



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.
14/627,634	02/20/2015	MARK UNAK	CU-100220	4837
124057	7590	03/22/2017	EXAMINER	
FLENER IP LAW, LLC			SYED, FARHAN M	
77 West Washington Street			ART UNIT	
Suite 800			PAPER NUMBER	
Chicago, IL 60602			2165	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			03/22/2017	
			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@fleneriplaw.com
fleneriplaw_docketing@cardinal-ip.com
zflener@fleneriplaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 14/627,634	Applicant(s) UNAK ET AL.	
	Examiner FARHAN SYED	Art Unit 2165	AIA (First Inventor to File) Status Yes

-- 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 MONTHS 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 2/20/15.
☐ A declaration(s)/affidavit(s) under **37 CFR 1.130(b)** was/were filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ 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*

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
5a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

* If any claims have been determined allowable, you may be eligible to benefit from the **Patent Prosecution Highway** program at a participating intellectual property office for the corresponding application. For more information, please see http://www.uspto.gov/patents/init_events/pph/index.jsp or send an inquiry to PPHfeedback@uspto.gov.

Application Papers

- 10) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 2/20/15 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).

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).

Certified copies:

- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some** c) ☐ None of the:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ 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) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08a and/or PTO/SB/08b)
- 3) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The present application, filed on or after March 16, 2013, is being examined under the first inventor to file provisions of the AIA.

2. In response to communications filed on 20 February 2015, claims 1-21 are presently pending in the application, of which, claims 1, 8 and 15 are presented in independent form. The Examiner acknowledges that no claims were amended, cancelled, or newly.

Priority

3. The Examiner acknowledges the pending application claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional 61/942,295, filed 20 February 2014 and U.S. Provisional 61/990,893, filed 09 May 2014, and has been accorded the earliest effective file date.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 24 June 2015 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

5. The drawings, filed 20 February 2015, have been reviewed and accepted by the Examiner.

Specification

6. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

7. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

8. Claims 17 and 18 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 17 is a computer system claim that appears to depend from a computer program product claim 14. The Examiner presumes the Applicant intended for the claim to depend from computer system claim 16.

Claim 18 is a computer system claim that appears to depend from a computer method claim 1. The Examiner presumes the Applicant intended for the claim to depend from computer system claim 15. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

9. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

10. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a judicial exception (i.e., a law of nature, a natural phenomenon, or an abstract idea) without significantly more.

Claims 1-7 are directed to a computer-implemented method. The claims do not include additional elements that are sufficient to amount to significantly more than the judicial exception because the claims as a whole, considering all claim elements both individually and in combination, do not amount to significantly more than an abstract idea. The claims are subject to a §101 rejection in accordance with the 2016 Interim Eligibility Guidance for use by USPTO personnel in determining subject matter eligibility under 35 U.S.C. 101 in view of the Supreme Court decision in *Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int'l*, 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014). The guidance may be found in the Federal Register (79 FR 74618 (Jul. 14, 2016)) (hereinafter Guidance).

As an initial matter, the independent claims fall under the four categories of subject matter eligible for patent protection: process, machines, manufactures, and compositions of matter. Claims falling under the subject matter categories may be ineligible for patent protection if they encompass laws of nature, physical phenomena, or abstract ideas (judicially recognized exceptions). In *Alice*, the Supreme Court applied the two-part framework earlier set out in *Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus*



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.