



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.
17/730,174	04/26/2022	Oscar P. PINTO	1535-798	1894
124044	7590	10/05/2023		
Renaissance IP Law Group LLP (SSI) 17933 NW Evergreen Place, Suite 121 Beaverton, OR 97006			EXAMINER YIMER, GETENTE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2181	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/05/2023	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):

dkt@renaissanceiplaw.com
eofficeaction@apcoll.com
pto@renaissanceiplaw.com

Detailed Action

Status of Claims

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.
2. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.
3. Claims 1-20 are rejected.
4. This Action is Non-Final.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 03/01/2023, the submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 1, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a judicial exception (i.e., a law of nature, a natural phenomenon, or an abstract idea) without significantly more. The claims do not include additional elements that are sufficient to amount to significantly more than the judicial exception when considered individually and in combination because the additional elements,

which are recited at a high level of generality, provide conventional functions that do not add meaningful limits to practicing the abstract idea.

8. Claim 1 recites, in part, “interacting with an interface for one or more computational devices” ; “ wherein the interacting is based on an identifier ”; and “wherein the identifier comprises information that identifies a functionality of a computational device function.”. These limitations describe the concept of a function identification scheme in accordance with example embodiments of the disclosure may enable interoperability of computational device functions across different device implementations, sources, and/or the like. ..., a function identifier may include a functionality identifier that may indicate a functionality (e.g., an algorithm and/or other type of behavior) of a computational device function. The abstract idea described in claim 1 is not meaningfully different than those abstract ideas found by the courts, therefore the claim is considered to be directed to an abstract idea.

9. The claim does not include additional elements that are sufficient to amount to significantly more than the judicial exception because the additional elements, when considered both individually and as an ordered combination, do not amount to significantly more than the abstract idea. The claim recites the additional elements of “ interacting,...”, “ identifier...”. Looking at the limitations as an ordered combination adds nothing that is not already present when looking at the elements taken individually. There is no indication that the combination of elements improves the functioning of a

computer or improves another technology. Their collective functions merely provide conventional computer implementations and functions.

10. Dependent claims 2-6,18 and 20 are drawn to the method comprising, wherein the information comprises a functionality identifier. This limitation describe the concept of a function identification scheme in accordance with example embodiments of the disclosure may enable interoperability of computational device functions across different device implementations, sources, and/or the like. ..., a function identifier may include a functionality identifier that may indicate a functionality (e.g., an algorithm and/or other type of behavior) of a computational device function. The abstract idea described in claim 1 is not meaningfully different than those abstract ideas found by the courts, therefore the claim is considered to be directed to an abstract idea.

11. Independent Claims 1,17 and 19 are therefore not drawn to eligible subject matter as they are directed to an abstract idea without significantly more.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. 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.

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.

13. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over **ELMASRI et al.** (US Patent Application Pub. No: 20190173989 A1) in view of **Santhana** (US Patent Application Pub. No: 20070265984 A1).

As per claim 1, **ELMASRI** teaches a method comprising:

interacting with an interface for one or more computational devices [Paragraphs 0022-0023, ... smart devices for users and clients, each smart device having: a user interface for communicating with an operator of the smart device, a network interface for communicating with a computer network, a processor for operating an application, and a store;...];

wherein the interacting is based on an identifier [Paragraph 0025, a box associated with a client, having a beacon protocol to broadcast a client identifier to a nearby smart device of a user (user device) and selectively cause content to be pushed to the user device;...].

ELMASRI discloses an identifier but does not explicitly disclose wherein the identifier comprises information that identifies a functionality of a computational device function.

Santhana discloses wherein the identifier comprises information that identifies a functionality of a computational device function [Paragraph 0033, The authentication

module further contains a database for storing digital certificates and RFID identifier information of mobile devices that are permitted to perform transactions or an algorithm to verify that the digital certificates or the RFID identifier of the transacting device is valid.].

It would have been obvious one ordinary skill in the art before the effective filing date of the claimed invention, to include Santhana's method for performing a transaction of value points between the digital wallet of a first RFID-enabled mobile device into ELMASRI's smart devices system that are provided for users and clients for the benefit of facilitates a guaranteed payment system that allows a customer to store monetary value on an RFID cellular phone and use the system to send or receive money from another similarly equipped cellular phone or an RFID reader/writer; facilitates remote or proximity payments and authentication of payer and payee and process transactions on a peer-to-peer level without the need for connectivity to a central server hosting a banking infrastructure (Santhana, [0003]) to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

As per claim 2, ELMASRI and Santhana teach all the limitations of claim 1 above, where Santhana teaches, a method, wherein the information comprises a functionality identifier [Santhana, Paragraphs 0022; 0033, The authentication module further contains a database for storing digital certificates and RFID identifier information of mobile devices that are permitted to perform transactions or an algorithm to verify that the digital certificates or the RFID identifier of the transacting device is valid.].

As per claim 3, ELMASRI and Santhana teach all the limitations of claim 1 above, where ELMASRI teaches, a method, wherein the identifier further comprises information that identifies a group of the computational device function ELMASRI, Paragraph 0066,.. server including: an engine associated with a database for storing data files of contact information sourced from user smart devices and content sourced from client smart devices, and a server interface for communicating with the smart devices and a box over the computer network;..].

As per claim 4, ELMASRI and Santhana teach all the limitations of claim 3 above, where ELMASRI teaches, a method, wherein the group of the computational device function is based on a source of the computational device function ELMASRI, Paragraph 0066,.. server including: an engine associated with a database for storing data files of contact information sourced from user smart devices and content sourced from client smart devices, and a server interface for communicating with the smart devices and a box over the computer network;..].

As per claim 6, ELMASRI and Santhana teach all the limitations of claim 1 above, where Santhana teaches, a method, wherein the interacting comprises requesting requested information using the interface Santhana, Paragraphs 0022; 0033, The transaction request includes the unique RFID identifier and the unique digital certificate of the first mobile device. Upon receiving the transaction request from the first mobile device, the second mobile device checks the authenticity of the RFID identifier sent by the first mobile device.].

As per claim 7, ELMASRI and Santhana teach all the limitations of claim 6 above, where Santhana teaches, a method, further comprising providing, by the

interface, based on the requesting, the requested information [**Santhana**, Paragraph 0022, The transaction request includes the unique RFID identifier and the unique digital certificate of the first mobile device. Upon receiving the transaction request from the first mobile device, the second mobile device checks the authenticity of the RFID identifier sent by the first mobile device.].

As per claim 8, **ELMASRI** and **Santhana** teach all the limitations of claim 6 above, where **Santhana** teaches, a method, wherein the requested information comprises an indication that one or more of the one or more computational devices support the computational device function [**Santhana**, Paragraphs 0022; 0033, The transaction request includes the unique RFID identifier and the unique digital certificate of the first mobile device. Upon receiving the transaction request from the first mobile device, the second mobile device checks the authenticity of the RFID identifier sent by the first mobile device.].

As per claim 9, **ELMASRI** and **Santhana** teach all the limitations of claim 8 above, where **Santhana** teaches, a method, wherein the indication comprises a list of computational devices that support the computational device function [**Santhana**, Paragraphs 0022; 0033, The transaction request includes the unique RFID identifier and the unique digital certificate of the first mobile device. Upon receiving the transaction request from the first mobile device, the second mobile device checks the authenticity of the RFID identifier sent by the first mobile device.].

As per claim 10, **ELMASRI** and **Santhana** teach all the limitations of claim 6 above, where **Santhana** teaches, a method, wherein the requested information comprises a list of computational device functions supported by at least one of the one

or more computational devices [Santhana, Paragraphs 0022; 0033, The transaction request includes the unique RFID identifier and the unique digital certificate of the first mobile device. Upon receiving the transaction request from the first mobile device, the second mobile device checks the authenticity of the RFID identifier sent by the first mobile device.].

As per claim 11, ELMASRI and Santhana teach all the limitations of claim 6 above, where Santhana teaches, a method, wherein the requested information comprises a format of the computational device function [Santhana, Paragraphs 0022; 0033;0036, Upon launching the software application in the first mobile device 103, a transaction request is sent from the first mobile device to the second mobile device. The transaction request includes the unique RFID identifier and the unique digital certificate of the first mobile device. Upon receiving the transaction request from the first mobile device, the second mobile device checks the authenticity of the RFID identifier sent by the first mobile device.].

As per claim 12, ELMASRI and Santhana teach all the limitations of claim 11 above, where Santhana teaches, a method, wherein the format comprises one or more parameters [Santhana, Paragraphs 0022; 0033;0036, Upon launching the software application in the first mobile device 103, a transaction request is sent from the first mobile device to the second mobile device. The transaction request includes the unique RFID identifier and the unique digital certificate of the first mobile device. Upon receiving the transaction request from the first mobile device, the second mobile device checks the authenticity of the RFID identifier sent by the first mobile device.].

As per claim 13, ELMASRI and Santhana teach all the limitations of claim 6 above, where ELMASRI teaches, a method, wherein the requesting comprises invoking an interface call [ELMASRI, Paragraphs 0022-0023;0151, The App is coded to enable this by tapping the area 203 and invoking a gallery to select an image of themselves or some object associated with them to constitute the photograph,...].

As per claim 14, ELMASRI and Santhana teach all the limitations of claim 6 above, where ELMASRI and Santhana teach, a method, wherein the interacting comprises accessing, based on the identifier [ELMASRI, Paragraphs 0025;0066, a box associated with a client, having a beacon protocol to broadcast a client identifier to a nearby smart device of a user (user device) and selectively cause content to be pushed to the user device;...], using the interface, the computational device function [Santhana, Paragraphs 0022; 0033, The transaction request includes the unique RFID identifier and the unique digital certificate of the first mobile device. Upon receiving the transaction request from the first mobile device, the second mobile device checks the authenticity of the RFID identifier sent by the first mobile device.].

As per claim 15, ELMASRI and Santhana teach all the limitations of claim 14 above, where Santhana teaches, a method, wherein the accessing comprises configuring the computational device function [Santhana, Paragraphs 0022; 0033, The transaction request includes the unique RFID identifier and the unique digital certificate of the first mobile device. Upon receiving the transaction request from the first mobile device, the second mobile device checks the authenticity of the RFID identifier sent by the first mobile device.].

As per claim 16, ELMASRI and Santhana teach all the limitations of claim 14 above, where Santhana teaches, a method, wherein the accessing comprises executing the computational device function [Santhana, Paragraphs 0022; 0033, The transaction request includes the unique RFID identifier and the unique digital certificate of the first mobile device. Upon receiving the transaction request from the first mobile device, the second mobile device checks the authenticity of the RFID identifier sent by the first mobile device.].

As per claims 17-18, claims 17-18 are rejected in accordance to the same rational and reasoning as the above claims 1 and 8 above, wherein claims 17-18 are the device claims for the method of claims 1 and 8.

As per claims 19-20, claims 19-20 are rejected in accordance to the same rational and reasoning as the above claims 1 and 6 above, wherein claims 19-20 are the system claims for the method of claims 1 and 6.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

RELEVANT ART CITED BY THE EXAMINER

The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is cited to establish the level of skill in the applicant's art and those arts considered reasonably pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See MPEP 707.05(c).

References Considered Pertinent but not relied upon

Karabinis et al. (US Patent No: 11,770,756 B2) teaches a method of enabling one or more functions of a device is disclosed. Karabinis discloses sensing by a device a physiological parameter of a user of the device. and the device determines whether or not the physiological parameter that is sensed satisfies a criterion. Karabinis suggests responsive to determining that the physiological parameter that is sensed satisfies the criterion, the device enables a number of functions of the device while disabling a function of the device.

Nguyen (US Patent No: 11,532,204 B2) teaches a system, apparatus, and method for social gaming may include a gaming machine configured to play a game of chance and produce game information. Nguyen discloses a social gaming server can be configured to communicate with the gaming machine, may establish a remote gaming session between the gaming machine and a user device, and may distribute the portion of the game information to the user device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to whose telephone number is 571-270-7106. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM-5:00PMSDT.If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, IDRIS

ALROBAYE can be reached on 571-270-1023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

**/GETENTE A YIMER/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2181**