

# Exhibit I

Application/Control Number: 15/404,075  
Art Unit: 2421

Page 2

## DETAILED OFFICE ACTION

### *Notice of Pre-AIA or AIA Status*

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

### *Information Disclosure Statement*

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 5/25/2017 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97 and is being considered by the examiner.

### *Claim Interpretation*

3. This application includes one or more claim limitations that use the word “module” but are nonetheless not being interpreted under 35 U.S.C. 112(f) or pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph because the claim limitation(s) recite(s) sufficient structure, materials, or acts to entirely perform the recited function. Such claim limitation(s) is/are: “stream scanner module” in system claims 2-3, 9. The claims are interpreted as the module being stored in a storage device. In this case, the module is not a generic placeholder for a structural element since the module is stored in a storage device, and a structural element cannot be stored in storage device and the term module is being used to represent only a non-structural element. The term is handled in accordance with MPEP 2161.01.

Because this/these claim limitation(s) is/are **not** being interpreted under 35 U.S.C. 112(f) or pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, it/they is

**Exhibit  
0008**

9/17/2021

William Mangione-Smith

Application/Control Number: 15/404,075

Page 3

Art Unit: 2421

interpreted to cover only the corresponding structure, material, or acts described in the specification as performing the claimed function, and equivalents thereof. If applicant intends to have this/these limitation(s) interpreted under 35 U.S.C. 112(f) or pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, applicant may: (1) amend the claim limitation(s) to remove the structure, materials, or acts that performs the claimed function; or (2) present a sufficient showing that the claim limitation(s) does/do not recite sufficient structure, materials, or acts to perform the claimed function.

4. In claim 9, with respect to the term "WiFi", the examiner conducted a search for "WiFi " as registered marks by using the Trademark Electronic Search System (TESS) which is available on the USPTO website to determine whether an apparent or identified mark in the patent application is a registered mark. While WiFi is a trademark, it is also being interpreted as an interoperability standard. *See Ex Parte Paul Regen, Peter Garrett, & Everett Hale, Appeal 2011-005683, 2013 WL 6253158, at \*1 (Dec. 2, 2013)* (the examiner in Regen rejected the use of the term "Bluetooth" in claim language because "the claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product." The PTAB reversed stating: "the term "Bluetooth" identifies a source of interoperability standards. MPEP 608.01 states that where the use of the term which is a trade name or a mark used in commerce, has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trade names and marks used in commerce (i.e., trademarks, service marks, certification marks, and collective marks) are permissible in patent applications, the proprietary