



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.
17/295,304	05/19/2021	Anders BERGGREN	SYP330962US01	1911
190293	7590	01/28/2025	EXAMINER	
TUCKER ELLIS LLP - Sony Group			DSOUZA, JOSEPH FRANCIS A	
950 MAIN AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1100			2632	
CLEVELAND, OH 44113-7213			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/28/2025	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):

patents@tuckerellis.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 17/295,304	Applicant(s) BERGGREN et al.	
	Examiner ADOLF DSOUZA	Art Unit 2632	AIA (FITF) 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 9/19/2024.
☐ 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) 1-2,4-13,15 and 17-18 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) 1-2,4-13,15 and 17-18 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 ____ 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)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 3) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Other: _____

Notice of Pre-AIA or AIA Status

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

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot because the new ground of rejection does not rely on any reference applied in the prior rejection of record for any teaching or matter specifically challenged in the argument.

Applicant submitted IDS (1/8/2025). Examiner is using R2-1708401 in the IDS to reject what Applicant argued in Remarks (REM 9/19/2024), i.e., the limitation: "wherein the information comprises a type of a core network with which the at least one further access node is associated". Though Examiner maintains his argument that "specifying the frequency, specifies the type of core network", R2-1708401 explicitly discloses the above limitation and hence is a better reference for this limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. 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 (i.e., changing from AIA to pre-AIA) 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.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent for a claimed invention may not be obtained, notwithstanding that the claimed invention is not identically disclosed as set forth in section 102, if the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious before the effective filing date of the claimed invention to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the claimed invention pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1 - 2, 4 - 5, 7 - 8, 10 - 13, 15, 17 - 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over **R2-1711112** (which had been provided in the International Search Report) in view of **R2-1708401** (which had been provided in the IDS (1/8/2025)).

Regarding claim 1, R2-1711112 discloses a **method of operating a wireless communication device** (page 2, section 2.2, Mobility in IDLE mode, 1st paragraph discloses UE in IDLE mode; page 1, section 1 discloses 5G, hence wireless), **the method comprising:**

the wireless communication device receiving from an access node of a cellular network, information associated with at least one further access node of the cellular network (page 2, section 2.1, 2nd last paragraph discloses “... *the legacy LTE HO command message should be enhanced to indicate the target CN type information to the UE, so that the UE can know whether it needs to change NAS layer type.*”; page 2, section 2.2, Scenario 1: Inter-frequency discloses “..the frequency of E-UTRA connected to 5GC should be set a higher priority for 5G UE who has the capability to

access 5GC, the 5G UE would have more chances to reselect such cell.”; page 2, Proposal 4 discloses “*For UE in IDLE mode, the inter-frequency cell reselection procedure could take the CN type supported by eNB into account ...*”; wherein the CN type is the information received by the UE and is associated with the inter-frequency),

and wherein the information enables the wireless communication device to control selection of the at least one further access node (page 2, Proposal 4 discloses cell reselection based on CN and associated inter-frequency);

and wherein the information is included in broadcasted system information of the serving access node (page 2, section 2.1, 2nd last paragraph discloses “... *the legacy L TE HO command message should be enhanced to indicate the target CN type information to the UE, so that the UE can know whether it needs to change NAS layer type.*”; wherein broadcasted system information is inherent in the command message).

R2-1711112 does not explicitly disclose wherein the information comprises a type of a core network with which the at least one further access node is associated.

In the same field of endeavor, however, R2-1708401 discloses **the information comprises a type of a core network with which the at least one further access node is associated** (section 2, 1st paragraph discloses “... *which means that the network should let the UE know its CN connectivity capability before the UE starts a RRC connection establishment procedure Therefore, it comes to the conclusion that the eNB should broadcast the CN type it connected to, i.e. 5GC or not. This*

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.