



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.
90/013,025	10/09/2013	7015868 .	59749-00003.868	5924
27896	7590	10/31/2013	EXAMINER	
EDELL, SHAPIRO & FINNAN, LLC 9801 Washingtonian Blvd. Suite 750 Gaithersburg, MD 20878			MENEFFEE, JAMES A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3992	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/31/2013	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.

Fractus S.A.



DO NOT USE IN PALM PRINTER

(THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS)

NOVAK DRUCE & QUIGG, LLP (NDQ REEXAMINATION GROUP)
1000 LOUISIANA STREET
FIFTY-THIRD FLOOR
HOUSTON, TX 77002

EX PARTE REEXAMINATION COMMUNICATION TRANSMITTAL FORM

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NO. 90/013,025.

PATENT NO. 7015868 ET AL.

ART UNIT 3992.

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above identified *ex parte* reexamination proceeding (37 CFR 1.550(f)).

Where this copy is supplied after the reply by requester, 37 CFR 1.535, or the time for filing a reply has passed, no submission on behalf of the *ex parte* reexamination requester will be acknowledged or considered (37 CFR 1.550(g)).

Fractus S.A.

Art Unit: 3992

ORDER GRANTING REEXAMINATION REQUEST

A substantial new question of patentability (“SNQ”) affecting claims 1, 26, 32, 33, and 35 of U.S. Patent No. 7,015,868 (“the ‘868 patent”) is raised by the reexamination request filed 10/9/2013 (“Request”). It is noted that claims 1, 32, and 33 were disclaimed by a statutory disclaimer filed 9/10/2013.¹ This has not yet been processed, so for the purpose of this determination the examiner will assume those claims are still live claims. If it is determined that they are in fact disclaimed, they will effectively no longer exist and therefore will not be examined in the prosecution stage of this proceeding. Reexamination was not requested of claims 2-25, 37-31, 34, 36, and 37, therefore they will not be reexamined. See MPEP 2243.

References Cited in Request

U.S. Patent No. 5,995,064 to Yanagisawa et al. (“Yanagisawa”).

U.S. Patent No. 6,133,879 to Grangeat et al. (“Grangeat”).

U.S. Patent No. 6,300,914 to Yang (“Yang”).

U.S. Patent No. 6,239,765 to Johnson et al. (“Johnson”).

Misra et al., Study of Impedance and Radiation Properties of a Concentric Microstrip Triangular-Ring Antenna and Its Modeling Techniques Using FDTD Method, IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation, Vol. 46, No. 4, Apr. 1998 (“Misra-Chowdhury”).

Declaration of Donald G. Bodnar filed with Request (“Bodnar Decl.”).

¹ The claims were also cancelled by amendment in a copending reexamination, but the certificate has not yet issued so that amendment is not yet effective.

Fractus S.A.

Art Unit: 3992

Prosecution History

The '868 patent is drawn to multilevel antennae, which are described as antennae formed by sets of similar geometric elements (polygons or polyhedrons) electromagnetically coupled together so that one may distinguish each of the elements forming the structure, as well as the overall structure. Col. 1 lines 8-12. For example, each of the black triangle elements in Fig. 1 can be distinguished from the others, and the whole structure can be distinguished as well. Such antennas provide advantages of reduction in size and simultaneous operation in several bands.

The claims at issue here depend from independent claim 1, and during the original prosecution the examiner stated the reasons for allowance as follows:

Claim 1 is allowable over the art of record because the prior art does not teach the region or area of contact between the polygonal or polyhedral elements is less than 50% of the perimeter or area of the elements, and wherein not all the polygonal or polyhedral elements have the same size and the perimeter of the multilevel structure has a different number of sides than the polygons that compose the multilevel structure, and in combination with the remaining claimed limitations.

Notice of Allowance mailed 9/1/2005, p. 3. References showing an antenna having such features would therefore have been important to a reasonable examiner in considering the patentability of the claims.

The '868 patent is also the subject of a co-pending reexamination proceeding, assigned control number 95/001,390 and examined by the undersigned examiner, in which claims 26 and 35 are under rejection and are awaiting a decision by the Board on patent owner's appeal. That proceeding originated from a request by the current third party requester. Two later requests were filed by different third parties and assigned control numbers 95/000,589 and 95/001,498. The three were merged, though eventually the latter two were terminated under 35 U.S.C. 317. 95/001,390 remains pending, and all issues which were deemed to raise an SNQ in the three

Fractus S.A.

Art Unit: 3992

proceedings are either currently under appeal as claim rejections or have been resolved due to cancellation/statutory disclaimer of claims or findings of patentability which were not appealed.

Claim Construction – General

The examiner has construed the claims in the related proceeding, particularly the coined term multilevel structure. See 95/001,390 RAN mailed 12/10/2012 pp. 4-11. The examiner is aware that the patent owner disagrees with this construction, but as the issues have already been fully developed in that proceeding the examiner will maintain the same position unless some new evidence (or a related Board or Federal Circuit decision) persuades him otherwise. It should also be noted that the patent owner's proposed definitions are much narrower than those it proposed to the court (and also those definitions the court ultimately adopted) in the related litigation. See *Fractus, S.A. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, Memorandum Order and Opinion 12/17/2010 6:09cv203 (E.D. Tex.).² In other words, additional attorney argument is unlikely to change the examiner's mind. One issue which requires further explanation is "fractal" discussed next.

Claim Construction – Fractal

In the '1390 proceeding, the examiner determined in the Order that fractal antennas were excluded from the definition of multilevel antennas. See 95/001,390 Order mailed 8/12/2010 pp. 3-4. The examiner later determined that not all fractal antennas were excluded. See 95/001,390 Office action mailed 7/1/2011 pp. 8-13. In the later action the examiner limited the earlier finding that *all* fractal antennas were excluded from the definition of multilevel, and instead

² Any discussion of related litigation herein refers to this case unless stated otherwise.

Fractus S.A.

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.