



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.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

90/019,488

04/17/2024

8862757

CEL757

1084

7590

07/15/2024

Ashok Tankha
36 Greenleigh drive
Sewell, NJ 08080

EXAMINER

CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3992

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/15/2024

PAPER

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.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

DO NOT USE IN PALM PRINTER

(THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS)

UNIFIED PATENTS, LLC
4445 WILLARD AVE.
SUITE 600
CHEVY CHASE, MD 20815

***EX PARTE* REEXAMINATION COMMUNICATION TRANSMITTAL FORM**

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NO. 90/019,488 .

PATENT UNDER REEXAMINATION 8862757 .

ART UNIT 3992 .

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above identified *ex parte* reexamination proceeding (37 CFR 1.550(f)).

Where this copy is supplied after the reply by requester, 37 CFR 1.535, or the time for filing a reply has passed, no submission on behalf of the *ex parte* reexamination requester will be acknowledged or considered (37 CFR 1.550(g)).

Order Granting Request For Ex Parte Reexamination	Control No. 90/019,488	Patent Under Reexamination 8862757	
	Examiner JOSHUA D CAMPBELL	Art Unit 3992	AIA (FITF) Status No

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

The request for *ex parte* reexamination filed 17 April 2024 has been considered and a determination has been made. An identification of the claims, the references relied upon, and the rationale supporting the determination are attached.

Attachments: a) ☐ PTO-892, b) ☒ PTO/SB/08, c) ☐ Other: _____

1. ☒ The request for *ex parte* reexamination is GRANTED.

RESPONSE TIMES ARE SET AS FOLLOWS:

For Patent Owner's Statement (Optional): TWO MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication (37 CFR 1.530 (b)). **EXTENSIONS OF TIME ARE GOVERNED BY 37 CFR 1.550(c).**

For Requester's Reply (optional): TWO MONTHS from the **date of service** of any timely filed Patent Owner's Statement (37 CFR 1.535). **NO EXTENSION OF THIS TIME PERIOD IS PERMITTED.** If Patent Owner does not file a timely statement under 37 CFR 1.530(b), then no reply by requester is permitted.

--	--	--

cc:Requester (if third party requester)

Decision on Request

1) A substantial new question (SNQ) of patentability affecting claims 1-26 of United States Patent Number 8,862,757 (hereinafter “the ‘757 Patent”) is raised by the request for *ex parte* reexamination filed April 17, 2024.

Information Disclosure Statement

2) Where the IDS citations are submitted but not described, the examiner is only responsible for cursorily reviewing the references. The initials of the examiner on the PTO-1449 indicate only that degree of review unless the reference is either applied against the claims, or discussed by the examiner as pertinent art of interest, in a subsequent office action.

See Guidelines for Reexamination of Cases in View of *In re Portola Packaging, Inc.*, 110 F.3d 786, 42 USPQ2d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 1997), 64 FR at 15347, 1223 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 125 (response to comment 6).

Consideration by the examiner of the information submitted in an IDS means that the examiner will consider the documents in the same manner as other documents in Office search files are considered by the examiner while conducting a search of the prior art in a proper field of search. The initials of the examiner placed adjacent to the citations on the PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08A and 08B or its equivalent mean that the information has been considered by the examiner to the extent noted above.

Regarding IDS submissions MPEP 2256 recites the following: "Where patents, publications, and other such items of information are submitted by a party (patent owner) in compliance with the requirements of the rules, the requisite degree of consideration to be given to such information will be normally limited by the degree to which the party filing the information citation has explained the content and relevance of the information."

Affidavits, Declarations, or Other Written Evidence

- 3) The Examiner notes that affidavits or declarations or other written evidence which explain the contents or pertinent dates of prior art patents or printed publications in more detail may be considered in reexamination (see: MPEP 2258(I)(E)), but any rejection must be based upon the prior art patents or printed publications as explained by the affidavits or declarations or other written evidence. The rejection in such circumstances cannot be based on the affidavits or declarations or other written evidence as such, but must be based on the prior art patents or printed publications.
- 4) The Examiner recognizes that a declaration of Dr. Philip Greenspun (Exhibit 1003) has been referenced in support of Third-Party Requester. The declaration has been considered and made of record. In the instant case, the submitted Greenspun Declaration at least further explains the contents of the prior art patents and printed publications in more detail.
- 5) The Examiner also recognizes the declaration of Dr. Ingrid Hsieh-Yee (Exhibit 1011) has been referenced in support of Third-Party Requester. In the instant case, the Hsieh-Yee declaration further discusses the date of public availability to some of the pertinent references of this reexamination proceeding.

Prior art cited in the Request

- 6) The present request indicates that the Requester considers that a substantial new question of patentability is raised as to claims 1-26 of the '757 Patent by the following prior art references:
- a. **Sohn** – Korean Patent No. KR100537818 (Certified Translation)
 - b. **Bodic** – “Mobile Messaging Technologies and Services: SMS, EMS, and MMS”
 - c. **Jin** – Korean Patent No. KR100608841 (Certified Translation)
 - d. **Wagner** – U.S. Patent No. 8,385,950
 - e. **Deshpande** – U.S. Patent No. 7,206,804
 - f. **Song** – U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0184383

Prosecution History

7) The '757 Patent application was assigned serial number 14/273,546 (hereinafter "the '546 application"), filed May 9, 2014. During the original prosecution, the '546 application initially included claims 1-30. The '546 application is a continuation of U.S. patent application No. 14/172,913 (U.S. Patent No. 8,798,539), filed February 5, 2014, which is continuation of application No. 13/740,214 (U.S. Patent No. 8,700,790), filed on January 3, 2013, which is a continuation of application No. 12/333,303 (U.S. Patent No. 8,392,591), filed on December 11, 2008, all of which rely on Provisional Application 61/017,202, filed on December 28, 2007.

In the first action, the examiner rejected all claims as nonstatutory double patenting in view of applications 14/109,972 and 14/297,616. The examiner also rejected some of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. In response, the patent owner filed proper terminal disclaimers which were approved. Additionally, the patent owner amended to the claims in an attempt to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112.

In response to the amendments and arguments, the case was passed to allowance with an examiner's amendment to the independent claims. The amendment was as follows (using claim 1 as example):

transferring a data segment along with said user identifier and said segment identifier to the web service, wherein transferring the data segment further comprises one or more of:

configuring the data segment so that the data segment can be received by the web service; and

configuring the data segment so that the data segments can be reassembled using segment identifiers by the web service;

The examiner made the following statement of reasons for allowance in the notice of allowance:

None of the prior art of the record explicitly teaches or fairly suggests all of the claimed limitation, especially the limitation wherein providing a software module on the Bluetooth

enabled mobile device, the software module, performing; determining size of a file to be transferred; segmenting said file into data segments at an application layer level, wherein said file is segmented in part due to size of said file and data transfer capabilities of said Bluetooth enabled mobile device, wherein data in said data segments comprises one or more of said file data and data associated with said file data; applying a segment identifier to each of said data segments at the application layer level; applying a user identifier to each of said data segments for the destination web service at the application layer level, wherein said user identifier uniquely identifies a particular user of the web service; transferring a data segment along with said user identifier and said segment identifier to the web service, wherein transferring the data segment further comprises one or more of: configuring the data segment so that the data segment can be received by the web service; and configuring the data segment so that the data segments can be reassembled using segment identifiers by the web service; receiving a reply message from the web service, corresponding to successful completion of said data segment transfer; repeating the step of data segment transfer and the step of receiving the reply message, until all the data segments have been transferred to the web service successfully, wherein if segmented file transfer is interrupted, the software module further performs: sending, a synchronization request to the web service from the application layer level, corresponding to asking the web service about the segmented file data the web service has successfully received, for said user identifier, after a network connection to the web service is restored; receiving, a synchronization reply back from the web service at the application layer level, corresponding to indicate segmented file data said web service has successfully received, for said user identifier; and resuming, the segmented file transfer based on the synchronization reply received, for said user identifier.

Thus, as it currently stands based on the prosecution history of the ‘546 application, it appears that the claims of the ‘757 Patent were allowed at least in part based on the limitations regarding “transferring a data segment along with said user identifier and said segment identifier to the web service, wherein transferring the data segment further comprises one or more of: configuring the data segment so that the

data segment can be received by the web service; and configuring the data segment so that the data segments can be reassembled using segment identifiers by the web service;” found in patent claim 1 (similar limitations found in claims 8, 15, and 21).

Following the issuance of the ‘757 Patent, IPR2024-00759 was requested to challenge claims 1-26, in view of Aaltonen, Drescher, Takahashi, Na, and Lind.

Ground	Claims	§102 Basis
1	1-26	Aaltonen and Drescher
2A	1-26	Takahashi and Na
2B	1-26	Takahashi, Na, and Lind

The PTAB has not yet decided whether or not to institute the *Inter Partes* Review of the ‘757 Patent.

Priority

8) As mentioned above, the ‘757 Patent is a continuation of U.S. patent application No. 14/172,913 (U.S. Patent No. 8,798,539), filed February 5, 2014, which is continuation of application No. 13/740,214 (U.S. Patent No. 8,700,790), filed on January 3, 2013, which is a continuation of application No. 12/333,303 (U.S. Patent No. 8,392,591), filed on December 11, 2008, all of which rely on Provisional Application 61/017,202, filed on December 28, 2007.

Substantial New Question of Patentability

9) The italicized sections of claim 1 (similar limitations found in claims 8, 15, and 21) are utilized by the examiner to show how specific teachings of the proposed references create a substantial new question of patentability.

1. A method of segmented file transfer from a Bluetooth enabled mobile device to a web service, the method comprising:

providing a software module on the Bluetooth enabled mobile device, the software module,

performing;

determining size of a file to be transferred;

segmenting said file into data segments at an application layer level, wherein said file is segmented in part due to size of said file and data transfer capabilities of said Bluetooth enabled mobile device, wherein data in said data segments comprises one or more of said file data and data associated with said file data;

applying a segment identifier to each of said data segments at the application layer level;

applying a user identifier to each of said data segments for the destination web service at the application layer level, wherein said user identifier uniquely identifies a particular user of the web service;

transferring a data segment along with said user identifier and said segment identifier to the web service, wherein transferring the data segment further comprises one or more of:

configuring the data segment so that the data segment can be received by the web service; and

configuring the data segment so that the data segments can be reassembled using segment identifiers by the web service;

receiving a reply message from the web service, corresponding to successful completion of said data segment transfer;

repeating the step of data segment transfer and the step of receiving the reply message, until all the data segments have been transferred to the web service successfully, wherein if segmented file transfer is interrupted, the software module further performs:

sending, a synchronization request to the web service from the application layer level,

corresponding to asking the web service about the segmented file data the web service has successfully received, for said user identifier, after a network connection to the web service is restored;

receiving, a synchronization reply back from the web service at the application layer level, corresponding to indicate segmented file data said web service has successfully received, for said user identifier; and
resuming, the segmented file transfer based on the synchronization reply received, for said user identifier.

Sohn (SNQ 1)

- 10) The Request shows that Sohn provides teachings relevant to the determination of patentability regarding the following limitations, for claim 1:

transferring a data segment along with said user identifier and said segment identifier to the web service, wherein transferring the data segment further comprises one or more of:

Sohn describes uploading split multimedia messages to a Multimedia Messaging Service Center (MMSC), the split messages each include a header field containing identification information and sequence information (page 4, paragraph 4 and page 5, paragraph 1 of the Sohn translation).

configuring the data segment so that the data segment can be received by the web service; and

Sohn describes the process of uploading split messages including defining the header fields according to the HTTP1.1 protocol (page 6, paragraphs 5-14 of the Sohn translation).
configuring the data segment so that the data segments can be reassembled using segment identifiers by the web service;

Sohn describes the header being configured to include the necessary information to allow reassembling the split messages (page 6, paragraphs 5-14 of the Sohn translation).

Sohn also describes receiving and interpreting the split messages in order to convert the overall multimedia message into a different format (page 5, paragraph 4 of the Sohn translation).

The Sohn reference was not previously discussed by the examiner nor applied to claims 1-26 in the prior examination of the patent as discussed above. Additionally, claims 1-26 were not subject to any Final Written Decision in view of Sohn in the IPR proceeding discussed above.

It is agreed that Sohn raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to at least independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 21 of the '757 Patent. There is a substantial likelihood that an examiner would consider these new, non-cumulative technological teachings important in deciding whether or not these claims are patentable.

Accordingly, Sohn raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to at least claims 1-26 of the '757 Patent, a question which has not been decided in a previous examination of the '757 Patent nor was there a final holding of invalidity by the Federal Courts regarding the '757 Patent.

Wagner in view of Sohn (SNQ 9)

11) The Request shows that Wagner and Sohn provide teachings relevant to the determination of patentability regarding the following limitations, for claim 1:

transferring a data segment along with said user identifier and said segment identifier to the web service, wherein transferring the data segment further comprises one or more of:

Wagner describes transferring data packets to an online service provider (column 6, lines 16-46 of Wagner).

Sohn describes uploading split multimedia messages to a Multimedia Messaging Service Center (MMSC), the split messages each include a header field containing identification information and sequence information (page 4, paragraph 4 and page 5, paragraph 1 of the Sohn translation).

configuring the data segment so that the data segment can be received by the web service; and

Wagner describes transferring a digital image to an online service provider in the form of packets carrying portions of the digital image (column 6, lines 16-46 of Wagner).

Sohn describes the process of uploading split messages including defining the header fields according to the HTTP1.1 protocol (page 6, paragraphs 5-14 of the Sohn translation). *configuring the data segment so that the data segments can be reassembled using segment identifiers by the web service;*

Sohn describes the header being configured to include the necessary information to allow reassembling the split messages (page 6, paragraphs 5-14 of the Sohn translation). Sohn also describes receiving and interpreting the split messages in order to convert the overall multimedia message into a different format (page 5, paragraph 4 of the Sohn translation).

The Wagner and Sohn references were not previously discussed by the examiner nor applied to claims 1-26 in the prior examination of the patent as discussed above. Additionally, claims 1-26 were not subject to any Final Written Decision in view of Wagner or Sohn in the IPR proceeding discussed above.

It is agreed that Wagner in view of Sohn raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to at least independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 21 of the '757 Patent. There is a substantial likelihood that an examiner would consider these new, non-cumulative technological teachings important in deciding whether or not these claims are patentable.

Accordingly, Wagner in view of Sohn raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to at least claims 1-26 of the '757 Patent, a question which has not been decided in a previous examination of the '757 Patent nor was there a final holding of invalidity by the Federal Courts regarding the '757 Patent.

Bodic, Jin, and Song (SNQs 2-8 and SNQs 10-16)

12) The Bodic, Jin, and Song references have been cited in combination with the Sohn reference or the combination of the Wagner and Sohn references in the Request as part of the asserted SNQ. As stated above, Sohn or the combination of Wagner and Sohn were not previously discussed by the examiner nor

applied to claims 1-26 in the prior examination of the '757 patent. The Bodic, Jin, and Song references were not previously discussed by the examiner nor applied to claims 1-26 in the prior examination. The Bodic, Jin, and Song references in combination with the Sohn reference or the combination of the Wagner and Sohn references raises an SNQ at least based on the discussion found of above regarding Sohn or the combination of Wagner and Sohn. The Request shows that the combinations of Sohn or the combination of Wagner and Sohn provide teachings that are relevant to the limitations noted above which may have been material in determining the patentability of the '757 Patent claims at the time of allowance.

It is agreed that the consideration of Bodic, Jin, and Song in combination with Sohn or the combination of Wagner and Sohn raises an SNQ with respect to at least independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 21 of the '757 Patent based on the teachings of Sohn or the combination of Wagner and Sohn cited above. There is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider these teachings important in deciding whether or not these claims are patentable.

Accordingly, the combination of the Bodic, Jin, and Song references with the Sohn reference or the combination of Wagner and Sohn references raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to at least claims 1-26 of the '757 Patent, a question which has not been decided in a previous examination. In addition, there has been no final holding of invalidity by the Federal Courts regarding the '757 Patent.

Deshpande (SNQs 17-32)

13) The Deshpande reference has been cited in combination with different combinations of Sohn, Bodic, Jin, Song, and/or Wagner in the Request as part of the asserted SNQ. As stated above, the combinations of Sohn, Bodic, Jin, Song, and/or Wagner were not previously discussed by the examiner nor applied to claims 1-26 in the prior examination of the '757 patent. The Deshpande reference was not previously discussed by the examiner nor applied to claims 1-26 in the prior examination. The Deshpande reference, in combination with the combinations of the Sohn, Bodic, Jin, Song, and/or Wagner references raises an SNQ at least based on the discussion found of above regarding the combinations of

Sohn, Bodic, Jin, Song, and/or Wagner. The Request shows that the combinations of Sohn, Bodic, Jin, Song, and/or Wagner provide teachings that are relevant to the limitations noted above which may have been material in determining the patentability of the '757 Patent claims at the time of allowance.

It is agreed that the consideration of Deshpande in combination with the combinations of Sohn, Bodic, Jin, Song, and/or Wagner raises an SNQ with respect to at least independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 21 of the '757 Patent based on the teachings of the combinations of Sohn, Bodic, Jin, Song, and/or Wagner cited above. There is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider these teachings important in deciding whether or not these claims are patentable.

Accordingly, the combination of the Deshpande reference with the combinations of Sohn, Bodic, Jin, Song, and/or Wagner references raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to at least claims 1-26 of the '757 Patent, a question which has not been decided in a previous examination. In addition, there has been no final holding of invalidity by the Federal Courts regarding the '757 Patent.

Scope of Reexamination

- 14) Claim 1-26 will be reexamined as requested.

325(d) Analysis

35 USC 325(d) states in part that "[i]n determining whether to institute or order a proceeding under this chapter, chapter 30, or chapter 31, the Director may take into account whether, and reject the petition or request because, the same or substantially the same prior art or arguments previously were presented to the Office." Thus, in order for the Director to exercise discretion as to whether to Order a reexamination proceeding under chapter 30, the request must first be determined to be based on the same or substantially the same prior art or arguments that previously were presented to the Office.

A review of the post grant history of the ‘757 patent indicates that the patent was the subject of a single prior AIA petition. On April 1, 2024, petitioner TikTok, Inc. filed a petition seeking *inter partes* review of claims 1-26 of the ‘757 patent (IPR2024-00759). In the petition, petitioner asserted the following grounds as raising a reasonable likelihood in prevailing (RLP) in showing the unpatentability of the claims:

RLP #	Claims Challenged	35 USC §	References
1	1-26	103	Aaltonen and Drescher
2	1-26	103	Takahashi, Na
3	1-26	103	Takahashi, Na, Lind

The Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB) has not yet issued a decision on the institution of *inter partes* review. Accordingly, the merits of the newly presented references of Aaltonen, Drescher, Takahashi, Na and Lind have not been addressed by the PTAB.

A comparison between the prior art and arguments presented in the current *ex parte* reexamination Request (90/019,488) and the prior *inter partes* review petition (IPR2024-00759) indicates that the instant request is not based on the same or substantially the same prior art or arguments as were previously presented to the Office.

As stated above, the instant request asserts the following grounds as raising an SNQ to claims 1-26 of the ‘757 patent:

SNQ #		Claims Challenged	Basis	References
1		1-26	103	Sohn
2		1-26	103	Sohn, Bodic
3		1-26	103	Sohn, Jin
4		1-26	103	Sohn, Bodic, Jin
5		1-26	103	Sohn, Song
6		1-26	103	Sohn, Bodic, Song
7		1-26	103	Sohn, Jin, Song
8		1-26	103	Sohn, Bodic, Jin, Song
9		1-26	103	Wagner, Sohn

10		1-26	103	Wagner, Sohn, Bodic
11		1-26	103	Wagner, Sohn, Jin
12		1-26	103	Wagner, Sohn, Bodic, Jin
13		1-26	103	Wagner, Sohn, Song
14		1-26	103	Wagner, Sohn, Bodic, Song
15		1-26	103	Wagner, Sohn, Jin, Song
16		1-26	103	Wagner, Sohn, Bodic, Jin, Song
17		7, 14, 20, 26	103	Sohn, Deshpande
18		7, 14, 20, 26	103	Sohn, Bodic, Deshpande
19		7, 14, 20, 26	103	Sohn, Jin, Deshpande
20		7, 14, 20, 26	103	Sohn, Bodic, Jin, Deshpande
21		7, 14, 20, 26	103	Sohn, Song, Deshpande
22		7, 14, 20, 26	103	Sohn, Bodic, Song, Deshpande
23		7, 14, 20, 26	103	Sohn, Jin, Song, Deshpande
24		7, 14, 20, 26	103	Sohn, Bodic, Jin, Song, Deshpande
25		7, 14, 20, 26	103	Wagner, Sohn, Deshpande
26		7, 14, 20, 26	103	Wagner, Sohn, Bodic, Deshpande
27		7, 14, 20, 26	103	Wagner, Sohn, Jin, Deshpande
28		7, 14, 20, 26	103	Wagner, Sohn, Bodic, Jin, Deshpande
29		7, 14, 20, 26	103	Wagner, Sohn, Song, Deshpande
30		7, 14, 20, 26	103	Wagner, Sohn, Bodic, Song, Deshpande
31		7, 14, 20, 26	103	Wagner, Sohn, Jin, Song, Deshpande
32		7, 14, 20, 26	103	Wagner, Sohn, Bodic, Jin, Song, Deshpande

As an initial matter, none of the grounds asserted as raising an SNQ in the current *ex parte* reexamination Request (90/019,488) are based on identical grounds asserted in the prior IPR petition and the arguments in the Request relate to these prior art combinations. Thus, the Request is not based on the same prior art or arguments previously presented to the Office.

In addition, the Request is also not based on substantially the same prior art or arguments as were previously presented to the Office. The prior art references of Sohn, Bodic, Jin, Song, Deshpande and Wagner are materially different references than presented in the IPR petition, as noted above, and thus

present different disclosures than the Aaltonen, Drescher, Takahashi, Na and Lind references presented in the prior IPR petition (IPR2024-00759).

However, to the extent that the references of Sohn, Bodic, Jin, Song, Deshpande and Wagner presented in the current *ex parte* reexamination Request (90/019,488) are considered to be substantially similar to the references of Aaltonen, Drescher, Takahashi, Na and Lind presented in the prior IPR petition (IPR2024-00759), the Examiner as delegated by the Director declines to exercise discretion to reject this request in view of the following facts:

- 1.) The fact that there has been only one prior post grant challenge to the ‘757 patent and there has been no finding of serial abusive Office challenges to the ‘757 patent by Third Party Requester;
- 2.) The fact that the PTAB has not yet issued a decision on the institution of *inter partes* review in the IPR2024-00759 petition and therefore has not yet considered the merits of references presented in the IPR petition;
- 3.) The fact that there is minimal additional burden on the Office in examining the claims of the ‘757 patent in view of the grounds determined to raise an SNQ; and
- 4.) The fact that there is a strong public interest that the prior art references of Sohn, Bodic, Jin, Song, Deshpande and Wagner, which are determined to raise an SNQ over claims 1-26 of the ‘757 patent, be fully considered by the Office to fully address the patentability of the challenged claims.

Accordingly, *Ex Parte* Reexamination is Ordered based on the determination that cited Sohn, Bodic, Jin, Song, Deshpande and Wagner raise an SNQ to the ‘757 patent for the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

15) Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) will not be permitted in these proceedings because the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 apply only to "an applicant" and not to parties in a reexamination proceeding.

Additionally, 35 U.S.C. 305 requires that reexamination proceedings "will be conducted with special dispatch" (37 CFR 1.550(a)). Extension of time in *ex parte* reexamination proceedings are provided for in 37 CFR 1.550(c).

16) The patent owner is reminded of the continuing responsibility under 37 CFR 1.565(a) to apprise the Office of any litigation activity, or other prior or concurrent proceeding, involving Patent No. 8,862,757 throughout the course of this reexamination proceeding. See MPEP §§ 2207, 2282 and 2286.

17) All correspondence relating to this *ex parte* reexamination proceeding should be directed:

Electronically: Registered users may submit via Patent Center at <https://patentcenter.uspto.gov/>.

By Mail to: Mail Stop *Ex Parte* Reexam
Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By FAX to: (571) 273-9900
Central Reexamination Unit

By hand: Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

For electronic transmissions, 37 CFR 1.8(a)(1)(i)(C) and (ii) states that correspondence (except for a request for reexamination and a corrected or replacement request for reexamination) will be considered timely filed if (a) it is transmitted via the USPTO patent electronic filing system in accordance with 37 CFR 1.6(a)(4), and (b) includes a certificate of transmission for each piece of correspondence stating the date of transmission, which is prior to the expiration of the set period of time in the Office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Joshua Campbell at telephone number (571) 272-4133.

/JOSHUA D CAMPBELL/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3992

Conferees:

/ADAM L BASEHOAR/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3992

/ALEXANDER J KOSOWSKI/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3992