18 April 2011</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ 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

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-5,9-16,18-21,24-30,32-39 and 41-45</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-5,9-16,18-21,24-30,32-39 and 41-45</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ 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).

11)☐ 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

12)☐ 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 Draftsperson'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

This office action is in reply to an amendment filed on 04/18/2011. Claims 1-5, 9-16, 18-21, 24-30, 32-39 and 41-45 are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 04/18/2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the prior art on record fails to teach the limitation 'mapping the time varying multicharacter code to information required to provide the services" Examiner disagrees.

Examiner would point out that, Gioradano teaches a method/system configured to map the multi-character code to secure data including information required to provide the services, the information including account identifying information where the account identifying information is unknown to the service provider, to provide the account identifying information to a third party to enable a transaction without providing the account identifying information to the service provider (i.e., note that the POS system does not get access to customers credit/debit account information, column 18, lines 5-47). Gioradano is silent on the multi-character code being time-varying. However, Brainard teaches an authentication system that maps time-varying multi-character code to stored secure data (i.e., <u>verifying by comparing</u> an authentication code, wherein the authentication code is time dependent, paragraphs 0019, 0020, 0045 and 0063). Examiner would further point out that, the time varying multi-character code of Brainard can be implemented into the multi-character code of Gioradano in order to enhance security of the system by changing the code based on timing data. It is therefore, <u>the combination of</u> Gioradano and Brainard that teaches the limitation mapping a time-varying multi-character code

to secure data ... unknown to the service provider. Examiner would further point out that the art

on record teaches the claim limitations and therefore, the rejection is respectfully maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

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 negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 9-16, 18-21, 24-30, 32-39 and 41-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Gioradano et al. US 7,571,139 B1 (hereinafter Gioradano) in view

Brainard et al. US 2006/0256961 A1 (hereinafter Brainard).

As per claims 1 and 16, Giorandano teaches a secure registry system for providing

information to a service provider to enable the service provider to provide services to entities

with secure data stored in the secure registry system, comprising:

a database including secure data for each entity, wherein each entity is associated with

and a multicharacter code for each entity having secure data in the secure registry system,

respectively [column 18, lines 14-47] and

a processor configured to receive, from the service provider, the multicharacter code for

the entity on whose behalf services are to be provided, configured to map the multicharacter

code to secure data including information required to provide the services, the information

including account identifying information where the account identifying information is unknown

to the service provider, to provide the account identifying information to a third party to enable a

transaction without providing the account identifying information to the service provider (i.e.,

note that the POS system does not get access to customers credit/debit account information, column 18, lines 5-47). Giorandano does not explicitly teach a time-varying code. In the same field of endeavor, Brainard teaches an authentication system including a time-varying multicharacter code to secure data and data access [paragraphs 0019 and 0020]. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to employ the teachings of Brainard within the system of Gioradano in order to enhance the security of the system.

As per claims 2 and 18, Gioradano further teaches the system wherein the multicharacter code represents an identity of the entity [column 18, lines 14-47].

As per claims 3 and 19, Gioradano further teaches the system wherein the multicharacter code is provided to the system via a secure electronic transmission device [column 18, lines 14-47].

As per claim 4 and 20, Gioradano further teaches the system wherein the code is encrypted and transmitted to the system and wherien the system is configured to decrypt the code with a public key of the entity [column 18, lines 14-47].

As per claims 5 and 21, Gioradano further teaches the system wherein said service provider's service includes delivery, wherein the information is an address to which n item is to be delivered to the entity, wherein the system receives the code and wherein the system uses the code to obtain the appropriate address for delivery of the item by the third party [column 18, lines 14-47].

DOCKET ALARM

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.

fastcase
Smarter legal research.