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.
12/720,147	03/09/2010	Allen F. Rozman	ARAC-01RE1	8473

7590   04/29/2011

Allen F. Rozman
6402 Wildlife Trail
Garland, TX 75044

EXAMINER
LAFORGIA, CHRISTIAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2439	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/29/2011	PAPER

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.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	12/720,147	ROZMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christian LaForgia	2439	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 April 2011*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-73* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-73* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 March 2010* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4/4/11*

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The amendment of 04 April 2011 has been noted and made of record.

2.   Claims 1-73 have been presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 04 April 2011 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement has been considered by the examiner.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments, see pages 20-21, filed 04 April 2011, with respect to the rejections made under 35 U.S.C. § 251 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. § 251 rejection of claims 1-57 has been withdrawn.

5.   Applicant's arguments, see pages 20-21, filed 04 April 2011, with respect to the rejections made under 35 U.S.C. § 112 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of claims 25 and 44-57 has been withdrawn.

6.   Applicant's arguments, see pages 20-21, filed 04 April 2011, with respect to the rejections made under 35 U.S.C. § 101 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of claims 44-57 has been withdrawn.

7.   Applicant's arguments with respect to the prior art rejection of claims 1-57 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9.   Claims 1-4, 5, 7, 10-12, 14-17, 19, 21-26, 29-48, 51-56, 58-67, and 69-73 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No.

2002/0002673 A1 to Narin, hereinafter Narin.

10.   As per claim 1, Narin teaches a method of operating a computer system capable of

exchanging data across a network of one or more computers and having at least a first and

second electronic data processor capable of executing instructions using a common operating

system, comprising the steps of:

executing browser instructions in a first logical process within the common operating

system using the first electronic data processor, wherein the first logical process is capable of

accessing data contained in a first memory space (Figures 2 [element 210, 212], 3 [element

310]], 4 [step 402], paragraphs 0019, 0030, 0031, 0035, 0036, 0040, 0046, i.e. secure application

offers a web browsing function in a multiprocessor system);

executing instructions in a second logical process within the common operating system

using the second electronic data processor, wherein the second logical process is capable of

accessing data contained in the second memory space (Figures 2 [elements 220, 222], 3 [element

320], 4 [step 404], paragraphs 0019, 0032, 0037, 0040-0041, 0050-0051); and

displaying data from the first logical process and the second logical process, wherein a

video processor is adapted to combine data from the first and second logical processes and

transmit the combined data to a display (Figures 1 [element 190], 5, Abstract, paragraphs 0007,

0050, 0051, the second process renders its output in a child window of the first process, so that

the use of a second process to host non-secure software objects is transparent to the user of the

first process);

wherein the computer system is configured such that data residing on the second

electronic data processor is operating in a protected mode and data residing on the first memory

space is protected from corruption by a malware process downloaded from the network and

executing as part of the second logical process (Abstract, paragraph 0035-0036, 0039, the first

process's address space is inaccessible to the second process; provides defense against from the

non-secure software object (i.e. web browsing functions, from observing or modifying anything

going on with the secure application)).

11.   Regarding claim 2, Narin teaches wherein the second memory space comprises memory

selected from the group consisting of: a memory zone within a physical memory common to the

first memory space (Figure 2 [element 141], paragraph 0025); a partition on a memory device;

random access memory (RAM) (Figure 2 [element 132], paragraph 0023); both volatile and

nonvolatile memory.

12.   Regarding claim 3, Narin teaches wherein the second logical process comprises a process

selected from the group consisting of: an electronic mail process, an instant messaging process,

an internet browser process (paragraphs 0007, 0036, 0045-0051), an interactive gaming process,

a virtual private network (VPN) process, and a reader application process.

DOCKET ALARM

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.

fastcase
Smarter legal research.