



# 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.
15/413,072	01/23/2017	Saad Ahmad	IDC-11614US03	3243
24374	7590	11/21/2017	EXAMINER	
VOLPE AND KOENIG, P.C.			DECKER, CASSANDRA L	
DEPT. ICC			ART UNIT	
UNITED PLAZA			PAPER NUMBER	
30 SOUTH 17TH STREET			2466	
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			NOTIFICATION DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			11/21/2017	
			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):

eoffice@volpe-koenig.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 15/413,072	<b>Applicant(s)</b> AHMAD, SAAD	
	<b>Examiner</b> CASSANDRA DECKER	<b>Art Unit</b> 2466	<b>AIA (First Inventor to File) Status</b> No

-- 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 23 January 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) 1-20 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) 1-20 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](http://www.uspto.gov/patents/init_events/pph/index.jsp) or send an inquiry to [PPHfeedback@uspto.gov](mailto:PPHfeedback@uspto.gov).

#### Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2017 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***

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

***Claim rejections – 35 USC 112(b)***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 112(b):

(b) CONCLUSION.—The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the inventor or a joint inventor regards as the invention.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 112 (pre-AIA), second paragraph:  
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 3-5, 13, 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112(b) or 35 U.S.C. 112 (pre-AIA), second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the inventor or a joint inventor, or for pre-AIA the applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112(b) or 35 U.S.C. 112 (pre-AIA), second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: steps which relate the discovery process of claim 3 to the receiving and transmitting steps of Claim 1.

For Claim 4, it is unclear whether “configuration information” has antecedent basis in Claim 1 (line 8).

For Claim 5, it is unclear whether "configuration information" has antecedent basis in the claim and what the configuration information is associated with.

For Claim 13, it is unclear whether “a WLAN ProSe ID” has antecedent basis in Claim 11 (line 7).

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112(b) or 35 U.S.C. 112 (pre-AIA), second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: steps which relate the discovery step of claim 13 to the receiving, transmitting, and establishing steps of Claim 11.

For Claim 16, it is unclear whether the claim is directed to a WTRU or a WTRU method.

For Claim 16, “the WTRU method” (line 3) lacks antecedent basis in the claim. Also it is unclear how a method can comprise a transmitter and receiver as claimed.

For Claim 18, it is unclear whether “a WLAN ProSe ID” has antecedent basis in Claim 16 (line 7).

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112(b) or 35 U.S.C. 112 (pre-AIA), second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: elements relating the configuration to perform a discovery process with the transmitter, receiver, and configuration to establish a connection in Claim 16.

For Claim 19, “the network node” lacks antecedent basis in the claim.

Remaining claims are rejected as depending from a rejected claim.

***Claim rejections – 35 USC 102***

In the event the determination of the status of the application as subject to AIA 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 (or as subject to pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103) is incorrect, any correction of the statutory basis for the rejection will not be considered a new ground of rejection if the prior art relied upon, and the rationale supporting the rejection, would be the same under either status.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of pre-AIA 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.

Claim(s) 1, 2, 6, 11, 12, 16, and 17, as understood in light of any rejections under 35 USC 112, is/are rejected under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yu et al. (US 2011/0098043).

**For Claim 1**, Yu teaches a method for establishing a wireless local area network (WLAN) proximity service (ProSe) connectivity between a first WLAN ProSe capable wireless transmit/receive unit (WTRU) and a second WLAN ProSe capable WTRU (see Figure 6, paragraph 84: WTRUs establish D2D connection), the method comprising:

receiving a request from the first WLAN ProSe capable WTRU to establish a WLAN ProSe connection to the second WLAN ProSe capable WTRU, the request including at least an identification of the second WLAN ProSe capable WTRU (see paragraphs 71, 82, and 89); and

transmitting a configuration message with configuration information associated with the second WLAN ProSe capable WTRU, wherein the configuration information

# 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.