

EXHIBIT 9


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.
14/633,804	02/27/2015	Malcolm K. Beyer JR.	MOC-005	8573
22235	7590	12/10/2015	EXAMINER OBAYANJU, OMONIYI	
Malin Haley DiMaggio & Bowen, P.A. 1936 S ANDREWS AVENUE FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33316			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 2646	
			NOTIFICATION DATE DELIVERY MODE 12/10/2015 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):

info@mhdpatents.com

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
Art Unit: 2646

Page 3

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.

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.