EXHIBIT N

		Document 165	-16 Filed 07/26/18 Page Application No. 14/633,804	2 of 17 PageID #: 6530 Applicant(s) BEYER ET AL.	
	ffice Action Sumr	•	Examiner OMONIYI OBAYANJU	Art Unit 2646	AIA (First Inventor to File) Status No
The Period for Rep		communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	corresponder	nce address
THIS COMMUN - Extensions of after SIX (6) N - If NO period for Failure to repl Any reply received.	NICATION. time may be available under th MONTHS from the mailing date or reply is specified above, the religion of the set or extended per	e provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 of this communication. maximum statutory period wriod for reply will, by statute, see months after the mailing	Y IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDON date of this communication, even if timely file.	imely filed n the mailing date ED (35 U.S.C. § 13	of this communication. 33).
Status					
1)⊠ Respo	onsive to communicati	ion(s) filed on <u>11/13</u>	<u>3/2015</u> .		
☐ A de	claration(s)/affidavit(s) under 37 CFR 1.1	30(b) was/were filed on		
2a) X This a	action is FINAL .	2b)□ This	action is non-final.		
•	An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on				
			have been incorporated into th		
,	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		nce except for formal matters, p		
		ne practice under <i>E</i>	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	153 O.G. 213	
Disposition of					
			pending in the application.		
•	· · · —		wn from consideration.		
·	i(s) is/are allow i(s) <u>1,2,5,8-14,17,20-2</u>		rojected		
•	n(s) <u>1,2,3,6-14,17,20-2</u> n(s) is/are object		rejectea.		
			r election requirement.		
•			igible to benefit from the Patent Pro	secution Hia	hwav program at a
-			oplication. For more information, pla	_	
			an inquiry to PPHfeedback@uspto		
Application Pa	ners				
	pecification is objected	I to by the Examine	r.		
<i>,</i> — .	•	•	epted or b)□ objected to by the	Examiner.	
			drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se		ō(a).
Replac	cement drawing sheet(s)	including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s) is o	bjected to. See	37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119				
	-	a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).	
Certified co	-	· ·		, , , , ,	
a)∏ All	b) Some** c) □	None of the:			
1.	Certified copies of th	e priority document	ts have been received.		
2.	Certified copies of th	e priority document	ts have been received in Applica	ation No	<u>_</u> .
3.	•		rity documents have been recei	ved in this Na	ational Stage
	application from the I		* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *		
** See the attache	ed detailed Office action	for a list of the certifie	ed copies not received.		
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of Ref	ferences Cited (PTO-892)		3) Interview Summar		
2) Information	Disclosure Statement(s) (PT	O/SB/08a and/or PTO/S	Paper No(s)/Mail [Date	



Application/Control Number: 14/633,804 Page 2

Art Unit: 2646

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 Page 4

Art Unit: 2646

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,



DOCKET

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.

