



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.
90/019,165	02/17/2023	7814170		7078

184647 7590 03/29/2023
Reichman Jorgensen Lehman & Feldberg LLP
100 Marine Parkway
Suite 300
Redwood City, CA 94065

EXAMINER

CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3992

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/29/2023

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)

FISCH SIGLER LLP
5301 WISCONSIN AVENUE NW
SUITE 400
WASHINGTON, DC 20015

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

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NO. 90/019,165.

PATENT UNDER REEXAMINATION 7,814,170.

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.	Patent Under Reexamination	
	90/019,165	7814170	
	Examiner	Art Unit	AIA (FITF) Status
	JOSHUA D CAMPBELL	3992	No

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

The request for *ex parte* reexamination filed 02/17/2023 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.

/JOSHUA D CAMPBELL/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3992		
--	--	--

cc:Requester (if third party requester)

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTOL-471G (Rev. 01-13)

Office Action in *Ex Parte* Reexamination

Part of Paper No. 20230316

Decision on Request

1) A substantial new question (SNQ) of patentability affecting claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 15 of United States Patent Number 7,814,170 (hereinafter “ ‘170 Patent”) is raised by the request for *ex parte* reexamination filed 17 February 2023.

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 recognizes that declarations by Sylvia D. Hall-Ellis (Exhibit 18) and Joseph B. Greene (Exhibit 19) have been referenced in support of Third Party Requester. The declarations have been considered and made of record. The Examiner further 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. In the instant case, the Hall-Ellis Declaration provides information regarding the publication date of the ONAG and Oracle Unleashed references, while the submitted Greene Declaration at least further explains the contents of the prior art patents and printed publications in more detail.

Prior art cited in the Request

4) The present request indicates that the Requester considers that a substantial new question of patentability is raised as to claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 15 of the '170 Patent by the following prior art references:

- a. **Skagerwall** – U.S. Patent No. 6,473,781
- b. **Wolff** – U.S. Patent No. 6,185,601
- c. **ONAG** – “Oracle Names Administrator’s Guide, Release 2.0”
- d. **Oracle Unleashed** – “Oracle8 Server Unleashed”
- e. **Steen** – “Locating Objects in Wide-Area Systems”

Prosecution History

5) The '170 Patent application was assigned serial number 11/354,224 (hereinafter "'224 application"), filed February 13, 2006. During the original prosecution, the '224 application after a preliminary amendment included claims 17-32. The '224 application was a continuation of application 09/661,222, filed on September 13, 2000 (U.S. Patent 7,103,640), a continuation-in-part of application 09/111,896, filed on July 8, 1998 (abandoned). The '170 application also relied on Provisional Applications 60/153,709, filed on September 14, 1999.

In a first action mailed 28 October 2008, the Office rejected all claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102, and rejected independent claims 17, 20, and 30 under non-statutory double patenting.

After extensive claim amendments, the prior art rejections were withdrawn, while the double patenting rejections were maintained, in a final rejection mailed 2 September 2009.

After the filing of a terminal disclaimer, the Office mailed a notice of allowance on June 25, 2010, the examiner gave the following reasons for allowance:

The prior art of record fails to teach neither singly nor in combination, the claimed limitations of "a data location server network comprising a plurality of data location servers, wherein data location information for a plurality of data entities is stored in the data location server network, at least one of the plurality of data location servers includes location information associated with the identifier string, each one of the plurality of data location servers comprises a processor and a portion of the data location information, *the portion of the data location information included in a corresponding one of the data location servers is based on a hash function used to organize the data location information across the plurality of data location servers, and each one of the data location servers is configured to determine the at least one of the plurality of data location servers based on the hash function applied to the identifier string.*" (emphasis added) as stated in claims 17, and " programming logic stored on the location server, wherein the programming logic is configured to return, in response to a location query related to a desired entity, a location message, the location message in conformance with the transfer protocol

and comprising at least one location associated with the desired entity, wherein the programming logic is further configured to return the location message if the location server contains location information for the desired entity, and *wherein the programming logic is further configured to return a redirect message if the location server lacks the location information for the desired entity, the redirect message comprising a list of at least one other location server known to have the location information for the desired entity.*” (emphasis added) as stated in claim 20 and similarly in claim 35. These limitations, in conjunction with other limitations in the independent claim, are not specifically disclosed or remotely suggested in the prior art of record. A review of claims 17-20, 22-29, and 33-37 indicated claims 17-20, 22-29, and 33-37 are allowable over the prior art of record.

(Notice of Allowance mailed June 25, 2010 in the ‘224 application)

Following the issuance of the ‘170 patent, *Ex Parte* reexamination control no. 90/019,035 was requested to challenge claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 15 in view of ONAG, OracleSG (“Oracle DBA Survival Guide, 1st ed.”), McGarvey (U.S. Patent No. 5,777,989), and Rajani (U.S. Patent No. 5,301,286). On September 27, 2022, a Notice of Intent to Issue a Reexamination Certificate was mailed confirming the patentability of claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 15. The examiner gave the following reasons for confirmation of said claims:

Independent claim 1 is directed to a system for managing data stored in a distributed network, the system comprising (*inter alia*) a data location server network comprising a plurality of data location servers, wherein data location information for a plurality of data entities is stored in the data location server network, at least one of the plurality of data location servers includes location information associated with an identifier string identifying the data entity, each one of the plurality of data location servers comprises a portion of the data location information based on a hash function used to organize the data location information across the plurality of data location servers, and *each one of the data location servers is configured to determine the at least one of the plurality of data location servers based on the hash function applied to the identifier string.*

The prior art of record fails to teach this feature.

Claim 2 incorporates these features from independent claim 1, and is confirmed on the same basis.

Independent claim 6 is directed to a system for managing data location information and providing the data location information in response to location queries, the system comprising (*inter alia*) programming logic configured to return a redirect message if the location server lacks the location information for the desired entity, *the redirect message comprising a list of at least one other location server known to have the location information for the desired entity.*

The prior art of record fails to teach this feature.

Claims 8, 9, and 12 incorporate these features from independent claim 6, and are confirmed on the same basis.

Independent claim 15 is directed to a method of handling location queries in a network, the network comprising a plurality of location servers including data location information, the method comprising (*inter alia*) receiving a location query from a client at one of the plurality of location servers, the location query requesting location information identifying a location of a data entity included in the data entities, and sending a redirect message to the client in response to determining the one of the plurality of location servers fails to include the location information, *the redirect message identifying which of the plurality of location servers includes the location information.*

The prior art of record fails to teach this feature.

(Notice of Intent to Issue Reexamination Certificate mailed

September 27, 2022 in Reexamination Control No. 90/019,035)

Thus, as it currently stands based on the prosecution history of the '170 application and reexamination control no. 90/019,034, it appears that the claims of the '170 Patent were allowed and confirmed at least in part based on the following limitations:

each one of the data location servers is configured to determine the at least one of the plurality of data location servers based on the hash function applied to the identifier string.

(claim 1)

wherein the programming logic is further configured to return a redirect message if the location server lacks the location information for the desired entity, the redirect message comprising a list of at least one other location server known to have the location information for the desired entity.

(claim 6)

sending a redirect message to the client in response to determining the one of the plurality of location servers fails to include the location information, the redirect message identifying which of the plurality of location servers includes the location information.

(claim 15)

Priority and Patent Term

6) As mentioned above, the '170 Patent was a continuation of application 09/661,222, filed on September 13, 2000 (U.S. Patent 7,103,640), a continuation-in-part of application 09/111,896, filed on July 8, 1998 (abandoned). The '170 application also relied on Provisional Applications 60/153,709, filed on September 14, 1999.

MPEP 2701(I) states the following:

A patent granted on a continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part application that was filed on or after June 8, 1995, will have a term which ends twenty years from the filing date of earliest application for which a benefit is claimed under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, 365(c), or 386(c) regardless of whether the application for which a benefit is claimed under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) was filed prior to June 8, 1995.

Based on the citation above, the '170 Patent is expired. The term of twenty years from the filing date of the earliest filed application (09/111,896, filed on July 8, 1998) for which a benefit is claimed plus the term adjustment of 749 days under 35 U.S.C. 154(b) has passed.

7) 37 C.F.R. 1.530(j) states, "No enlargement of claim scope. No amendment may enlarge the scope of the claims of the patent or introduce new matter. ***No amendment may be proposed for entry in an expired patent. Moreover, no amendment, other than the cancellation of claims, will be incorporated into the patent by a certificate issued after the expiration of the patent.***" (emphasis added). Thus, because the patent is expired no amendments of the claims will be allowed aside from the cancellation of claims.

Additionally, in making the determination of whether to order reexamination, the Office will determine the proper meaning of the patent claims by giving the claims their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification (see *In re Yamamoto*, 740 F.2d 1569 (Fed. Cir. 1984)), except in the case of an expired patent (in a reexamination involving claims of an expired patent, claim construction is pursuant to the principle set forth by the court in *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1316, 75 USPQ2d 1321, 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (words of a claim "are generally given their ordinary and customary meaning" as understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art in question at the time of the invention, see *Ex parte Papst-Motoren*, 1 USPQ2d 1655 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1986)).

The examiner agrees with the Request that claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 15 do not appear to be fully supported by the 09/111,896 application (pages 10 and 11 of the Request). The '170 Patent is a continuation-in-part of application '896, however because of this lack of support claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 15 are not granted the benefit of the July 8, 1998 filing date. The proper effective filing date of claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 15 is September 14, 1999, the filing date of provisional application no. 60/153,709.

Claim Interpretation

8) Upon review of the original specification and prosecution history, the examiner has found several instances of lexicographic definitions.

Specifically, the following terms were defined at col. 4, lines 8-27:

Identifier/identifier string – a unique string with which zero or more locations strings are associated in a network distributed tracking protocol (NDTP) server.

Data location/location – a string that is a member of a set of strings associated with an identifier string in an NDTP server.

NDTP client/client – a network-attached component that initiates update or lookup of identifier/location mappings from an NDTP server with NDTP request messages.

Location server¹/server – a network-attached component that maintains a set of identifier/location mappings that are modified or returned in response to NDTP request messages from NDTP clients.

These claim terms will be interpreted consistent with Patent Owner's lexicographical definitions. Since these terms have been expressly defined in Patent Owner's disclosure, these definitions will take precedence over any other proposed construction.

In addition, Patent Owner offered proposed construction for a number of other claim terms during pending litigation².

Specifically, Patent Owner proposed the following claim term construction:

Location information – information pertaining to one or more locations of data and/or identities of one or more location servers.

¹ The Office notes that the term 'location server', although claimed, does not appear in Patent Owner's specification. That said, the analogous term 'NDTP server' is defined in the specification. The claimed 'location server' will be interpreted consistent with the 'NDTP server' definition provided in the specification.

² *Kove IO, Inc. v. Amazon Web Services, Inc.*, 1:18cv08175 (N.D. Ill.)

Hash table – a data structure that stores values in a table, where values are stored and retrieved by applying a hash function to an input and using the function result as an index into the table.

A hash function used to organize the data location information across the plurality of location servers – a hash function that maps identifier strings to one or more of the data location servers.

Data pertaining to the entity – data pertaining to a person or thing (real, digital, or abstract).

These claim terms will be interpreted consistent with the above construction.

Substantial New Question of Patentability

9) The italicized sections of claim 1 and claim 6 are utilized by the examiner to show how specific teachings of the proposed references create a substantial new question of patentability.

1. A system for managing data stored in a distributed network, the system comprising:
 - a data repository configured to store a data entity, wherein an identifier string identifies the data entity; and
 - a data location server network comprising a plurality of data location servers, wherein data location information for a plurality of data entities is stored in the data location server network, at least one of the plurality of data location servers includes location information associated with the identifier string, each one of the plurality of data location servers comprises a processor and a portion of the data location information, the portion of the data location information included in a corresponding one of the data location servers is based on a hash function used to organize the data location information across the plurality of data location servers, and *each one of the data location servers is configured to determine the at least one of the plurality of data location servers based on the hash function applied to the identifier string.*

6. A system for managing data location information and providing the data location information in response to location queries, the system comprising:
- a location server configured to receive a location addition request, the location addition request formatted in conformance with a transfer protocol, the location addition request comprising an identifier and at least one location to associate with the identifier, wherein the identifier identifies an entity and wherein each of the at least one location specifies a location of data in a network pertaining to the entity;
- wherein the location server includes a processor; and
- programming logic stored on the location server, wherein the programming logic is configured to return, in response to a location query related to a desired entity, a location message, the location message in conformance with the transfer protocol and comprising at least one location associated with the desired entity, wherein the programming logic is further configured to return the location message if the location server contains location information for the desired entity, *and wherein the programming logic is further configured to return a redirect message if the location server lacks the location information for the desired entity, the redirect message comprising a list of at least one other location server known to have the location information for the desired entity.*

Skagerwall in view of Wolff

- 10) The Request shows that Skagerwall and Wolff provide teachings relevant to the determination of patentability regarding the following limitations, for claim 1 and claim 6:

each one of the data location servers is configured to determine the at least one of the plurality of data location servers based on the hash function applied to the identifier string.

Skagerwall describes the ability of a primary directory server to identify the location a desired object using a lookup request (column 12, line 63-column 13, line 6; column 10, lines 21-26; and column 11, lines 37-45 of Skagerwall).

Wolff describes alternate path determination and redirection command across a network (Abstract and column 5, lines 24-38 of Wolff).

programming logic is further configured to return a redirect message if the location server lacks the location information for the desired entity, the redirect message comprising a list of at least one other location server known to have the location information for the desired entity.

Skagerwall describes the ability of a primary directory server to identify the location a desired object using a lookup request (column 12, line 63-column 13, line 6; column 10, lines 21-26; and column 11, lines 37-45 of Skagerwall).

Wolff describes alternate path determination and redirection command across a network (Abstract and column 5, lines 24-38 of Wolff).

The Skagerwall and Wolff references were not previously discussed by the examiner nor applied to claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 15 in the prior examination of the '170 Patent as discussed above.

It is agreed that Skagerwall in view of the Wolff raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to at least independent claims 1, 6, and 15 of the '170 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, Skagerwall in view of the Wolff raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to at least independent claims 1, 6, and 15 of the '170 Patent, a question which has not been decided in a previous examination of the '170 Patent nor was there a final holding of invalidity by the Federal Courts regarding the '170 Patent.

ONAG in view of Oracle Unleashed and Steen

- 11) The Request shows that ONAG, Oracle Unleashed, and Steen provide teachings relevant to the determination of patentability regarding the following limitations, for claim 1 and claim 6:

each one of the data location servers is configured to determine the at least one of the plurality of data location servers based on the hash function applied to the identifier string.

ONAG describes a portable software that runs on a variety of computer platforms (pages 62-63 of ONAG). An example found on page 129 of ONAG shows a query and the systems response, reproduced below:

```
NAMECTL> QUERY BONES.DEM.MEDICINE A.SMD
Total response time: 0.04 seconds
Response status: normal, successful completion
Authoritative answer: yes
Number of answers: 1
Canonical name: bones.dem.medicine
TTL: 1 day
Alias translations:
  from: bones.dem.medicine
  to: bones.dem.medicine
Answers:
  data type is "a.smd"
  Syntax is ADDR:...{DESCRIPTION={ADDRESS=
  {COMMUNITY=tcp}{PROTOCOL=TCP}{Host=cowboy}
  {Port=1522}}{CONNECT_DATA={SID=rodeo}}}
```

As can be seen in the example above, the request from the client for location information results in a response ("Answers") which provides the location information for the desired entity (see also page 109 of ONAG).

Steen describes the each subnode should be aware of how the directory node with which it communicates is partitioned, allowing the avoidance of querying the management service each time a subnode needs to communicate with its parent or children (page 108 of Steen).

Oracle Unleashed describes the benefits of using hash function instead of an index (pages 394 and 638 of Oracle Unleashed).

programming logic is further configured to return a redirect message if the location server lacks the location information for the desired entity, the redirect message comprising a list of at least one other location server known to have the location information for the desired entity.

ONAG describes a portable software that runs on a variety of computer platforms (pages 62-63 of ONAG). An example found on page 129 of ONAG shows a query and the systems response, reproduced below:

```
NAMECTL> QUERY BONES.DEM.MEDICINE A.SMD
Total response time:    0.04 seconds
Response status:        normal, successful completion
Authoritative answer:   yes
Number of answers:      1
Canonical name:         bones.dem.medicine
TTL:                    1 day
Alias translations:
    from:                bones.dem.medicine
    to:                  bones.dem.medicine
Answers:
    data type is "a.smd"
    Syntax is ADDR+...{DESCRIPTION={ADDRESS=
    {COMMUNITY=top}{PROTOCOL=TCP}{Host=cowboy}
    {Port=1522}}{CONNECT_DATA={SID=radeo}}}
```

As can be seen in the example above, the request from the client for location information results in a response ("Answers") which provides the location information for the desired entity (see also page 109 of ONAG).

Steen describes the each subnode should be aware of how the directory node with which it communicates is partitioned, allowing the avoidance of querying the management service each time a subnode needs to communicate with its parent or children (page 108 of Steen).

Oracle Unleashed describes the benefits of using hash function instead of an index (pages 394 and 638 of Oracle Unleashed).

The ONAG, Oracle Unleashed, and Steen references were not previously discussed by the examiner nor applied to claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 15 in the prior examination of the '170 Patent as discussed above. The ONAG reference was discussed in the prior reexamination of the '170 Patent, but it was not discussed in combination with the Oracle Unleashed and Steen references as presented in the request.

It is agreed that ONAG in view of the Oracle Unleashed and Steen raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to at least independent claims 1, 6, and 15 of the '170 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, ONAG in view of the Oracle Unleashed and Steen raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to at least independent claims 1, 6, and 15 of the '170 Patent, a question which has not been decided in a previous examination of the '170 Patent nor was there a final holding of invalidity by the Federal Courts regarding the '170 Patent.

Steen in view of Skagerwall and Wolff

12) The Request shows that Steen, Skagerwall, and Wolff provide teachings relevant to the determination of patentability regarding the following limitations, for claim 1 and claim 6:

each one of the data location servers is configured to determine the at least one of the plurality of data location servers based on the hash function applied to the identifier string.

programming logic is further configured to return a redirect message if the location server lacks the location information for the desired entity, the redirect message comprising a list of at least one other location server known to have the location information for the desired entity.

Steen describes the each subnode should be aware of how the directory node with which it communicates is partitioned, allowing the avoidance of querying the management service each time a subnode needs to communicate with its parent or children (page 108 of Steen).

Skagerwall describes the ability of a primary directory server to identify the location a desired object using a lookup request (column 12, line 63-column 13, line 6; column 10, lines 21-26; and column 11, lines 37-45 of Skagerwall).

Wolff describes alternate path determination and redirection command across a network (Abstract and column 5, lines 24-38 of Wolff).

programming logic is further configured to return a redirect message if the location server lacks the location information for the desired entity, the redirect message comprising a list of at least one other location server known to have the location information for the desired entity.

Steen describes the each subnode should be aware of how the directory node with which it communicates is partitioned, allowing the avoidance of querying the management service each time a subnode needs to communicate with its parent or children (page 108 of Steen).

Skagerwall describes the ability of a primary directory server to identify the location a desired object using a lookup request (column 12, line 63-column 13, line 6; column 10, lines 21-26; and column 11, lines 37-45 of Skagerwall).

Wolff describes alternate path determination and redirection command across a network (Abstract and column 5, lines 24-38 of Wolff).

The Steen, Skagerwall, and Wolff references were not previously discussed by the examiner nor applied to claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 15 in the prior examination of the '170 Patent as discussed above.

It is agreed that Steen in view of Skagerwall and Wolff raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to at least independent claims 1, 6, and 15 of the '170 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, Steen in view of Skagerwall and Wolff raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to at least independent claims 1, 6, and 15 of the '170 Patent, a question which has not been decided in a previous examination of the '170 Patent nor was there a final holding of invalidity by the Federal Courts regarding the '170 Patent.

Scope of Reexamination

- 13) Claim 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 15 will be reexamined as requested.

Conclusion

- 14) 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).

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. 7,814,170 throughout the course of this reexamination proceeding. See MPEP §§ 2207, 2282 and 2286.

All correspondence relating to this *ex parte* reexamination proceeding should be directed as follows:

By U.S. Postal Service Mail to:

Mail Stop Ex Parte Reexam
ATTN: Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By FAX to:

(571) 273-9900
Central Reexamination Unit

By hand to:

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany St.
Alexandria, VA 22314

By EFS-Web:

Registered users of EFS-Web may alternatively submit such correspondence via the electronic filing system EFS-Web, at

<https://efs.uspto.gov/efile/myportal/efs-registered>

EFS-Web offers the benefit of quick submission to the particular area of the Office that needs to act on the correspondence. Also, EFS-Web submissions are “soft scanned” (i.e., electronically uploaded) directly into the official file for the reexamination proceeding, which offers parties the opportunity to review the content of their submissions after the “soft scanning” process is complete.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Reexamination Legal Advisor or Examiner, or as to the status of this proceeding, should be directed to the Central Reexamination Unit at telephone number (571) 272-7705.

/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

