

# Exhibit 17

object-oriented software. Dr. Wilson's declaration provides his technical opinions on the technical teachings of the applied Cohen reference.

***II. Status of the Claims Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.530(e)***

Claims 1-14 are pending. No amendments to the claims are sought, and therefore no explanation for support under 37 C.F.R. § 1.530(e) is required.

The Examiner has rejected claims 8, 9, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Cohen; claims 1, 2, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Cohen; and claims 3-5, 7, 10-12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Cohen in view of Bernstein. Based on the following remarks, Patent Owner Apple respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

***III. Statement of Substance of the Personal Interview Held on February 8, 2011 Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.560(b)***

Apple would like to thank Examiner Desai and her Conferees, Examiners Harrison and Ferris, for the interview held on February 8, 2011 at the USPTO. In attendance at the interview for Apple were technical expert David A. Wilson, Ph.D., and Apple's representatives Robert G. Sterne (Reg. No. 28,912), Glenn J. Perry (Reg. No. 28,458), Richard D. Coller III (Reg. No. 60,390), and Salvador M. Bezos (Reg. No. 60,889).

During the interview, differences between the pending claims, with attention to claim 8, and Cohen were discussed. A presentation summarizing the arguments presented herein was given by Apple and discussed by the interview attendees, and a copy of presentation slides was given to Examiner Desai for entry into the record.

It is noted that the Examiner's Interview Summary mailed on February 8, 2011 indicates that the interview was telephonic. However, as indicated above, the interview was held in person at the USPTO, with each of the individuals identified above present.

The remainder of this Response reiterates and expands upon arguments presented at the interview. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned with any questions.

***IV. Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, and 13 are Patentable over Cohen***

The Examiner has rejected claims 8, 9, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Cohen. Similarly, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Cohen. The ground for both rejections is similar, except for the purported teaching of the "memory means" of claim 1. (Office Action, p. 9). Patent Owner Apple respectfully traverses the foregoing rejections.

Cohen does not teach, suggest, or disclose all of the elements of claim 8. For example, Cohen does not teach, suggest, or disclose, *inter alia*, a notification receiver object, specifically, "receiving the notification by the at least one of the ***plurality of objects***," as well as a "***connection object***," as recited in claim 8.

Each of these claim elements that are not taught, suggested, or disclosed by Cohen are discussed in further detail below. For the purposes of discussion herein, and consistent with the interview held on February 8, 2011, the rejections are addressed in the context of claim 8 and its dependents. However, the arguments also apply to the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.