



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.
90/019,257	09/22/2023	11446056	A236-0010RE	4521
24030 7590 10/26/2023 POL SINELLI PC PO Box 140310 KANSAS CITY, MO 64114-0310			EXAMINER WILLIAMS, CATHERINE SERKE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3993	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/26/2023	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)

LEE & HAYES, P.C.
601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE
SUITE 1400
SPOKANE, WA 99201

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

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NO. 90/019,257.

PATENT UNDER REEXAMINATION 11446056.

ART UNIT 3993.

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. 90/019,257	Patent Under Reexamination 11446056	
	Examiner CATHERINE S WILLIAMS	Art Unit 3993	AIA (FITF) Status Yes
--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address-- The request for <i>ex parte</i> reexamination filed 09/22/2023 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 <i>ex parte</i> 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)

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

Office Action in *Ex Parte* Reexamination

Part of Paper No. 20231019

DECISION ON REQUEST FOR REEXAMINATION

A substantial new question (hereinafter “SNQ”) of patentability affecting claims 1, 4-6 and 10-13 of United States Patent Number 11,446,056 (hereinafter “the ‘056 patent”) is raised by the request for *ex parte* reexamination.

Notice of Pre-AIA or AIA Status

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

Service of Papers

After the filing of a request for reexamination by a third party requester, any document filed by either the patent owner or the third party requester must be served on the other party (or parties where two or more third party requester proceedings are merged) in the reexamination proceeding in the manner provided in 37 CFR 1.248. See 37 CFR 1.550(f).

Extensions of Time

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 *ex parte* reexamination proceedings “will be conducted with special dispatch” (37 CFR 1.550(a)). Extensions of time in *ex parte* reexamination proceedings are provided for in 37 CFR 1.550(c).

Amendment in Reexamination Proceedings

Patent owner is notified that any proposed amendment to the specification and/or claims in this reexamination proceeding must comply with 37 CFR 1.530(d)-(j), must be formally presented pursuant to 37 CFR 1.52(a) and (b), and must contain any fees required by 37 CFR

1.20(c). See MPEP § 2250(IV) for examples to assist in the preparation of proper proposed amendments in reexamination proceedings.

Submissions

In order to insure full consideration of any amendments, affidavits or declarations or other documents as evidence of patentability, such documents must be submitted in response to the first office action on the merits (which does not result in a close of prosecution). Submissions after the second office action on the merits, which is intended to be a final action, will be governed by the requirements of 37 CFR 1.116, after final rejection and by 37 CFR 41.33 after appeal, which will be strictly enforced.

Notification of Concurrent Proceedings

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 the '056 patent throughout the course of this reexamination proceeding. Likewise, if present, the third party requester is also reminded of the ability to similarly apprise the Office of any such activity or proceeding throughout the course of this reexamination proceeding. See MPEP §§ 2207, 2282 and 2286.

35 USC 325(d)

A review of the post grant history for the '056 patent indicates that there have been no other Office post grant challenges made to the patent (Reexamination Proceedings or Inter Partes Review, Post Grant Review, Covered Business Method trials). Accordingly, a discretionary denial of reexamination pursuant to 35 USC 325(d) is not applicable.

Substantial New Question

The SNQ is based on:

1. BK Medical, Prostate Biplane Transducer Type 8808e, User Guide (June 2023) (“BK Medical”);
2. Giovanni Novella, et al., *Pain Assessment After Original Tranperineal Prostate Biopsy Using a Coaxial Needle*, 62 Urology 689 (2003) (“Novella”);
3. Stephan Zangos, et al., *MR-Guided Transgluteal Biopsies with an Open Low-Field System in Patients with Clinically Suspected Prostate Cancer; Technique and Preliminary Results*, 15 European Radiology 174 (Sept. 4, 2004) (“Zangos”);
4. US Patent No. 5,494,039 to Gary Onik, et al. (“Onik”); and
5. Japanese Patent No. 4,550,531 to Hisashi Nakamura (“Nakamura”) with certified English language translation and certification of accurate translation.

A discussion of the specifics now follows:

Requester’s Position

- A. Claims 1, 4-6 and 11-13 are unpatentable in light of BK Medical taken with Novella.
- B. Claim 10 is unpatentable in light of BK Medical taken with Novella and Zangos.
- C. Claims 1, 4-6 and 11-13 are unpatentable in light of Onik and Novella and taken with Nakamura.
- D. Claim 10 is unpatentable in light of Onik and Novella and taken with Nakamura and Zangos.

Prosecution History – 17/494,962

The ‘056 patent issued from US Patent Application no. 17/494,962 (“the ‘962 application”). In the ‘962 application the Notice of Allowance mailed 06/02/2022 indicated in the reason for allowance that the closest prior art to US Pat. No. 5,494,039 to Onik et al.; US Pub. No. 2015/0366544 to Yap et al.; and US Pub. No. 2015/0119715 to Baumann does not teach alone or in combination the limitations of the claims

specifically "a guide member coupled to the mount and including a rail receiving channel extending a first length between a proximal end and a distal end of the rail receiving channel, and a displacement member including a rail member extending a second length between a proximal end and a distal end of the rail member and a vertically extending member extending from the distal end of the rail member, the vertically extending member including a plurality of needle receiving ports, wherein the rail receiving channel is positioned generally parallel with a longitudinal axis of the transrectal ultrasound probe; sliding the rail member within the rail receiving channel so as to position the vertically extending member of the displacement member adjacent the perineal access site of the patient; inserting an access needle into the perineal access site of the patient, the access needle supported by one of the plurality of needle receiving ports; and inserting a needle through the access needle and into a first location of the prostate of the patient".

One Non-Final Rejection preceded the notice of allowance which was mailed on 02/03/2022. In the Non-Final action claims 1-20 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting. No prior art rejection was made on the claims.

Analysis of the Prior Art Provided in the Request

On November 2, 2002, Public Law 107-273 was enacted. Title III, Subtitle A, Section 13105, part (a) of the Act revised the reexamination statute by adding the following new last sentence to 35 U.S.C. 303(a) and 312(a):

The existence of a substantial new question of patentability is not precluded by the fact that a patent or printed publication was previously cited by or to the Office or considered by the Office.

For any reexamination ordered on or after November 2, 2002, the effective date of the statutory revision, reliance on previously cited/considered art, i.e., "old art," does not necessarily preclude the existence of a substantial new question of patentability (SNQ) that is based

exclusively on that old art. Rather, determinations on whether a SNQ exists in such an instance shall be based upon a fact-specific inquiry done on a case-by-case basis.

In the present instance, Onik qualifies as old art since the patent previously cited in the reasons for allowance in the original examination of the '962 application.

However, being "old art" does not necessarily preclude a reference from establishing a SNQ. A SNQ may be based solely on old art where the old art is being presented/viewed in a new light, or a different way, as compared with its use in the earlier concluded examination(s), in view of a material new argument or interpretation in the request. See MPEP § 2242. This reference is now being presented and viewed in a new light, or in a different way, as compared with its use in the earlier examinations since this reference is being relied upon in conjunction with another reference in order to allegedly teach the claim limitations. Accordingly, the use of this reference in this reexamination is proper. Below is a detailed analysis for each of the references requester asserts raise an SNQ.

BK Medical taken with Novella

The consideration of BK Medical taken with Novella raises a SNQ as to claims 1, 4-6 and 11-13 of the '056 patent.

As referenced above, during the prosecution of the '962 application no prior art was applied to the claims in a rejection under 35 USC 102 or 103. As indicated in the reasons for allowance mailed 06/02/2022 the limitations of "a guide member coupled to the mount and including a rail receiving channel extending a first length between a proximal end and a distal end of the rail receiving channel, and a displacement member including a rail member extending a second length between a proximal end and a distal end of the rail member and a vertically

extending member extending from the distal end of the rail member, the vertically extending member including a plurality of needle receiving ports, wherein the rail receiving channel is positioned generally parallel with a longitudinal axis of the transrectal ultrasound probe” in combination with “sliding the rail member within the rail receiving channel so as to position the vertically extending member of the displacement member adjacent the perineal access site of the patient... [an] access needle supported by one of the plurality of needle receiving ports; and inserting a needle through the access needle and into a first location of the prostate of the patient” were not taught by the prior art alone or in combination.

The request filed 09/22/2023 sets forth that “BK Medical discloses a transperineal biopsy coupled to a transrectal ultrasound probe including: (1) a guide member coupled to a mount and including a rail receiving channel extending a first length between a proximal end and a distal end of the rail receiving channel; (2) a displacement member including a rail member extending a second length between a proximal end and a distal end of the rail member and a vertically extending member extending from the distal end of the rail member, the vertically extending member including a plurality of needle receiving ports; and (3) wherein the rail receiving channel is positioned generally parallel with a longitudinal axis of the transrectal ultrasound probe. BK Medical also discloses sliding the rail member within the rail receiving channel so as to position the vertically extending member of the displacement member adjacent the perineal access site of the patient. BK Medical also discloses inserting a needle into the perineal access site of the patient, the needle supported by one of the plurality of needle receiving ports, []. ... Novella further discloses performing transperineal biopsy procedures (1) by using an access needle (coaxial needle) and (2) by inserting a biopsy needle through the coaxial needle, as well

as the benefits of such a procedure.” See the Request for Reexamination filed 09/22/2023, pages 20-21.

Turning to BK Medical, the user’s guide shows a Prostate Biplane Transducer that includes two convex arrays. See Introduction on page 4. Page 12 reviews the attachment and procedure for transperineal puncture (biopsy) with the attachment shown in Fig. 7. The attachment seems to include a guide member coupled to a mount and including a rail receiving channel extending a first length between a proximal end and a distal end of the rail receiving channel, and a displacement member including a rail member extending a second length between a proximal end and a distal end of the rail member and a vertically extending member extending from the distal end of the rail member, the vertically extending member including a plurality of needle receiving ports, wherein the rail receiving channel is positioned generally parallel with a longitudinal axis of the transrectal ultrasound probe as shown in Figs. 8-9. BK Medical also seems to teach the method of sliding the rail member within the rail receiving channel so as to position the vertically extending member of the displacement member adjacent the perineal access site of the patient in the note on page 12 that states “The needle guide can be adjusted 70mm lengthwise with respect to the mounting ring, using the adjustment screw.” See BK Medical page 12.

Requester relies on Novella to teach “[an] access needle supported by one of the plurality of needle receiving ports; and inserting a needle through the access needle and into a first location of the prostate of the patient.” Novella is a published journal article study “[t]o assess whether the use of a coaxial needle reduces discomfort in patients undergoing multiple-core transperineal prostate biopsy to detect prostate cancer.” The study utilized a 17-gauge coaxial needle as a transperineal path for repeated atraumatic passage of the biopsy needle. The results

indicated that using a coaxial needle reduced the procedure's invasiveness and patient's pain compared with the conventional procedure. See Novella, Conclusion.

There is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider the above teachings disclosed in BK Medical and Novella important in determining the patentability of the limitations in the claims. Accordingly, requester has raised a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1, 4-6 and 11-13, which question has not been decided in a previous examination of the '056 patent.

BK Medical and Novella further taken with Zangos

The consideration of BK Medical and Novella further taken with Zangos raises a SNQ as to claim 10 of the '056 patent. Claim 10 depends from independent claim 1 and in that dependency claim 10 includes all the limitations of claim 1. A SNQ has already been established for independent claim 1 with regard to BK Medical and Novella as indicated above. Therefore, the same SNQ applies to dependent claim 10 with the addition of Zangos.

The request filed 09/22/2023 asserts that Zangos teaches "uses of a 14-gauge, 15-gauge, or 16-gauge access needle...in prostate biopsy procedures." See Request page 21. Zangos is a published journal article study that includes the use of a coaxial technique for obtaining prostate tissue biopsy. As stated in Zangos, "[a]fter disinfection of the skin and local infiltration anesthesia [] a 15-gauge biopsy needle [] was guided to the target lesion so that a true-cut MRI-compatible biopsy needle [] of 16 gauge in size could be inserted into the suspicious areas." See Zangos, page 176.

There is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider the above teachings disclosed in BK Medical and Novella, as detailed above, in addition to Zangos

important in determining the patentability of the limitations in the claims. Accordingly, requester has raised a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1 (above) and thereby 10, which question has not been decided in a previous examination of the '056 patent.

Onik and Novella taken with Nakamura

The consideration of Onik and Novella taken with Nakamura raises a SNQ as to claims 1, 4-6 and 11-13 of the '056 patent.

As referenced above, during the prosecution of the '962 application no prior art was applied to the claims in a rejection under 35 USC 102 or 103. As indicated in the reasons for allowance mailed 06/02/2022 the limitations of “a guide member coupled to the mount and including a rail receiving channel extending a first length between a proximal end and a distal end of the rail receiving channel, and a displacement member including a rail member extending a second length between a proximal end and a distal end of the rail member and a vertically extending member extending from the distal end of the rail member, the vertically extending member including a plurality of needle receiving ports, wherein the rail receiving channel is positioned generally parallel with a longitudinal axis of the transrectal ultrasound probe” in combination with “sliding the rail member within the rail receiving channel so as to position the vertically extending member of the displacement member adjacent the perineal access site of the patient...[an] access needle supported by one of the plurality of needle receiving ports; and inserting a needle through the access needle and into a first location of the prostate of the patient” were not taught by the prior art alone or in combination.

The request filed 09/22/2023 sets forth that “Onik [] discloses a tranperineal biopsy guide coupled to a transrectal ultrasound probe and including a guide member with a rail receiving

channel and a displacement member with a vertically extending needle guide member.”

Nakamura is asserted to disclose a similar guide to Onik that includes “a vertically extending needle guide member, the needle guide member having a plurality of needle receiving ports.”

See the Request for Reexamination filed 09/22/2023, page 22.

Turning to Onik, the patent seems to include a guide member coupled to a mount and including a rail receiving channel extending a first length between a proximal end and a distal end of the rail receiving channel, and a displacement member including a rail member extending a second length between a proximal end and a distal end of the rail member and a vertically extending member extending from the distal end of the rail member, the vertically extending member including a plurality of needle receiving ports, wherein the rail receiving channel is positioned generally parallel with a longitudinal axis of the transrectal ultrasound probe as shown in Figs. 1-2. Onik also seems to teach the method of sliding the rail member within the rail receiving channel so as to position the vertically extending member of the displacement member adjacent the perineal access site of the patient at col. 4, ll.58-61 which states “[e]xtending through slide block 16 in a direction parallel to the longitudinal axis of ultrasound probe 2 is at least one channel 18 which slidably receives a needle holder and guide assembly 27.”

Requester relies on Novella, as provided above in the first SNQ, to teach “[an] access needle supported by one of the plurality of needle receiving ports; and inserting a needle through the access needle and into a first location of the prostate of the patient.” Novella is a published journal article study “[t]o assess whether the use of a coaxial needle reduces discomfort in patients undergoing multiple-core transperineal prostate biopsy to detect prostate cancer.” The study utilized a 17-gauge coaxial needle as a transperineal path for repeated atraumatic passage of the biopsy needle. The results indicated that using a coaxial needle reduced the procedure’s

invasiveness and patient's pain compared with the conventional procedure. See Novella, Conclusion.

Nakamura is a Japanese Patent that shows in Fig. 5 a guide member coupled to a mount and including a rail receiving channel extending a first length between a proximal end and a distal end of the rail receiving channel, and a vertically extending member extending from the distal end of the rail member, the vertically extending member including a plurality of needle receiving ports, wherein the rail receiving channel is positioned generally parallel with a longitudinal axis of the transrectal ultrasound probe.

There is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider the above teachings disclosed in Onik and Novella and further taken with Nakamura important in determining the patentability of the limitations in the claims. Accordingly, requester has raised a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1, 4-6 and 11-13, which question has not been decided in a previous examination of the '056 patent.

Onik, Novella and Nakamura further taken with Zangos

The consideration of Onik, Novella and Nakamura further taken with Zangos raises a SNQ as to claim 10 of the '056 patent. Claim 10 depends from independent claim 1 and in that dependency claim 10 includes all the limitations of claim 1. A SNQ has already been established for independent claim 1 with regard to Onik, Novella and Nakamura as indicated above. Therefore, the same SNQ applies to dependent claim 10 with the addition of Zangos.

The request filed 09/22/2023 asserts that Zangos teaches "uses of a 14-gauge, 15-gauge, or 16-gauge access needle...in prostate biopsy procedures." See Request page 21. Zangos is a published journal article study that includes the use of a coaxial technique for obtaining prostate

tissue biopsy. As stated in Zangos, “[a]fter disinfection of the skin and local infiltration anesthesia [] a 15-gauge biopsy needle [] was guided to the target lesion so that a true-cut MRI-compatible biopsy handy [] of 16 gauge in size could be inserted into the suspicious areas.” See Zangos, page 176.

There is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider the above teachings disclosed in Onik, Novella and Nakamura, as detailed above, in addition to Zangos important in determining the patentability of the limitations in the claims. Accordingly, requester has raised a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1 (above) and thereby 10, which question has not been decided in a previous examination of the ‘056 patent.

Scope of Reexamination

Since requester did not request reexamination of claims 2-3, 7-9 and 14-30 and did not assert the existence of a SNQ for such claims (see 35 U.S.C. § 311(b)(2); see also 37 CFR 1.915b and 1.923), such claims will not be reexamined. This matter was squarely addressed in *Sony Computer Entertainment America Inc., et al. v. Jon W. Dudas*, Civil Action No. 1:05CV1447 (E.D.Va. May 22, 2006), Slip Copy, 2006 WL 1472462. (Not Reported in F.Supp.2d.) The District Court upheld the Office's discretion to not reexamine claims in an *inter partes* reexamination proceeding other than those claims for which reexamination had specifically been requested. The Court stated:

To be sure, a party may seek, and the PTO may grant, *inter partes* review of each and every claim of a patent. Moreover, while the PTO in its discretion may review claims for which *inter partes* review was not requested, nothing in the statute compels it to do so. To ensure that the PTO considers a claim for *inter partes* review, § 311(b)(2) requires that the party seeking reexamination demonstrate why the PTO should reexamine each and every claim for which it seeks review. Here, it is undisputed

that Sony did not seek review of every claim under the '213 and '333 patents. Accordingly, Sony cannot now claim that the PTO wrongly failed to reexamine claims for which Sony never requested review, and its argument that AIPA compels a contrary result is unpersuasive.

(Slip copy at page 9.)

The *Sony* decision's reasoning and statutory interpretation apply analogously to *ex parte* reexamination, as the same relevant statutory language applies to both *inter partes* and *ex parte* reexamination. 35 U.S.C. § 302 provides that the *ex parte* reexamination "request must set forth the pertinency and manner of applying cited prior art to every claim for which reexamination is requested" (emphasis added), and 35 U.S.C. § 303 provides that "the Director will determine whether a substantial new question of patentability affecting any claim of the patent concerned is raised by the request..." (Emphasis added). These provisions are analogous to the language of 35 U.S.C. § 311(b)(2) and 35 U.S.C. § 312 applied and construed in *Sony*, and would be construed in the same manner. As the Director can decline to reexamine non-requested claims in an *inter partes* reexamination proceeding, the Director can likewise do so in *ex parte* reexamination proceeding. See Notice of Clarification of Office Policy To Exercise Discretion in Reexamining Fewer Than All the Patent Claims (signed Oct. 5, 2006) 1311 OG 197 (Oct. 31, 2006). See also MPEP § 2240, Rev. 5, Aug. 2006.

Therefore, claims 2-3, 7-9 and 14-30 will not be reexamined in this *ex parte* reexamination proceeding.

Correspondence

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

By EFS: Registered users may submit via the electronic filing system, EFS-Web, at: <https://efs.uspto.gov/efile/myportal/efs-registered>.

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

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

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

For EFS-Web 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 Office's 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 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 (CRU) at telephone number: 571.272.7705. The CRU's fax number is: 571.273.9900.

/CATHERINE S WILLIAMS/
Reexamination Specialist, CRU 3993

Conferees:
/Patricia L Engle/
Reexamination Specialist, Art Unit 3993

/EILEEN D LILLIS/
SPRS, Art Unit 3993

Search Notes 	Application/Control No. 90/019,257	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination 11446056
	Examiner CATHERINE S WILLIAMS	Art Unit 3993

CPC - Searched*		
Symbol	Date	Examiner
none	10/20/2023	CSW

CPC Combination Sets - Searched*		
Symbol	Date	Examiner
none	10/20/2023	CSW

US Classification - Searched*			
Class	Subclass	Date	Examiner
none		10/20/2023	CSW

* See search history printout included with this form or the SEARCH NOTES box below to determine the scope of the search.

Search Notes		
Search Notes	Date	Examiner
reviewed entire prosecution history of US PAT NO 11,446,056	10/20/2023	CSW
conducted P-Tacts search for post grant proceedings on USPN 11,446,056 and PDP search for copending Reexamination and Reissue proceedings		

Interference Search			
US Class/CPC Symbol	US Subclass/CPC Group	Date	Examiner
none		10/20/2023	CSW

--	--

Reexamination 	Application/Control No. 90/019,257	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination 11446056
	Certificate Date	Certificate Number

Requester Correspondence Address: ☐ Patent Owner ☒ Third Party
LEE & HAYES, P.C. 601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 1400 SPOKANE, WA 99201

LITIGATION REVIEW ☒	CSW (examiner initials)	23 September 2023 (date)
Case Name		Director Initials
Advance Medical Designs, Inc. v. Corbin Clinical Resources, LLC; 1: 22cv789, open		

COPENDING OFFICE PROCEEDINGS	
TYPE OF PROCEEDING	NUMBER
regular	17/214,323
	18/094,534
	18/099,700

--	--