

# Exhibit 902

In addition, with regard to the “host server” of Claim 1, the Office states that “Morgan did not explicitly describe a second server in the office for providing mailbox storage,” but that “it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to operate one of the computers 102 or 105 as a server for providing electronic message document storage in the manner of document storage 203 in the Morgan system . . . .” *Office Action at pages 6 and 7*. The Office’s rationale is that “using an additional server to provide electronic message document storage, instead of local document storage 203, may be justified and prove more efficient in a large office environment with large data transfer requirements” as the motivation to modify the communication system taught by Morgan. *Office Action at page 7 (emphasis added)*.

Patent Owner respectfully disagrees. First, Morgan fails to teach or suggest that the office server 101 sends a request for a data unit to another server or any other computer during the document transmission mode. See Morgan at Column 4, line 15 to Column 5, line 54. Instead, Morgan’s server is affirmatively given the document by the originating party. Second, because the originating party of Morgan’s system sends both the document and separate destination information to the server 101, it is unclear in the Office’s hypothetical why the “computers 102 or 105” would provide document storage in addition to the document memory 203. Third, a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have recognized that the Office’s hypothetical would create duplicative storage that is wasteful. If the Office is instead suggesting that the only storage of the document received by the server 101 is in computer 102 or 105, then it is submitted that a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made (note that the application was filed in late 1995 when communications were slow and costly compared to today) would have been discouraged to store the documents at a remote location that requires additional network transmissions.

For the host server limitation of Claim 1, the Office bases its position on obviousness by citing, in part, to the Detailed Description of the ’899 patent. Patent Owner respectfully submits that the statements made in the Detailed Description of the ’899 patent should not be used to create a hindsight analysis of the pending claims.

Therefore, Patent Owner respectfully submits that it would not have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Morgan's communication system to move (or duplicate) document storage 203 to one of the computers 102/105 and operate them as servers. Patent Owner further submits that, even if such suggested modification were made, the prior art still fails to teach or suggest "a mailbox of a user associated with the communication unit" as recited in Claim 1. Thus, Claim 1 is not obvious and is patentable over the prior art of record.

In regard to Claim 2, the Office repeats the same rejections as Claim 1. Claim 2 recites, *inter alia*, "a host server, in communication with [a] communication server, comprising a store for storing the first data unit and being operable for, in response to a request for the first data unit by the communication server, forwarding the first data unit to the communication server, wherein the store comprises a client-server program file memory . . . ." The arguments presented above with regard to the failure of the prior art of record to teach or suggest "a host server, in communication with [a] communication server, . . . being operable for, in response to a request for the first data unit by the communication server, forwarding the first data unit to the communication server" similarly apply to Claim 2. Therefore, for this and other reasons, Claim 2 is respectfully submitted as patentable over the prior art of record.

New Claims 14 and 16 recite the use of sessionless-oriented and session-oriented protocols among the communication unit, the communication server and the host server of Claims 1 and 2, respectively. New Claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, a determination whether to forward the optimized reply or a replica reply. Patent Owner respectfully submits that these new claims recite patentable features in addition to the novel and non-obvious combinations found in their respective parent claims. New Claim 17 also recites a novel and non-obvious combination, based on original Claim 7, including a determination whether to send a reply or an optimized reply. Allowance is respectfully requested.