Hb

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/343,607	06/30/1999	YASSER ALSAFADI	PHA-23.706	8127

7590   02/14/2002

CORPORATE PATENT COUNSEL
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
580 WHITE PLAINS ROAD
TARRYTOWN, NY 10591

EXAMINER
CHAVIS, JOHN. Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2122	6

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2002

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

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

Hb

		Application No.	Applicant	
Office Action Summary		09/343,607	Alsafadi et al.	
		Examiner		Art Unit
		John Chavis		2122

-- 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 ___3___ MONTH(S) 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 the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- 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 *papers filed 6-30-99 and 11-29-99*

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) *1-21* _____ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideratio

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-21* _____ is/are rejected.

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

8) ☐ Claims _____ 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 objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

    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.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

16) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). *2 & 4*

18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

20) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.　　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.

2.　　Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carroll et al.

(6,301,707) in view of the applicant's design choice of determining to compare for uncompatible

versus compatible items to determine compatibility.

Claims	Carroll
1. A processor implemented method for controlling the reconfiguration of an electronic device, the method comprising the steps of:	see the title, abstract and the Background of the invention.
receiving information representative of a reconfiguration request relating to the electronic device;	This feature is inherent in view of col. 4 lines 37-49, specifically the Feature that indicates that "Reconfiguration can be selectively Selectively activated" (ie. Requested)
determining at least one device component required to implement the reconfiguration request;	see col. 3 lines 20-35 and col. 5 lines 54-col. 6 line 12.
comparing the determined component and information specifying at least one additional component currently implemented in the electronic device with at least one of a list of known unacceptable configurations for the electronic device; and	see col. 1 lines 43-54, specifically the Phrase that indicates "the core program needs to access only selected components... Also, see col. 6 lines 13-23 (a subset of which are Be installed in the target system According to a profile of the target

System that is stored in the target
system. These features indicate that
A comparison is occurring; however,
The comparison is based on the
"profile of the system", which infers
That like items are compared.
However, it is considered a choice of
Design to select to compare either
Items that are compatible (as taught
By Carroll) or items that are not
Compatible; since, both provides the
Same result of determining if the
Component is compatible with the
Target. Therefore, it would have
Been obvious to a person of ordinary
Skill in the art at the time of the
invention to substitute for the feature
Of comparing to determine similarity
(based On the profile of the target
system), With comparing to
determine if the items are dissimilar
(Unacceptable configurations), since
The test merely utilize opposite types
Of data (similar vs dissimilar) to
Determine the same result
(compatibility of the update).

generating information indicative of an
approval or a denial of the reconfiguration
request based at least in part on the result of
the comparing step.

see col. 8 lines 49-53.

2. The method of claim 1 further including
the step of generating information indicative
of an approval of the reconfiguration
request if the determined component and the
additional component are consistent with a
given one of the known acceptable
configurations.

see the rejection of the last step of
claim 1, supra.

3. The method of claim 1 further including

see again the last step of claim 1.

the step of downloading the determined
component to the electronic device if the
determined component and the additional
component are consistent with a given one
of the known acceptable configurations.

4. The method of claim 1 further including   see the comparing step of claim 1.
the steps of: comparing the determined
component and information specifying at
least one additional component currently
implemented in the electronic device with
the list of known unacceptable
configurations for the electronic device; and

generating information indicative of a denial   see the last step of claim 1.
of the reconfiguration request if the
determined component and the additional
component are consistent with a given one
of the known unacceptable configurations.

5. The method of claim 1 further including   see claim 1.
the steps of: comparing the determined
component and information specifying at
least one additional component currently
implemented in the electronic device with
the list of known unacceptable
configurations for the electronic device; and

generating information indicating that the
requested reconfiguration is unknown if the
determined component and the additional
component are not consistent with a given
one of the known acceptable or
unacceptable configurations.

6. The method of claim 1 further including   see claim 1.
the step of transmitting in response to the
reconfiguration request a list of additional
components required in the electronic device
in order to implement the reconfiguration.

7. The method of claim 1 wherein the   See the PCN's, which identifies the

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.