



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.
13/901,437	05/23/2013	Giorgio Calderari	23278.2.US.8	8160
53449	7590	07/16/2013	EXAMINER	
PATENT CORRESPONDENCE ARNALL GOLDEN GREGORY LLP 171 17TH STREET NW SUITE 2100 ATLANTA, GA 30363			GEMBEH, SHIRLEY V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1628	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/16/2013	ELECTRONIC

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):

patents@agg.com

Dr. Reddy's Laboratories, Ltd., et al.
v.
Helsinn Healthcare S.A., et al.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	13/901,437	CALDERARI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KATHLEEN K. BRAGDON	1600	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) KATHLEEN K. BRAGDON. (3)_____.

(2) CLARK SULLIVAN. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 11 July 2013.

Type: Telephonic Video Conference
 Personal [copy given to: applicant applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Issues Discussed 101 112 102 103 Others
(For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: n/a.

Identification of prior art discussed: n/a.

Substance of Interview

(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

Applicant called the undersigned to inquire about the notice received, mailed on 7/12/2013, in which the Office stated that the AIA status of the instant application was being changed to "No".

Applicant explained that this assessment was incorrect because the instant application was filed as a CIP on 5/23/2013, designated as a CIP in the ADS and designated as an AIA application in the ADS.

The undersigned agreed with Applicant's assessment and has reset the AIA status to being AIA" Yes". The instant application will be examined as an AIA application.

No further action is required by Applicant.

Applicant recordation instructions: It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.

Examiner recordation instructions: Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recordation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

Attachment

/KATHLEEN K BRAGDON/
Quality Assurance Specialist, TC 1600
AIA FITF POC