UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
14/627,703	02/20/2015	MARK UNAK	CU-100221	1909

124057 7590 09/05/2017		EXAMINER
FLENER IP LAW, LLC		KUJUNDZIC, DINO
77 West Washington Street		
Suite 800		
Chicago, IL 60602		

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/05/2017	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):

fleneriplaw_docketing@cardinal-ip.com
zflener@fleneriplaw.com
info@fleneriplaw.com

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Office Action Summary</td><td>Application No.
14/627,703</td><td>Applicant(s)
UNAK ET AL.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Examiner
DINO KUJUNDZIC</td><td>Art Unit
2179   AIA (First Inventor to File) Status
Yes</td></tr>
</table>

-- 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 *05/29/2017*.

   ☐ 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 <u>allowable</u>, 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 _____ 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:

    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)☐ 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.   This action is responsive to the following communication: Claim Amendments

and Remarks filed on May 29, 2017. **This action is made final.**

2.   Claims 1-21 are pending in the case; Claims 1, 8, and 15 are independent.

3.   In the Non-Final Rejection mailed on December 30, 2016 (see pgs. 2-4), Claims

8-14 were rejected under 35 USC § 101 but Claim Amendments filed on May 29, 2017

have rendered this rejection moot; in the Non-Final Rejection it was also noted that

Claims 15-21 were interpreted as being directed to a computing system implemented at

least in part in hardware – in Claim Amendments filed on May 29, 2017, independent

Claim 15 was amended to explicitly recite that the computing system includes hardware.

Claim Objections

4.   Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 4, as

amended, recites "The computer-implemented method of claim wherein …" but it does

not specify which Claim it is dependent upon. For the purposes of examination, it is

presumed that Claim 4 depends from Claim 1.

        Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments with respect to 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection of Claims 1-21

(see Remarks filed May 29, 2017, pgs. 8-9), have been fully considered and are

persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further

consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Sacco, as discussed

below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

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 –
>
> (a)(1) the claimed invention was patented, described in a printed publication, or in public use, on sale or otherwise available to the public before the effective filing date of the claimed invention.

6.   **Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a)(1) as being anticipated by**

Giovanni Maria Sacco (hereinafter Sacco), "The intelligent e-store: easy

interactive product selection and comparison," Proceedings of the Seventh IEEE

International Conference on E-Commerce Technology, published in 2005.

As to independent Claim 1, Sacco teaches a computer-implemented method,

executed on a computer, the computer- implemented method comprising:

- rendering a first-level menu for an online catalog, wherein the first-level menu

   defines a plurality of first-level categories (see Fig. 1, § 4.1, showing the initial

   taxonomic summary).

- associating a match quantity with each of the plurality of first-level categories

   (see Fig. 1, § 4.1, showing associated quantity with each category corresponding

   to a count of items classified under each category).

- receiving a first response from a user of the online catalog that defines a selected first-level category, chosen from the plurality of first-level categories (see Fig. 2, § 4.1, showing preparation to zoom on a particular category which results in computation of corresponding sub-categories and modification of the count corresponding to the category in focus – a sub-tree/category is expanded and displayed on the user interface (i.e., first category: zoom [59] is expanded into second category: max optical zoom [53] (which can be further expanded into sub-category: 3x zoom [25])).

- rendering a plurality of second-level categories, associated with the selected first-level category, in a subordinate fashion with respect to the selected first-level category (see Fig. 2, §§ 4.1 and 4.2, showing preparation to perform a zoom).

With respect to **dependent Claim 2**, Sacco teaches wherein the method further includes the step of adjusting the matching quantity for each of the plurality of first-level categories based on the user response and wherein rendering a plurality of second-level categories includes: rendering a plurality of non-selected first-level categories (see Fig. 3, § 4.1, showing updated taxonomy to reflect the user's input (zoom operation to focus on a particular category/attribute); see also § 4.2 showing that in Fig. 1, there were 60 cameras under "Brand" but in Fig. 3 (corresponding to the user input illustrated in Fig. 2) there are only 30 cameras under "Brand").

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.