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.
13/531,072	06/22/2012	Michael D. Prstojevich	215127.01662	7563

11333 7590 02/14/2013

Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.
Attorneys for client 215127 & 315127
10 South Wacker Drive
Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER	
STICE, PAULA J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3766	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/14/2013	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.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	13/531,072	PRSTOJEVICH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	PAULA J. STICE	3766	

-- 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) 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 *22 June 2012*.

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

3)☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.

4)☐ 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

5)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

7)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

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

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

* If any claims have been determined allowable, you may be eligible to benefit from the **Patent Prosecution Highway** program at a participating intellectual property office for the corresponding application. For more information, please see http://www.uspto.gov/patents/init_events/pph/index.jsp or send an inquiry to PPHfeedback@uspto.gov.

Application Papers

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

11)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *22 June 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. 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).

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) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

3) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

4) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The specification, paragraph [0001] cross-reference data, needs to be amended to reflect the status of application 12/498,197 as being now allowed US Patent No. 8,224,429.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lubell et al. US 4,566,461 in the IDS.

3. Regarding claims 1, 12 and 17: Lubell discloses a processor 55 (Fig. 6) and memory 55a storing non-transitory computer readable medium instructions (“algorithm”, Col. 12, line 5, fig. 5 also shows the program in a graphical form); the processor determines a plurality of heart rate zones based on first rate measurements received from a sensor (the processor determines a resting heart rate 9, fig. 5 as well as a maximum heart rate, Col. 4, lines 1-3 and Col. 9, lines 5-10; the heart rate zones are determined to be 60% and 80% of the max Vo2 which is also determined in part by the heart rate); a prompt is generated instructing the user to maintain a heart rate within a chosen zone (Col. 10, lines 25-43); the processor monitors a second heart rate as the

individual exercise, which is a heart rate subsequent to the prompt (Col. 10, lines 25-43) and determines if the heart rate is within the designated zone.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. 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.

5. Claims 2-5, 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lubell et al. US 4,566,461 in view of Yoshimura et al. US 2003/0073911.

6. Regarding claims 2-4, 13 and 18: Lubell discloses the claimed invention. However, Lubell is silent as to the use of encoded messages with identification data related to the heart rate measurements and decoding the message downstream using identification information for the sensor. Yoshimura however teaches of a similar device (Fig. 1) in which two sensor signals are monitored 13/14 (Fig. 4), each sensor signal is encoded using an ID coded protocol (pg. [0017]) and then decoded and the opposite end of the transmission (also pg. [0017]);as shown in Fig. 3 the device has bit information related to the specific sensor. It therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lubell to include encoding signals with an ID coded protocol in order to transmit more than one signal at a time and then identify between the signals once decoded using bit information as in fig. 3, as taught by Yoshimura.

7. Regarding claim 5: Lubell/Yoshimura discloses the claimed invention, Yoshimura further teaches of a speed sensor (broadly interpreted to be an accelerometer 13, Fig. 4), and the message comprises speed information (pg. [0018]). It therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lubell/Yoshimura to include a speed sensor that sends a message comprising speed information, as taught by Yoshimura in order to measure workout paces during exercise.

8. Claims 6-11, 14-16 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lubell et al. US 4,566,461 in view of Yoshimura et al. US 2003/0073911 and further in view of Flach et al. US 2001/0023315.

9. Regarding claims 6-10, 14-15 and 19: Lubell/Yoshimura discloses the claimed invention, however Lubell/Yoshimura is silent as to the use of a designated time channel for either sensor for communicating the associated data and distinguishing between the sensor signals based on the time in which the signals were sent. Flach however, teaches of a time division multiple access protocol, in which data from specific sensors is sent during designated timeslots (pgs. [0016-0017]). It therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lubell/Yoshimura to include designated time channels for either sensor to communicate the associated signal, as taught by Flach, in order to distinguish between sensor signals.

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.