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.
17/083,668	10/29/2020	Matthew T. Scholz	59889US018	5906
	7590 11/02/202 TVE PROPERTIES CO	_		
PO BOX 33427			PURDY, KYLE A	
ST. PAUL, MN	N 55133-3427		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			1611	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/02/2023	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):

LegalUSDocketing@mmm.com



	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	17/083,668	Scholz et al.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	AIA (FITF) Status			
	KYLE A PURDY	1611	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 8/25/2023.						
A declaration(s)/affidavit(s) under 37 CFR 1.130(b) was/were filed on						
,	☐ 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 <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims*						
5) Claim(s) 102,104-107,109 and 111-124 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) 102,104-107,109 and 111-124 is	/are rejected.					
8) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
9) Claim(s) are subjected 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						
$\underline{\text{http://www.uspto.gov/patents/init_events/pph/index.jsp}} \text{ or send}$	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	in is required if the drawing(s) is object	cted 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 t	ho:					
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,						
1. Certified copies of the priority docum		allastias Na				
2. Certified copies of the priority docum	•	-				
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)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	3) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08a and/or PTO/S	B/08b) Paper No(s)/Mail D 4) Other:	ate				



Application/Control Number: 17/083,668 Page 2

Art Unit: 1611

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of t/e previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/25/2023 has been entered.

Status of Application

- 2. The Examiner acknowledges receipt of the arguments filed 8/25/2023.
- 3. Claims 102, 104-107, 109 and 111-124 are presented for examination on the merits. The following rejections are made.

Response to Applicants' Arguments

- 4. Applicants arguments filed 4/6/2023 regarding the rejection of claims 102, 104-107, 109 and 111-121 made by the Examiner under 35 USC 103(a) over Wei et al. (US 2002/0098159; of record) in view of Scholz (US 5908619) and Wilkins, Jr (US 2004/0131567; of record) have been fully considered but they are not found persuasive and is **MAINTAINED** for the reasons of record in the office action mailed on 12/6/2022.
- 5. Applicants arguments filed 4/6/2023 regarding the rejection of claim 122 made by the Examiner under 35 USC 103(a) over Wei et al. (US 2002/0098159; of record) in view of Scholz (US 5908619) and Wilkins, Jr (US 2004/0131567; of record), further in view of Watanabe et al. (1995) have been fully considered but they are not found persuasive and is **MAINTAINED** for the reasons of record in the office action mailed on 12/6/2022.
 - 6. In regards to the 103(a) rejection, Applicant asserts the following:



Application/Control Number: 17/083,668 Page 3

Art Unit: 1611

A) the Office has not provided any reason why one would assume that antimicrobial activity intended for a skin surface would be effective when applied to a mucosal surface. Moreover, mucus and mucin biopolymers can bind and inhibit antimicrobials.

7. In response to A, as was noted in the previous Office Action regarding the issue of treating a skin surface and a mucosal surface, it is not seen why treatment of one surface would result in loss of antimicrobial activity. Wei teaches that their composition is useful for inhibiting bacterial infections of the skin. Thus, it would be reasonable to expect that when the antibacterial composition is applied on to other (biological) surfaces, such as a mucosal surface, an outcome of killing unwanted microbes would be achieved. It is noted that Applicant has provided evidence that mucus/mucin can reduce the efficacy of antibiotics. However, the current method is applying a fatty acid and an ester of a fatty alcohol which are not seen as structurally analogous to the antibiotics referenced in the response. It is observed however that the mucus/mucin does not stop antibiotic activity but rather reduces antibiotic activity meaning that the antibiotic is still capable of killing the target microbe and so even if mucus/mucin did interfere with the inhibition, it would not be sufficient to stop the method from inhibiting the unwanted target microbes.

Maintained Rejections, of Record Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 8. The following is a quotation of pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.



Application/Control Number: 17/083,668 Page 4

Art Unit: 1611

9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 10. Claims 102, 104-107, 109 and 111-123 are rejected under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wei et al. (US 2002/0098159; of record) in view of Scholz (US 5908619) and Wilkins, Jr (US 2004/0131567; of record), evidenced by PubChem: Docusate sodium.
 - 11. Wei provides antimicrobial compositions and methods of using such compositions.
- 12. Methods involve applying the antimicrobial composition to the skin to achieve a disinfecting benefit (see [0321]). The amount of the antimicrobial formulation, and the frequency applied, and the period applied vary depending on the disinfection and cleansing desired.

 Preferably the composition is applied at least once per day, and more preferably at least three time per day. Inhibition of *S. aureus* is contemplated (see [0008]) (see instant claim 102).
- 13. The composition used in the methods may comprise **lauric acid** (see [0313]) (see instant claim 102, 104, 105, 123 and 124) in an amount ranging from 0.1-10% (see [0302]) (see instant claim 111). It's noted that Wei uses lauric acid as a stabilizer. However, as Wei's lauric acid is chemically identical to the lauric acid of the claims, it would necessarily possess antimicrobial activity, despite being used for a different purpose (by Wei).
- 14. Wei teaches including an aqueous component that includes water, water soluble alcohols such as **ethanol**, propanol or isopropanol, and mixtures thereof (see [0091]) in amounts ranging



DOCKET

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.

