

---

**REMARKS**


1. Applicant notes claims 1-26 have been examined as claims 1-6 were found allowable and claims 7-26 currently stand rejected.
2. Claims 7-26 stand objected to on two informalities:
  - a. Claims 7-26 stand objected to as they are not underlined per 37 C.F.R. 1.173. Applicant has underlined claims 7-26.
  - b. Claim 7 stands objected to as its steps are not separated by a line indentation per 37 C.F.R. 1.75(i). Applicant has rewritten the claim in proper form.
3. Claims 7-11 and 18-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended the claims to recite a computer effecting the steps of the claimed invention.
4. Claims 7-8, 11-13, 16-18, 12-23, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,434,729 to Cracchiolo (herein Cracchiolo).
5. Applicant gratefully thanks Examiner for his time on June 28, 2012 discussing the teachings of Cracchiolo with undersigned in view of Applicants' claimed invention. It is undersigned belief the rejection is withdrawn.
6. Responsive to the June 28, 2012 interview, it is understood that the rejection based on Cracchiolo is withdrawn with respect to claim 8.
7. Responsive to the June 28, 2012 interview, it is understood that the rejection based on Cracchiolo is withdrawn with respect to claim 11.
8. Responsive to the June 28, 2012 interview, it is understood that the rejection based on Cracchiolo is withdrawn with respect to claim 12.
9. Responsive to the June 28, 2012 interview, it is understood that the rejection based on Cracchiolo is withdrawn with respect to claim 13.
10. Responsive to the June 28, 2012 interview, it is understood that the rejection based on Cracchiolo is withdrawn with respect to claim 16.
11. Responsive to the June 28, 2012 interview, it is understood that the rejection based on Cracchiolo is withdrawn with respect to claim 17.
12. Responsive to the June 28, 2012 interview, it is understood that the rejection based on Cracchiolo is withdrawn with respect to claim 18.

13. Responsive to the June 28, 2012 interview, it is understood that the rejection based on Cracchiolo is withdrawn with respect to claim 21.
14. Responsive to the June 28, 2012 interview, it is understood that the rejection based on Cracchiolo is withdrawn with respect to claim 22.
15. Responsive to the June 28, 2012 interview, it is understood that the rejection based on Cracchiolo is withdrawn with respect to claim 23.
16. Responsive to the June 28, 2012 interview, it is understood that the rejection based on Cracchiolo is withdrawn with respect to claim 26.
17. Claims 9, 14, 19 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Cracchiolo in view of DiRienzo (US 6343310).
18. Responsive to the June 28, 2012 interview, it is understood that the rejection based on Cracchiolo in view of DiRienzo is withdrawn with respect to claim 9.
19. Responsive to the June 28, 2012 interview, it is understood that the rejection based on Cracchiolo in view of DiRienzo is withdrawn with respect to claim 14.
20. Responsive to the June 28, 2012 interview, it is understood that the rejection based on Cracchiolo in view of DiRienzo is withdrawn with respect to claim 19.
21. Responsive to the June 28, 2012 interview, it is understood that the rejection based on Cracchiolo in view of DiRienzo is withdrawn with respect to claim 24.
22. Claims 10, 15, 20 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Cracchiolo in view of DiRienzo and further in view of LLic (US 20050122953).
23. Responsive to the June 28, 2012 interview, it is understood that the rejection based on Cracchiolo in view of DiRienzo and further in view of LLic is withdrawn with respect to claim 10.
24. Responsive to the June 28, 2012 interview, it is understood that the rejection based on Cracchiolo in view of DiRienzo and further in view of LLic is withdrawn with respect to claim 15.
25. Responsive to the June 28, 2012 interview, it is understood that the rejection based on Cracchiolo in view of DiRienzo and further in view of LLic is withdrawn with respect to claim 20.

26. Responsive to the June 28, 2012 interview, it is understood that the rejection based on Cracchiolo in view of DiRienzo and further in view of LLic is withdrawn with respect to claim 25.
27. Responsive to the June 28, 2012 interview, it is understood that the rejection based on Cracchiolo in view of DiRienzo and further in view of LLic is withdrawn with respect to claim 10, 15, 20 and 25.
28. Applicant gratefully thanks Examiner for finding original claims 1-6 allowable.
29. Applicant appreciates Examiner's availability for further discussion.
30. Applicant acknowledges the contact information for his supervisor.
31. Applicant acknowledges the availability of case status information through PAIR.
32. Applicant acknowledges the availability of the electronic filing system.
33. Applicant acknowledges alternative submission systems.

In conclusion, Applicant thanks examiner Nyuyen, Morgan and Sorey for their time today and advancing this important case to allowance.

Very respectfully,  
**SMITH & HOPEN**



By:

Anton J. Hopen

Dated: June 28, 2012  
Reg. No. 41,849  
180 Pine Avenue North  
Oldsmar, Florida 34677  
(813) 925-8505 telephone  
(813) 925-8525 fax  
[patents@smithhopen.com](mailto:patents@smithhopen.com)  
Attorneys for Applicant