Exhibit 1003

IN THE CLAIMS

Please cancel Claims 4, 5, and 12-14 without prejudice.

Please amend the following claims by adding the underlined material and deleting the bracketed material:

1. (Amended) A method for displaying messages in a data communication receiver, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving [a] an alphanumeric message;

referencing a database to <u>determine whether at least one word</u> included in the alphanumeric message matches at least one key word included in the <u>database</u> [locate image data associated with at least one code included in the message], wherein the [image data] at least one key word is associated with <u>image data that is</u> representative of at least one image; [and]

presenting, when the alphanumeric message includes at least one word that matches at least one key word located in the database, the at least one image as a graphic message that is accompanied by the alphanumeric message on a display; and

presenting, when the alphanumeric message does not include at least one word that matches at least one key word located in the database, the alphanumeric message without an accompanying graphic message on the display.

- 2. (Amended) The method of claim 1, further comprising the step of: receiving, prior to the presenting step, a display command indicating that the <u>alphanumeric</u> message is to be presented.
- 3. (Amended) The method of claim 1, [further comprising, prior to the referencing step,] wherein the referencing step includes the step of:

Idetermining, prior to the referencing step, that the at least one code is included in the message by reference to a code format] comparing each alphanumeric word in the alphanumeric message with key words stored in the database.

/ /-

6. (Amended) The method of claim 1, further comprising, prior to the terning step, the steps of:

receiving a programming message that includes a [code] key word and image data; and

storing the [code] key word and the image data in the database.

9. (Amended) A data communication receiver for presenting information, the data communication receiver comprising:

a receiver for receiving [a] an alphanumeric message including at least one [code] word;

a database for storing [codes] key words and image data associated with the [codes] key words;

a presentation element coupled to the receiver and the database for determining whether at least one word included in the alphanumeric message matches at least one key word included in the database [locating the at least one code in the database to retrieve image data associated with the at least one code], wherein the image data associated with the at least one [code] key word is representative of at least one image; and

a display coupled to the presentation element for presenting, when the at least one word matches at least one key word, the at least one image as a graphic message accompanied by the alphanumeric message, and for presenting, when the at least one word does not match at least one key word, the alphanumeric message without an accompanying graphic message.

11. (Amended) The data configuration receiver of claim 10, further comprising:

controls coupled to the processor for providing user-initiated commands thereto, wherein presentation of the <u>alphanumeric message and any accompanying</u> graphic message occurs in response to reception of a display command.

2

15. (Amended) The data communication receiver of claim 10, further comprising:

a message memory coupled to the processor for storing the alphanumeric message received by the data communication receiver; and an alert mechanism coupled to the processor for generating an alert

in response to reception of the alphanumeric message.

17. (Amended) The data communication receiver of claim 16, wherein he programming means comprises:

the receiver for receiving a programming message including a [code] key word and image data;

a memory for storing a programming word; and storing means for storing the [code] key word and the image data in

the database in response to determining that the programming message includes the programming word.

18. (Amended) The data communication receiver of claim 16, wherein the programming means comprises:

controls for receiving a programming message comprising a [code] key word and image data; and

storing means for storing the [code] key word and the image data in the database.

(Amended) A data communication receiver for presenting information, the data communication receiver comprising:

- a receiver for receiving a message;
- a decoder coupled to the receiver for decoding the message to recover [at least one code] one or more alphanumeric words therefrom;
 - a memory coupled to the decoder for storing the message;
- a database coupled to the decoder for storing a plurality of [codes] <u>key</u> <u>words</u> and image data associated therewith, the image data representative of <u>images</u>;
- a presentation element coupled to the database for <u>determining</u> whether at least one alphanumeric word included in the message matches at <u>least one key word included in the database</u> [referencing the database to retrieve image data that is associated with the at least one code and that is representative of at least one image]; and
- a display coupled to the presentation element for presenting, when at least one alphanumeric word matches at least one key word, [the at least one] a corresponding image as a graphic message [that conveys a meaning without requiring presentation of additional information] accompanied by the message, and for presenting, when at least one alphanumeric word does not match at least one key word, the message unaccompanied by any graphic messages.



REMARKS

In the above-identified patent application, Claims 1-19 are pending. Claims 1-19 have been rejected, and the specification has been objected to by the Examiner. Additionally, various other mistakes have been noted by the Examiner.

RESPONSE TO THE OFFICE ACTION

In response to the Office Action dated December 26, 1996, Claims 4, 5, and 12-14 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-3, 6, 9, 11, 15, and 17-19 have been amended. The specification has been amended in one (1) place. Additionally, three (3) sheets of proposed drawing corrections are submitted concurrently herewith.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

In the Office Action of December 26, 1996, the specification is objected to because the Brief Description of the Drawings does not describe FIGs. 18-23. Applicants have therefore amended the specification in one (1) place to include descriptions for FIGs. 18-23. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

PROPOSED DRAWING CORRECTIONS

In the Office Action of December 26, 1996, the Examiner notes several errors in the drawings. Applicants have therefore submitted proposed drawing corrections for sheet 1 (correcting FIG. 1), sheet 6 (correcting FIGs. 14-16), and sheet 8 (correcting FIG. 21).

Regarding FIG. 1, a reference database (157) has been added in red ink. Regarding FIG. 14, reference number 155' has been replaced with --500--, as marked in red ink.

Regarding FIGs. 15 and 16, the figure numbers have been interchanged as marked in red ink.

Regarding FIG. 21, the spelling of "Charlotte" has been corrected in red ink.

Once the Examiner has approved the proposed drawing changes and indicated that the above-identified patent application includes allowable subject matter, Applicants will furnish a set of formal drawings incorporating approved changes.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3 UNDER 35 USC §102(b)

In the Office Action of December 26, 1996, Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Gaskill et al. (Gaskill). Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 1-3 under 35 USC §102(b) has been overcome by the amendments to Claims 1-3 and the remarks herein.

As amended, Independent Claim 1 calls for determining whether any word of a received alphanumeric message matches a key word included in a database, wherein the key word is associated with image data representative of an image. When the message includes a word that matches a key word, the corresponding image is displayed as a graphic message along with the alphanumeric message. When the message does not include a word matching any key word, the alphanumeric message is displayed alone, without an accompanying graphic message.

Claims 2 and 3, as amended, depend from Amended Claim 1.

Gaskill shows a paging system in which the sender can input a code (column 7, line 64 to column 8, line 11) that is sent to a pager. The pager recognizes the code and displays a graphic symbol, such as a house or office icon, corresponding thereto (column 10, lines 23-31).

Applicants respectfully submit that Gaskill does not disclose the step of determining whether a word of a received alphanumeric message matches a key word stored in a database or the step of presenting, when the word matches a key word, a graphic message corresponding to the key word as well as the original alphanumeric message received by the data communication receiver. Gaskill further does not disclose the step of presenting, when no message words match any key words, the alphanumeric message without an accompanying graphic message.

Instead, in Gaskill, the sender can either enter a code that causes the display of an icon or a different code that permits the sending of information that is directly displayed by the recipient pager. There is no suggestion that a graphic message can be displayed to supplement the meaning of a conventionally entered and received alphanumeric message. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Gaskill does not disclose each element of Amended Claims 1-3.

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejection of Claims 1-3 under 35 USC §102(b) has been traversed by the amendments to Claims 1-3 and the remarks hereinabove.

REIECTION OF CLAIMS 4-5 UNDER 35 USC §103

In the Office Action of December 26, 1996, Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Gaskill in view of Miyashita. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 4-5 has been rendered moot by the cancellation of Claims 4 and 5 without prejudice.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 6-7 UNDER 35 USC §103

In the Office Action of December 26, 1996, Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Gaskill in view of Miyashita and Lipp et al. (Lipp). Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 6-7 under 35 USC §103 has been overcome by the amendments to Claims 1 and 6 and the remarks herein.

Claims 6-7, as amended, depend from Independent Claim 1, as amended, and include all of the limitations thereof.

Miyashita describes a paging receiver that receives a code, recognition of which causes display of a canned message.

Lipp describes over the air programming of canned messages.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Gaskill, Miyashita, and Lipp does not teach the step of determining whether a word of a received alphanumeric message matches a key word stored in a database or the step of presenting, when the word matches a key word, a graphic message corresponding to the key word as well as the original alphanumeric message received by the data communication receiver (as called for in Independent Claim 1, as amended). The combination of the cited art further does not suggest the step of presenting, when no message words match any key words, the alphanumeric message without an accompanying graphic message (as called for in Independent Claim 1, as amended).

Instead, in Gaskill, the sender can either enter a code that causes the display of an icon or a different code that permits the sending of information that is directly displayed by the recipient pager. There is no suggestion that a graphic message can be displayed to supplement the meaning of a conventionally

entered and received alphanumeric message. Miyashita similarly does not teach that words forming a received alphanumeric message can be compared to stored key words to determine whether a graphic message, representative of the word, is to be displayed along with the alphanumeric message itself or whether the alphanumeric message is to be displayed alone. Rather, Miyashita shows the reception of a general message and a code that causes display of a canned message with the general message. Miyashita therefore teaches away from presentation of a graphic message along with the general message in response to determining that one or more words included in the general message match a stored key word. Lipp does not correct the deficiencies of Gaskill and Miyashita because Lipp also does not suggest that words included in the alphanumeric message can cause display of a graphic message accompanied by the alphanumeric message itself.

The advantage of the invention described in Amended Claims 6 and 7, which depend from Amended Claim 1, is that a user who is not fluent in the language of the presented message can still, under some circumstances, understand the presented message. Specifically, sending of a key word as a part of the alphanumeric message causes presentation of a graphic message that can be understood by users of all languages. At the same time, the alphanumeric message itself is presented along with any graphic message so that meaning of the graphic message is clarified when read by a user having the appropriate language skills. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the combination of Gaskill, Miyashita, and Lipp does not teach or suggest the features of Amended Claim 1, which are included in Dependent Claims 6 and 7, as amended.

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejection of Claims 6-7 under 35 USC §103 has been traversed by the amendments to Claims 1 and 6 and the remarks hereinabove.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 8 UNDER 35 USC §103

In the Office Action of December 26, 1996, Claim 8 is rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Gaskill in view of Miyashita, Lipp, and DeLuca et al. (DeLuca '005). Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 8 under 35 USC §103 has been overcome by the amendments to Claims 1 and 6 and the remarks herein.

Claim 8 is a dependent claim that depends from Amended Claim 1.

For the reasons set forth above in connection with the rejection of Claims 6 and 7, Independent Claim 1 is believed to be patentable over the combination of Gaskill, Miyashita, and Lipp. Applicants respectfully submit that combining DeLuca with Gaskill, Miyashita, and Lipp does not render Independent Claim 1 obvious because DeLuca also does not teach or suggest that words included in a received alphanumeric message are compared to stored key words in a database, that, when a word of the message matches a key word, a graphic message corresponding to the key word is displayed along with the alphanumeric message itself, or that, when no message words match any key words, the alphanumeric message is displayed alone without an accompanying graphic message.

Because Dependent Claim 8 includes all of the limitations of Amended Claim 1, Claim 8 is also believed to be patentable over the combination of Gaskill, Miyashita, Lipp, and DeLuca.

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejection of Claim 8 under 35 USC §103 has been traversed by the amendments to Claims 1 and 6 and the remarks hereinabove.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 9-11 UNDER 35 USC §103

In the Office Action of December 26, 1996, Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Gaskill. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 9-11 has been overcome by the amendment to Claim 9 and the remarks herein.

Amended Claims 9-11 contain features similar to those called for in Independent Claims 1 and 2. For the reasons set forth in connection with the Rejection of Claims 1-3 and the Rejection of Claims 6-7, it is believed that Claims 9-11, as amended, are not rendered obvious by Gaskill.

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejection of Claims 9-11 has been traversed by the amendment to Claim 9 and the remarks hereinabove.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 12-14 UNDER 35 USC §103

In the Office Action of December 26, 1996, Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Gaskill in view of Miyashita, Lipp and DeLuca '005. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 12-14 under 35 USC §103 has been rendered moot by the cancellation of Claims 12-14 without prejudice.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 15-19 UNDER 35 USC §103

In the Office Action of December 26, 1996, Claims 15-19 are rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Gaskill in view of Miyashita, Lipp and DeLuca '005. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 15-19 under 35 USC §103 has been overcome by the amendments to Claims 9 and 17-19 and the remarks herein.

Claims 15-18, as amended, depend from Amended Claim 9, which includes features similar to those called for in Amended Claim 1. For the reasons set forth above in connection with the Rejection of Claims 6-7 and the Rejection of Claim 8, it is believed that Amended Claim 9, like Amended Claim 1, is patentable over the combination of Gaskill, Miyashita, Lipp, and DeLuca. Since Claims 15-18 include all of the limitations of Amended Claim 9, Amended Claims 15-18 are also believed to be patentable over the combination of Gaskill, Miyashita, Lipp, and DeLuca.

Independent Claim 19, as amended, includes features and limitations similar to those called for in Amended Claim 1 and Amended Claim 9. Therefore, Amended Claim 19 is also believed to be patentable over the combination of Gaskill, Miyashita, Lipp, and DeLuca.

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejection of Claims 15-19 under 35 USC §103 has been traversed by the amendments to Claims 9 and 17-19 and the remarks hereinabove.

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated December 26, 1996. It is submitted that Claims 1-3, 6-11, and 15-19 are in condition for allowance, and a favorable response at an early date is earnestly solicited.

Applicants have previously paid for twenty (20) claims, including three (3) independent claims. After the foregoing Amendment, the above-identified patent application includes fourteen (14) claims, three (3) of which are independent. Applicants submit that no fee is due or owing at this time. Should it be determined that any fee is due or any excess fee has been received, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required or credit any overpayment to deposit account #13-4778.

If the Examiner believes that there are any informalities which can be corrected by Examiner's amendment, a telephone call to the undersigned is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted, DELUCA, et al.

MOTOROLA, INC. IP Law Dept. MS96 1500 Gateway Blvd. Boynton Beach, Florida 33426 Kelly Al Gardner
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 35,147
Tel. (561) 739-2860
FAX (561) 739-2825