



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.
13/590,423	08/21/2012	Aleksandar Modrag Tasic	121973	9482
23696	7590	11/14/2013	EXAMINER	
QUALCOMM INCORPORATED 5775 MOREHOUSE DR. SAN DIEGO, CA 92121			TRAN, KHANH C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2631	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/14/2013	ELECTRONICELECTRONIC

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

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 negated 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.

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.

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 disclose the input RF signal comprising transmissions sent on multiple carriers at different frequencies to a wireless device as set forth in the application claim.

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.

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.