

# EXHIBIT N



Application/Control Number: 14/633,804  
Art Unit: 2646

Page 2

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

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed 11/13/2015 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the reference Melen (U.S. Pub. No. 20040148090) fails to show certain amended features of applicant's invention (i.e. with a first device, receiving a message from a second device, wherein the message relates to joining a group). Applicant further argued and/or stated that **"the first and second navigation systems do not communicate with each other until the server adds the first navigation system 300 to the group"**.

Examiner very kindly directs the Applicant to reference Richardson: **In fig. 1, and ¶ [0036] and [0038]**, discussed the concept of group interaction in a communication system. Melen further discussed and/or stated that the navigation systems are **capable of establishing groups of members and communicating wirelessly with other navigation systems without the use of a vehicle network server**. Therefore, in contrast to the Applicant's argument above, the claim does not uniquely and particularly define the limitations so as to distinguish from the applied prior art. **During patent**

Application/Control Number: 14/633,804

Page 3

Art Unit: 2646

examination, the claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. See also MPEP §2111. The at least claimed limitation in question is broadly claimed, therefore, is fairly characterized as discussed in **fig. 1, and ¶ [0036]**. Therefore it is believed that Melen teaches the claim limitations.

In regards to the amended and/or new dependent claims, arguments are moot and new grounds of rejection are applied as set forth below.

**Applicant(s) are reminded that the Examiner is entitled to give the broadest reasonable interpretation to the language of the claim. The Examiner is not limited to Applicant's definition, which is not specifically set fourth in the claims, *In re Tanaka et al*, 193 USPQ 139, (CCPA) 1977. Therefore, the previous rejection is maintained.**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112(a):

(a) IN GENERAL.—The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same, and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor or joint inventor of carrying out the invention.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same, and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Application/Control Number: 14/633,804  
Art Unit: 2646

Page 4

**Claims 9, 12, 21, 24, 35, and 41**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112(a) or 35 U.S.C. 112 (pre-AIA), first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor or a joint inventor, or for pre-AIA the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In **regards to claims 9 and 21**, the claims recited at least “**sending, from the first device**, a request **for a second map**, wherein the request specifies **a map location**; and receiving, from the server, the second map.” (Emphasis Added). Upon further review of the Applicant’s original specification of file, the limitations stated above were not mentioned, inconsistent, and/or not clearly described so as to be readily understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. The Applicant's specification did not mention anything about second or different map, therefore it is unclear what how the first device request at least a different or second map. Also, it is unclear as to what “**a map location**” is according to the specification.

In **regards to claims 12 and 24**, the claims recites at least in part “sending, by the first device, updated location information comprising an updated location of the first device, **the updated location information being sent based on passage of a predetermined time interval since sending previous location** information comprising a previous location of the first device, **displacement of the first device by a predetermined distance relative to a previous location** of the first device, or both.” (Emphasis Added). Upon further review of the Applicant’s original specification of file,

# 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.