Exhibit 15

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

Claims 1-12 are pending and subject to reexamination. 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 provided the following grounds of rejection:

Issue 1: The Requestor asserts claims 1-12 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Boyce and the rejection is accepted as proposed in the Request, See pages 16-35.

Issue 2: The Requestor asserts claims 4, 11 and 12 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Boyce in view of Microsoft. The rejection is accepted as proposed in the Request, See pages 35-43.

Patent Owner Apple appreciates that the Examiner has identified claims 13-15 as being patentable and/or confirmed. Based on the following remarks, the Patent Owner respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the aforementioned rejections.

IV. Statement of Substance of the Personal Interview Held on April 11, 2011 Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.560(b)

Apple and its representatives thank Primary Examiner Steven B. Theriault and his conferees (two conferees present in person (Mark J. Reinhart and Jessica Harrison) and one by telephone (James Menefee)) for their time and attention at the interview held on April 11, 2011 at the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office. In attendance at the interview on behalf of the Patent Owner were inventor Robert R. Urlich, technical expert Aaron Marcus, Apple patent attorney Chi Chang (Reg. No. 52,717), and Apple's outside counsel 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 particular attention to claim 1, and the applied documents were discussed. Apple's representatives presented a slide deck summarizing arguments presented herein. A printed copy of the presentation slides was given to Examiner Theriault (and to each of the two present-in-person conferees) for entry into the record. This Response reiterates and expands upon arguments presented at the interview.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned with any questions.

V. Claims 1-12 are Patentable over Boyce

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-12 as allegedly being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. section 103 by Boyce. Patent Owner Apple respectfully traverses. Claims 1, 5, 9 and 12 are the independent claims.

A. Boyce does not teach "themes" as claimed.

Each of independent claims 1, 5, 9 and 12 recites "themes." Boyce does *not* teach "themes" as taught by the '795 patent and claimed in each of its independent claims. We focus on claim 1 for purposes of discussion, but the argument applies to each of the independent claims which all recite "themes" in their respective language. Claim 1 requires first and second sets of GUI objects collectively associated with first and second common themes. Claim 1 is reproduced with emphasis in bold type below.