	ED STATES PATENT	AND TRADEMARK OFFICE	UNITED STATES DEPAR United States Patent and Address: COMMISSIONER F P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22. www.uspto.gov	FOR PATENTS
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
13/590,423	08/21/2012	Aleksandar Modrag Tasic	121973	9482
23696 7590 11/14/2013 QUALCOMM INCORPORATED 5775 MOREHOUSE DR.			EXAMINER TRAN, KHANH C	
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2631	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE

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):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com

DOCKET

Δ

LARM

i

Page 1

	Application No. 13/590,423		Applicant(s) TASIC ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner KHANH C. TRAN	Art Unit 2631	AIA (First Inventor to File Status No	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app eriod for Reply	bears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence	ce address	
 A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 36(a). In no event, however, may a repl will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH e, cause the application to become ABAN	Y ION. y be timely filed S from the mailing date of IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133	this communication.	
tatus				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on $\underline{8/21}$				
A declaration(s)/affidavit(s) under 37 CFR 1.1		<u>.</u>		
	action is non-final.			
3) An election was made by the applicant in resp			ng the interview on	
 the restriction requirement and election Since this application is in condition for alloward 			a tha marita ia	
closed in accordance with the practice under I		· 1	o the ments is	
	LX parte Quayle, 1955 C.D.	11, 455 0.0. 215.		
isposition of Claims				
5) Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application				
5a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.			
6) Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
7) Claim(s) <u>1,7,17 and 19</u> is/are rejected.				
 8) Claim(s) <u>2-6,8-16, 18 and 20</u> is/are objected to 9) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o 				
If any claims have been determined <u>allowable</u> , you may be e	·	t Prosecution High	way program at a	
articipating intellectual property office for the corresponding a				
tp://www.uspto.gov/patents/init_events/pph/index.jsp or senc	d an inquiry to <u>PPHfeedback@u</u>	<u>spto.gov</u> .		
pplication Papers				
10) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.			
11) The drawing(s) filed on $\underline{8/21/2012}$ 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	e. See 37 CFR 1.85	(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the drawing(s)	is objected to. See	37 CFR 1.121(d).	
riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. & 1	19(a)-(d) or (f).		
Certified copies:		(, (, (-),		
a) All b) Some * c) None of the:				
1. Certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been received.			
2. Certified copies of the priority documen		plication No.		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price				
application from the International Bureau			0	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of		d.		
tachment(s)				
ttachment(s) ⊠ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	3) 🗍 Interview Sun	nmary (PTO-413)		
	3)	nmary (PTO-413) ⁄Iail Date		

DETAILED ACTION

1. The present application is being examined under the pre-AIA first to invent

provisions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of pre-AIA 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.

The factual inquiries set forth in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating

obviousness or nonobviousness.

DOCKE.

2. Claims 1, 7, 17 and 19 are rejected under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Eisenhut et al. U.S. Patent 7,751,513 B2.

Application/Control Number: 13/590,423 Art Unit: 2631

DOCKE

Regarding claim 1, Eisenhut et al. discloses an apparatus (see FIG. 1) comprising:

a first amplifier stage configured to receive and amplify an input radio frequency (RF) signal and provide a first output RF signal to a first load circuit when the first amplifier stage is enabled (signal path 6 including an amplifier and an analog/digital conversion; column 5 lines 27-35. Eisenhut et al. further discloses the two signal paths 6 and 7 can be individually activated or disconnected by a corresponding activation signal at their associated inputs 62 and 72. The signal paths 6 and 7 can thus both be active, both be disconnected, or one of them be active and the other be disconnected; column 5 lines 20-23);

and a second amplifier stage configured to receive and amplify the input RF signal and provide a second output RF signal to a second load circuit when the second amplifier stage is enabled (signal path 7 including an amplifier and an analog/digital conversion; column 5 lines 27-35. Eisenhut et al. further discloses the two signal paths 6 and 7 can be individually activated or disconnected by a corresponding activation signal at their associated inputs 62 and 72. The signal paths 6 and 7 can thus both be active, both be disconnected, or one of them be active and the other be disconnected; column 5 lines 20-23).

Eisenhut et al. differs from the application claim in that Eisenhut et al. does not discloses the input RF signal comprising transmissions sent on multiple carriers at different frequencies to a wireless device as set forth in the application claim. Application/Control Number: 13/590,423 Art Unit: 2631

Because the application claim recites the signal input being an input RF signal, therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that one recognizes Eisenhut et al. would apply to the input RF signal as claimed.

Regarding claim 7, Eisenhut et al. further discloses a feedback circuit coupled between an output and an input of at least one of the first and second amplifier stages (FIG. 1 discloses a feedback circuit).

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 2-6, 8-16, 18 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Thomsen et al. U.S. Patent 6,249,687 B1.

Yates U.S. Patent 7,039,377 B1.

DOCKE.

DOCKET A L A R M



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.