


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.				
95/001,409	08/13/2010	7680256	51783-2 (256)	6267				
52450	7590	10/22/2010	<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="2">EXAMINER</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">ESCALANTE, OVIDIO</td> </tr> </table>		EXAMINER		ESCALANTE, OVIDIO	
EXAMINER								
ESCALANTE, OVIDIO								
KRIEG DEVAULT LLP ONE INDIANA SQUARE SUITE 2800 INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204-2079			<table border="1"> <tr> <th>ART UNIT</th> <th>PAPER NUMBER</th> </tr> <tr> <td>3992</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	3992	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER							
3992								
			<table border="1"> <tr> <th>MAIL DATE</th> <th>DELIVERY MODE</th> </tr> <tr> <td>10/22/2010</td> <td>PAPER</td> </tr> </table>		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	10/22/2010	PAPER
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE							
10/22/2010	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 Patents 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
GOOGLE, INC.,
1600 AMPHITHEATRE PARKWAY
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94043

Date:

MAILED
OCT 22 2010
CENTRAL REEXAMINATION UNIT

**Transmittal of Communication to Third Party Requester
Inter Partes Reexamination**

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NO. : 95001409
PATENT NO. : 7680256
TECHNOLOGY CENTER : 3999
ART UNIT : 3992

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above identified Reexamination proceeding. 37 CFR 1.903.

Prior to the filing of a Notice of Appeal, each time the patent owner responds to this communication, the third party requester of the inter partes reexamination may once file written comments within a period of 30 days from the date of service of the patent owner's response. This 30-day time period is statutory (35 U.S.C. 314(b)(2)), and, as such, it cannot be extended. See also 37 CFR 1.947.

If an ex parte reexamination has been merged with the inter partes reexamination, no responsive submission by any ex parte third party requester is permitted.

All correspondence relating to this inter partes reexamination proceeding should be directed to the Central Reexamination Unit at the mail, FAX, or hand-carry addresses given at the end of the communication enclosed with this transmittal.

OFFICE ACTION IN INTER PARTES REEXAMINATION	Control No.	Patent Under Reexamination	
	95/001,409	7680256	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	OVIDIO ESCALANTE	3992	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address. --

Responsive to the communication(s) filed by:

Patent Owner on _____

Third Party(ies) on 13 August 2010

RESPONSE TIMES ARE SET TO EXPIRE AS FOLLOWS:

For Patent Owner's Response:

2 MONTH(S) from the mailing date of this action. 37 CFR 1.945. EXTENSIONS OF TIME ARE GOVERNED BY 37 CFR 1.956.

For Third Party Requester's Comments on the Patent Owner Response:

30 DAYS from the date of service of any patent owner's response. 37 CFR 1.947. NO EXTENSIONS OF TIME ARE PERMITTED. 35 U.S.C. 314(b)(2).

All correspondence relating to this inter partes reexamination proceeding should be directed to the **Central Reexamination Unit** at the mail, FAX, or hand-carry addresses given at the end of this Office action.

This action is not an Action Closing Prosecution under 37 CFR 1.949, nor is it a Right of Appeal Notice under 37 CFR 1.953.

PART I. THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892
2. Information Disclosure Citation, PTO/SB/08
3. _____

PART II. SUMMARY OF ACTION:

- 1a. Claims 1-13 are subject to reexamination.
- 1b. Claims _____ are not subject to reexamination.
2. Claims _____ have been canceled.
3. Claims _____ are confirmed. [Unamended patent claims]
4. Claims _____ are patentable. [Amended or new claims]
5. Claims 1-13 are rejected.
6. Claims _____ are objected to.
7. The drawings filed on _____ are acceptable are not acceptable.
8. The drawing correction request filed on _____ is: approved. disapproved.
9. Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119 (a)-(d). The certified copy has:
 - been received. not been received. been filed in Application/Control No _____.
10. Other _____

Art Unit: 3992

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action addresses claims 1-13 of United States Patent No. 7,680,256 for which it has been determined in the Order Granting *Inter Partes* Reexamination (hereafter the "Order") that a substantial new question of patentability was raised in the request for *inter partes* reexamination, filed on August 13, 2010 (hereinafter the "Request").

Status of the Claims

2. Original claims 1-13 are rejected.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. With respect to the Information Disclosure Statement filed on August 19, 2010 and August 30, 2010, the information cited has been considered as described in the MPEP. Note that MPEP 2256 and 2656 indicate that degree of consideration to be given to such information will be normally limited by the degree to which the party filing the information citation has explained the content and relevance of the information. Information that does not appear to be "patents or printed publications" as identified in 35 U.S.C. 301 have been considered to the same extent (unless otherwise noted), but have been lined through and will not be printed on any resulting reexamination certificate

Art Unit: 3992

Rejections Proposed by the Requester

4. The following issues for rejection were proposed in the Request for *inter partes* reexamination. Any modifications made to the below proposed rejections are not listed in this section and will be noted under each issue as addressed separately below

- Issue 1** CINEMA is asserted as rendering claims 1-7, 9 and 10 anticipated.
- Issue 2 CINEMA in view of Schulzrinne is asserted as rendering claims 1, 4, 9 and 10 obvious.
- Issue 3 CINEMA in view of Schulzrinne '384 is asserted as rendering claims 1, 3, 4 and 10 obvious.
- Issue 4 CINEMA in view of Wood is asserted as rendering claims 1, 3 and 4 obvious.
- Issue 5 CINEMA in view of HTML 4.01 Specification is asserted as rendering claims 1 and 8 obvious.
- Issue 6 CINEMA in view Burg, Hanson '097 and Hanson '109 is asserted as rendering claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10 obvious.
- Issue 7 CINEMA in view of Singh is asserted as rendering claims 2-4, 6 and 9 obvious.
- Issue 8 CINEMA in view of Homan is asserted as rendering claims 3 and 6 obvious.
- Issue 9 CINEMA in view of Ram is asserted as rendering claim 3 obvious.
- Issue 10 CINEMA in view of Lennox is asserted as rendering claim 3 obvious.
- Issue 11 CINEMA in view of Hariri is asserted as rendering claim 4 obvious.
- Issue 12 CINEMA in view of Leung and Personal Reach is asserted as rendering claim 4 obvious.
- Issue 13 CINEMA in view of Singh, Homan and HTML 4.01 Specification is asserted as rendering claim 5 obvious.
- Issue 14 CINEMA in view of Hokusui is asserted as rendering claims 7 and 9 obvious.
- Issue 15 CINEMA in view of Ram and HTML 4.01 Specification is asserted as rendering claim 7 obvious.

Art Unit: 3992

- Issue 16 CINEMA in view of Lennox and HTML 4.01 Specification is asserted as rendering claim 7 obvious.
- Issue 17 CINEMA in view of Archer is asserted as rendering claim 10 obvious.
- Issue 18 CINEMA in view of Straub is asserted as rendering claim 11 obvious.
- Issue 19** Ram is asserted as rendering claims 1, 4, 5 and 9-13 anticipated.
- Issue 20 Ram in view of Singh is asserted as rendering claim 6 obvious.
- Issue 21 Ram in view of Homan is asserted as rendering claim 6 obvious.
- Issue 22 RAM in view of CINEMA is asserted as rendering claim 11 obvious.
- Issue 23 RAM in view of CINEMA and Straub is asserted as rendering claims 12 and 13 obvious.
- Issue 24** Lennox is asserted as rendering claims 1, 4, 5, 9 and 10 anticipated.
- Issue 25 Lennox in view of Singh is asserted as rendering claim 6 obvious.
- Issue 26 Lennox in view of Homan is asserted as rendering claim 6 obvious.
- Issue 27** Hariri is asserted as rendering claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9-13 anticipated.
- Issue 28 Hariri in view of Hokusui is asserted as rendering claim 7 obvious.
- Issue 29 Hariri in view of CINEMA and Straub is asserted as rendering claims 12 and 13 obvious.
- Issue 30** Hokusui is asserted as rendering claims 1 and 4 anticipated.
- Issue 31 Hokusui in view of CINEMA and Singh is asserted as rendering claim 8 obvious.
- Issue 32** Archer is asserted as rendering claims 1-2 and 4 anticipated.
- Issue 33** Leung in view of Personal Reach is asserted as rendering claim 1 obvious.

Art Unit: 3992

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Issue 1 - Adopted in Part

As set forth on page ix of the Request, CINEMA is listed with a publication date of May 2002. The Examiner however, acknowledges that the CINEMA document does not appear to

Art Unit: 3992

include the May 2002 date as noted in the Request. In addition, the Examiner notes that at least one citation which appears in the References Page of CINEMA is dated after the May 2002 publication date noted in the Request. For example item 32 on page 69 has a publication date of July 2002.

The Examiner additionally notes that the citation provided in the Request also cites to "Columbia University Technical Report CUCU-011-02". The Examiner cannot locate such citation in the submitted reference. It is unknown whether there are missing pages which lists the publication date or the above Report Number or whether the submitted document is complete as submitted.

Nonetheless, for the purposes of addressing the proposed rejection, the Examiner treats the May 2002 date as the effective publication date of the CINEMA reference.

7. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by CINEMA.

As per claims 3 and 6, the Examiner notes that the claim requires "a voice mail application configured to record a voice mail message if said user does not accept said call and an email application configured to automatically generate an email message containing said voice mail message and then send said email message to an email address designated by said user" and "wherein said email notification includes an attachment that comprises said voicemail message" respectively.

CINEMA discloses a voice mail application that generates an email notification that is sent to a designated email account of said user indicating receipt of a voicemail message, but

Art Unit: 3992

does not specifically disclose transmitting the voice mail message to a designated email address, (page 38). CINEMA's preferred embodiment "uses SIP for signaling and RTSP for storage and retrieval of voice messages as described in [38]. The user gets an email notification when a new message arrives. The user messages are also listed on a web page as shown in Fig. 20, where they can be played by just a mouse-click. Alternatively, an RTSP client such as Apple's QuickTime can be used to play back the message. Using streaming media to deliver voicemail avoids having to download the whole message while traveling, for example."

The Examiner agrees with the request that CINEMA discloses a voice mail application that generates an email notification that is sent to a designated email account of said user. This is shown in CINEMA in section 9.1 on page 38.

The Examiner notes however, that the Request acknowledges that CINEMA "does not specifically disclose transmitting the voice mail message to a designated email address." Thus, since CINEMA does not disclose this feature then it cannot anticipate the claim. The Examiner maintains that sending a notification to an email address of a voice mail message is different that sending the actual voicemail message with the email to the email address of the user.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt the proposed rejection of claims 3 and 6 as being anticipated by CINEMA.

Art Unit: 3992

As set forth in claim 7, the claim requires a web based control panel which includes a "selection item" associated with each of said plurality of contact numbers that allows the users to temporarily activate and deactivate respective one or more numbers.

The Request does not specifically state how it interprets the "selection item" but instead broadly states that "CINEMA discloses a "web-based user interface to configure and manage the system," including to permit the user to temporarily activate and deactivate respective one or more numbers contained in said plurality of contact numbers." This citation is similar to the citation that was used with respect to the "activate and deactivate" limitation in claim 5.

As will be noted below with respect to claim 5, the Examiner agrees that under the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim, activating or deactivating one or more of the numbers is equivalent to comparable methods of e.g., editing the contact numbers which includes temporarily adding or changing numbers that will be associated with the primary contact number. Claim 7, however requires a "selection item" which allows the user to temporarily activate and deactivate the numbers. The Request failed to specify what it considers to be equivalent to the claimed "selection item".

In light of the '256 patent specification, the Examiner notes that an example is given on how a user may select/deselect several numbers. This example is shown in relation to Figure 5 and its related text. While the Examiner appreciates that there are many ways to support a reading on a selection item, the Request failed to specifically point out how CINEMA supports a selection item which allows a user to temporarily activate and deactivate the numbers as claimed.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt the rejection of claim 7 over CINEMA.

Art Unit: 3992

Regarding claim 1:

A system, comprising: a web browser based control panel allowing a user to designate a plurality of contact numbers correlated to a primary contact number assigned to said user, said web browser based control panel including means for allowing said user to activate and deactivate select contact numbers contained in said plurality of contact numbers;

CINEMA discloses a "web-based user interface to configure and manage the system.... Both the per-user information and system configuration tables can be manipulated from the web interface," (1st paragraph on page 16). CINEMA also discloses user information is generally stored in the Primary User Table, including the primary user contact number and user contact numbers, (pages 9-11). As further disclosed therein, data in the Primary User Table "can be updated from the web page or by the SIP phones using SIP registration," (page 9 - Section 3.2).

The Examiner notes that the web-based user interface permits a user to designate a plurality of contact numbers correlated to a primary contact number assigned to said user and to permit a user to activate and deactivate select contact numbers contained in his contact numbers. For example, CINEMA lets a user set call preferences and policy via a web interface to fork a call to one or several different locations, either sequentially or simultaneously.

As disclosed on page 20 of CINEMA:

"Bob's preferences and policy are then executed. These may, for example, demand that a calling user be authenticated, refuse or redirect calls, or apply preferences about where Bob wants to be reached. If the server determines that Bob's current policy allows Alice's call to reach him, it contacts Bob's list of registered locations. Bob's current SIP phones ring, he picks up the handset and starts talking to AliceIf there are multiple contacts found for the user, then all of the contact locations are used. The preference values (q-value) of the contacts are used to order the contact locations. The more preferred value is tried first, and if it fails or times out, the next preferred location is used. If multiple

Art Unit: 3992

contacts have the same or similar q values, then the server forks the call request to all those locations in proxy mode."

The Examiner additionally notes that an additional implementation of a web-based control panel is described at 38 & Fig. 20. See also Fig. 7 on page 17 (example of one portion of a web-based control panel).

The Examiner notes the Request acknowledged that this limitation is written in means-plus-function format and that the '256 patent discloses structure linked to the function in Figure 5. The Request further notes that Figure 5 appears to be a web based interface between the user and his account maintained on the Internet that permits the user to log into his account via the Internet and modify the account attributes.

The Request then notes that under the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification the claimed limitations "activate" and "deactivate" may include equivalent or comparable methods of populating, editing, managing, etc., information in a database.

The Examiner treats that as saying that by adding or deleting contacts in the user profile of CINEMA that the user is "activating" or "deactivating" selected contact numbers.

a database for storing said plurality of contact numbers linked to said primary contact number in memory;

CINEMA discloses a variety of user databases, including a "Primary User Table" that includes, *inter alia*, a database that stores a plurality of contact numbers linked to a primary contact number in memory, (page 11 - see the contact (text) description - "Contact URI for this user. Multiple contacts for the same user are stored in different records.").

Art Unit: 3992

In addition, as set forth on page 6 of CINEMA an example is provided which shows that a primary contact number for Alice is associated with a plurality of other numbers including her desk phone and others such as "Alice.Cueba @intern.com, alice@columbia.edu and ac114@hostel.school.com". Each of these contacts will be stored in the database as disclosed by CINEMA.

a call processing server configured to receive a call from a calling terminal designating said primary contact number;

CINEMA discloses a call processing server that is configured to receive a call from a calling terminal that designates a primary contact number at pages 5-6 and 19-22. The call processing server includes the SIP/PSTN gateway and media server, which function in coordination with CINEMA's SIP server and associated databases, (pages 8-9 & Fig. 3). The SIP/PSTN gateway and media server interface with the telephone network. The interface can be through a Private Branch Exchange (PBX) or directly with the switch (in CINEMA's example, the University telephone switch), (pages 27-30 & Fig. 15).

a lookup application configured to query said database to retrieve activated contact numbers from said plurality of contact numbers as a function of said primary contact number;

CINEMA discloses a lookup application that is configured to query a Primary User Table to retrieve activated contact numbers from the plurality of contact numbers associated with the primary contact number in the Primary User Database, (pages 5-7, 11 and 19-22).

As noted on page 6 a forking proxy can fork the call request to more than one location so that the first phone that is picked up gets the call. In addition, as set forth on page 6 of CINEMA,

Art Unit: 3992

an example is provided which shows that a primary contact number for Alice is associated with a plurality of other numbers including her desk phone and others such as "Alice.Cueba@intern.com, alice@columbia.edu and ac114@hostel.school.com".

a calling application configured to forward said call to a plurality of call reception terminals that are each associated with a respective one of said activated contact numbers;

and

CINEMA discloses a calling application configured to forward a call, at the option of the user, to a plurality of call reception terminals that are each associated with an activated contact number in the Primary User Database. As set forth in page 6:

"4. Alice has registered four contacts, with one of them (her desk phone) as her preferred location. Thus, the server at school.edu tries the more preferred location for Alice at her desk phone.

5. The phone is idle, and sends a ringing response. However, since it is not picked up, the server times out.

6. The server then forks the call request to all the remaining three locations simultaneously. The locations are Alice.Cueba@intern.com, alice@columbia.edu and ac114@hostel.school.com.").

In addition, see also pages 11, 16 and 19-22.

At pages 20-21, CINEMA discloses the following:

"For example, if user sales@company.com, has locations repl@pcl.company.com (preference 1.0), rep2@pc2.company.com (preference 1.0), rep3@pc3.company.com (preference 0.8), senior-rep@company.com (preference 0.3) and manager@company.com (preference 0.3) then a call to sip:sales@company.com is first forwarded to both repl and rep2. If they do not pick up the phone or the call fails, then rep3 is tried. If rep3 also does not answer the call, then it is forwarded to senior-rep and manager simultaneously."

Art Unit: 3992

a connection application for establishing a voice based communication session between said calling terminal and a respective one of said plurality of call reception terminals if said user accepts said call.

CINEMA discloses a connection application for establishing a voice based communication session between the caller and one of a user's plurality of contact numbers ("call location terminals") if the user accepts the call, (pages 6-7, 11, 16 and 20).

Regarding claim 2:

The system of claim 1, further comprising a dial in portal configured to allow said user to use a communication device to call said call processing server to allow said user to enter additional contact numbers or delete contact numbers that are correlated to said primary contact number.

CINEMA discloses, *inter alia*, a VoiceXML application as part of an Interactive Voice Response unit (IVR), which comprises a dial in portal, and using the VoiceXML system to access the user data, (pages 39 and 64)

"We are implementing a VoiceXML [40] browser that allows us to easily implement services such as retrieving email, including voicemail, via traditional phones, but also simplifies the task of building voice menus, making such services available to small organizations. VoiceXML is an XML DTD that mimics HTML forms input via DTMF or speech recognition."

Additionally, CINEMA discloses entering additional contact numbers or deleting contact numbers that are correlated to said primary contact number via a web-based interface accessed on a dial-in communication device (e.g., a data transmission from a mobile Smartphone), (pages 5-7, 11, 16 and 20).

Art Unit: 3992

Regarding claim 4:

The system of claim 1, wherein said call includes a SIP message header containing a call origination field and a call destination field that is sent to said call processing server, said call destination field including said primary contact number, said call processing server using said primary contact number to obtain said plurality of contact numbers and said call origination field to establish said voice based communication session between said calling terminal and said call reception terminal.

CINEMA discloses using a SIP message header containing a call origination field and a call destination field that is sent to said call processing server, said call destination field including said primary contact number, said call processing server using said primary contact number to obtain said plurality of contact numbers and said call origination field to establish said voice based communication session between said calling terminal and said call reception terminal, (pages 5-7, 11, 16 and 20).

In addition, as set forth on page 19 of CINEMA an incoming call example is discussed. In this example Alice, sip:alice@cs.columbia.edu calls Bob, sip:Bob.Wilson@cs.columbia.edu. Alice's user agent identifies a plurality of contact numbers for the primary contact "Bob.Wilson@cs.columbia.edu". As further noted on page 20 there can be multiple contacts for a user and the system attempts to call each location that is associated with the primary contact number.

Art Unit: 3992

Regarding claim 5:

A system, comprising: a server in communication with a communication network operable receive an incoming call from a calling terminal, wherein said incoming call is calling a primary contact number;

CINEMA discloses a server in communication with a communication network operable receive an incoming call from a calling terminal, wherein said incoming call is calling a primary contact number, (pages 5-6 and 19-22). The call processing server includes the SIP/PSTN gateway and media server, which function in coordination with CINEMA's SIP server and associated, (pages 8-9 & Fig. 3). The SIP/PSTN gateway and media server interface with the telephone network. The interface can be through a Private Branch Exchange (PBX) or directly with the switch (in CINEMA's example, the University telephone switch), (pages 27-30 & Fig. 15).

CINEMA provides several examples of a incoming call calling a primary contact number. As shown page 19 Alice at sip:alice@cs.columbia.edu calls Bob at sip:Bob.Wilson@cs.columbia.edu. Likewise at page 6, Bob at bob@home.com calls Alice at allice@office.com.

a multiple contact lookup application executable by said server configured to obtain a plurality of contact numbers associated with said primary contact number;

CINEMA discloses a multiple contact lookup application executable by said server configured to obtain a plurality of contact numbers associated with said primary contact number, (pages 5-7, 11, 16 and 20). An example is given at item six on page 7 of CINEMA. In this

Art Unit: 3992

example a plurality of contacts numbers that are associated with Alice's primary number are contacted.

a calling application executable by said server configured to simultaneously ring said plurality of contact numbers in response to said incoming call;

CINEMA discloses a configurable calling application that be executed by the server to simultaneously ring a plurality of contact numbers in response to said incoming call, (pages 5-7, 11, 16 and 20). The Examiner notes that for example as shown on item 6 of page 6 the server forks the call request to all three locations "simultaneously". A similar example is disclosed on page 20 of CINEMA.

a call connection application executable by said server configured to establish a communication session between said calling terminal and a terminal associated with a respective one of said plurality of contact numbers if a user accepts said incoming call;

CINEMA discloses a call connection application executable by said server configured to establish a communication session between said calling terminal and a terminal associated with a respective one of said plurality of contact numbers if a user accepts said incoming call, (pages 5-7, 11, 16 and 20).

a voicemail application configured to allow a calling party using said calling terminal to leave a voicemail message for said user if said incoming call is not accepted;

CINEMA discloses a voicemail application configured to allow a calling party using said calling terminal to leave a voicemail message for said user if said incoming call is not accepted, (page 38).

Art Unit: 3992

a voicemail email application configured to automatically generate an email notification that is sent to a designated email account of said user indicating receipt of said voicemail message; and

CINEMA discloses a voicemail email application configured to automatically generate an email notification that is sent to a designated email account of said user indicating receipt of said voicemail message. (page 38, "[t]he user gets an email notification when a new message arrives").

a web based control panel accessible by said user that includes a plurality of data input fields that allow said user to input said plurality of contact numbers associated with said primary contact number, wherein said plurality of contact numbers are stored in a database associated with said user, wherein said web based control panel is configured to allow said user to temporarily activate and deactivate one or more numbers contained in said plurality of contact numbers.

CINEMA discloses a "web-based user interface to configure and manage the system," (page 16). The web-based user interface permits the user to access a plurality of data input fields that allow said user to input said plurality of contact numbers associated with said primary contact number, wherein said plurality of contact numbers are stored in a database associated with said user (the "Primary User Database"). A user may temporarily activate and deactivate one or more numbers contained in said plurality of contact numbers, (pages 5-6, 11, 20, and 38).

As noted above, the Request then notes that under the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification the claimed limitations "activate" and "deactivate" may include

Art Unit: 3992

equivalent or comparable methods of populating, editing, managing, etc., information in a database.

The Examiner treats that as saying that by adding or deleting contacts or modifying the individual contacts in the user profile of CINEMA that the user is “activating” or “deactivating” selected contact numbers.

Regarding claim 9:

The system of claim 5, wherein said communication session comprises a VoIP communication session.

CINEMA discloses a VoIP system that includes at least one VoIP communication session, (pages 5-7, 11-12, 16-22).

In addition, as noted on page 24 in reference to Figure 11, a PSTN to IP call is disclosed. In this example a “voice-over-IP” call-leg specifier is defined.

Regarding claim 10:

The system of claim 5, further comprising a call answering application associated with said call processing server configured to establish an initial communication session between said calling terminal and said server.

CINEMA discloses a call answering application associated with said call processing server configured to establish an initial communication session between said calling terminal and said server, (pages 5-7, 11-12 and 16-22).

Art Unit: 3992

Issue 2 - Not Adopted

8. The rejection of claims 1, 4 and 9-10 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CINEMA in view of Schulzrinne is not adopted.

As set forth on page 44 of the Request, the Request notes that CINEMA describes a web-based, one-number system for integrating voicemail, telephony and email in a unified messaging environment. CINEMA's disclosed system uses a single identifier--e.g., a phone number, SIP header, or email address--as a primary contact number for a user's home phone, office phone, email addresses, and voicemail. A caller can dial this single number, either via the Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) or using a Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) device, and reach the user wherever (and at whatever phone) the user may be. The caller can also leave a voicemail message if the user is unavailable or declines to take the call, in which case CINEMA's system can send the user an email alerting the user that he or she has a new message.

The Request further noted that Schulzrinne describes SIP functionality for a one-number system. In addition, it was noted that Schulzrinne also discloses that SIP allows a plurality of contact numbers to be correlate to a primary contact number for a user. In addition, it was noted that Schulzrinne does not disclose a web browser based control panel including means for allowing said user to activate and deactivate select contact numbers contained in said plurality of contact numbers.

The Examiner first notes that the Request did not point to any deficiency with the primary reference CINEMA.

Art Unit: 3992

The Examiner maintains that under the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

With respect to CINEMA the Examiner agrees that the Requester determined the scope and contents of CINEMA. However, the Requester failed to ascertain the differences between CINEMA and the claims at issue.

The Requester's proposed rejection does not properly present a proper 103 rejection since it does not show what it considers to be deficient in CINEMA. As noted above, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

It is clear that the "differences" must be explained. Since the Request failed to address this aspect then it is not clear why one of ordinary skill in the art would look to Schulzrinne in showing the claims are obvious.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt this proposed rejection.

Art Unit: 3992

Issue 3 - Not Adopted

9. The rejection of claims 1, 3, 4 and 10 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CINEMA in view of Schulzrinne '384 is not adopted.

As noted on page 48 of the Request, it was noted that Schulzrinne '384 discloses a SIP-based fined-me follow-me system that provides advanced call processing services over the internet. It was also noted that Schulzrinne '384 discloses accessing and modifying its internet-based telephone system using a GUI interface on a PC, which is a web-enabled control panel.

The Examiner notes that the Request did not point to any deficiency with the primary reference CINEMA.

The Examiner notes that under the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

With respect to CINEMA the Examiner agrees that the Requester determined the scope and contents of CINEMA. However, the Requester failed to ascertain the differences between CINEMA and the claims at issue.

The Requester's proposed rejection does not properly present a proper 103 rejection since it does not show what it considers to be deficient in CINEMA. As noted above, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or

Art Unit: 3992

described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

It is clear that the “differences” must be explained. Since the Request failed to address this aspect then it is not clear why one would look to Schulzrinne '384 for meeting the claimed limitations.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt this proposed rejection.

Issue 4 - Not Adopted

10. The rejection of claims 1, 3 and 4 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CINEMA in view of Wood is not adopted.

As set forth on page 49 of the Request Wood was relied upon for disclosing a web-enabled control panel to modify a central messaging system that integrates voicemail and email.

The Examiner first notes that the Request did not point to any deficiency with the primary reference CINEMA.

The Examiner notes that under the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 3992

With respect to CINEMA the Examiner agrees that the Requester determined the scope and contents of CINEMA. However, the Requester failed to ascertain the differences between CINEMA and the claims at issue.

The Requester's proposed rejection does not properly present a proper 103 rejection since it does not show what it considers to be deficient in CINEMA. As noted above, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

It is clear that the "differences" must be explained. Since the Request failed to address this aspect it is not know how CINEMA can be combined with Wood.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt this proposed rejection.

Issue 5 - Adopted in Part/with Modification

11. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CINEMA in view of HTML 4.01 Specification.

As per claim 1:

As set forth on page 50, HTML 4.01 Specification was cited to teach basic HTML programming for providing web browser based control panel, including using a check box,(or other means) on a web browser control panel to activate and deactivate selected entries (such as contact numbers) contained in a plurality of entries.

Art Unit: 3992

The Request did not explain what limitation HTML 4.01 Specification was being applied to for claim 1. In addition, the Request did not cite any deficiency with respect to CINEMA in claim 1.

The Requester's proposed rejection does not properly present a proper 103 rejection since it does not show what it considers to be deficient in CINEMA. As noted above, under 35 U.S.C.

103(a), a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt the proposed rejection to claim 1.

As noted above with respect to CINEMA and claim 7, the Examiner maintains that the Request did not point out how the selection item of claim 7 is being treated. However, this current issue addresses claim 8 which is dependent upon claim 8. In this issue a more specific selection item is claimed. Since the Examiner agrees with the teachings of HTML 4.01 Specification, the Examiner will modify the originally proposed rejection to add claim 7.

Regarding claim 7:

The system of claim 5, wherein said web based control panel includes a selection item associated with each of said plurality of contact numbers that allows said user to

Art Unit: 3992

temporarily activate and deactivate respective one or more numbers contained in said plurality of contact numbers.

Regarding claim 8:

The system of claim 7, wherein said selection item comprises a check box.

As explained above, CINEMA describes a web-based, one-number system for integrating voicemail, telephony and email in a unified messaging environment. CINEMA's disclosed system uses a single identifier--e.g., a phone number, SIP header, or email address--as a primary contact number for a user's home phone, office phone, email addresses, and voicemail, (abstract; pages 5-7 and 8-15). A caller can dial this single number, either via the Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) or using a Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) device, and reach the user wherever (and at whatever phone) the user may be. The caller can also leave a voicemail message if the user is unavailable or declines to take the call, in which case CINEMA's system can send the user an email alerting the user that he or she has a new message.

As further noted above CINEMA allows a user to edit their contact list including the activation and deactivation of a contact.

The Examiner acknowledges that Request does not show that CINEMA specifically discloses a selection item or that the selection item can comprise a check box.

Nonetheless, HTML 4.01 Specification teaches basic HTML programming for providing web browser based control panel, including using a check box (or other means) on a web

Art Unit: 3992

browser control panel to activate and deactivate selected entries contained in a plurality of entries,(page 166).

The Examiner acknowledges that HTML 4.01 Specification discusses generally that web pages can contain "radio buttons" or "push buttons", (equivalents to check boxes), this teaching shows that a web page such as in CINEMA could be modified to include such a selection item.

It would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teachings of HTML 4.01 Specification to create a web page to control the functionality of an Internet-based one number system. This selection item check box allows a user to more easily select or deselect specific contact numbers.

Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to look to the teachings of these references because they are in the same technological field and contain similar disclosures: each discloses a one number or unified messaging system in the field of telephony (including Internet telephony) and discloses the basic functionality of the claimed one number systems of the '256 Patent.

Moreover, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have combined the teachings of these references with one another because the references disclose and teach the basic functionality of one number systems incorporating the use of computer and software-based IP telephony (such as SIP) and web enabled access to modify or change information such as contact numbers.

Art Unit: 3992

Issue 6 - Adopted with Modification

12. The rejection of claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CINEMA in view of Burg, Hanson '097 and Hanson '109 is not adopted.

13. Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CINEMA in view of Hanson U.S. Patent Pub: 2005/0074109.

As per claims 1, 2, 5, 7 9 and 10,

The Examiner notes that the Request discloses that Burg, Hanson '097, and Hanson '109 discloses the features of claims.

The Examiner, however, notes that the Request did not point to any deficiency with the primary reference CINEMA.

The Examiner notes that under the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

With respect to CINEMA the Examiner agrees that the Requester determined the scope and contents of CINEMA. However, the Requester failed to ascertain the differences between CINEMA and the claims at issue.

Art Unit: 3992

The Requester's proposed rejection does not properly present a proper 103 rejection since it does not show what it considers to be deficient in CINEMA. As noted above, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have ~~been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to~~ which said subject matter pertains.

It is clear that the "differences" must be explained. Since the Request failed to address this aspect it is not know how CINEMA can be combined with Burg, Hanson '097 and Hanson '109.

In addition, the Request failed to specifically explain how specific limitations are met. For example, with respect to claim 7, the Request noted that "[t]he Examiner found that Burg, Hanson '097 and Hanson '109 disclose each limitations of claims 5 and 7 except and email/voicemail element and a particular web browser based control panel." The Request then referenced Ex. B at 107-110. In considering this citation, there is no reference to how the Examiner considered "a selection item" as claimed.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt this proposed rejection.

Art Unit: 3992

As per claims 3 and 6,

The Examiner notes that these claims are directed to recording a voicemail message and the automatic generation of an email message containing said voice mail message and the sending of the email message with the voice mail message to an email address.

The Request only states “[s]imilarly, the ‘256 Patent’s Examiner recognized that claim 3 to be fully disclosed in the art before him, including Burg, Hanson ‘097, and Hanson ‘109.” The Request then cite to Ex. B at 107-110.

As noted in Exhibit B, at page 109, it is agreed that Hanson ‘109 (US 2005/0074109) discloses of recording a voicemail message and the automatic generation of an email containing the voice mail message. This is noted in paragraph 92 and Fig. 7.

The Examiner notes however, that the proposed rejection is based on the combination of Burg, Hanson ‘097 and Hanson ‘109. As noted above, the Request failed to identify the differences in CINEMA and further fails to show how each of Burg, Hanson ‘097 and Hanson ‘109 cures those deficiencies.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt this proposed rejection.

Nonetheless, the Examiner acknowledges that for claims 3 and 6, CINEMA is deficient as to including a voicemail message with the email message thus, the Examiner Adopts the Proposed rejection with Modification to be rejected under CINEMA in view of the teachings of Hanson ‘109.

Regarding claim 3:

Art Unit: 3992

The system of claim 1, further comprising a voice mail application configured to record a voice mail message if said user does not accept said call and an email application configured to automatically generate an email message containing said voice mail message and then send said email message to an email address designated by said user.

Regarding claim 6:

The system of claim 5, wherein said email notification includes an attachment that comprises said voicemail message.

As noted above, CINEMA discloses on page 38 of sending an email notification when a new voice mail message arrives. The Examiner acknowledges that CINEMA does not disclose of the email message containing said voice mail message.

Nonetheless, as disclosed by Hanson '109 at paragraph 92, a caller leaves a voicemail message. The system then has the option to send the voice mail message as an email attachment to a specified email address.

The Examiner notes that CINEMA clearly suggests of notifying the recipient of a pending message, thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of CINEMA by allow the message recipient to receive their voicemail message via email as disclosed by Hanson '109 so that the user can quickly listen to important messages that they are received. In CINEMA a user must access the disclosed user interface in order to listen to their messages. By allowing the user the freedom to listen to their message via their received email message, the user is provided greater access to their messages.

Art Unit: 3992

Issue 7 - Adopted in Part

14. Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CINEMA in view of Singh.

As per claims 2, 4 and 9,

Singh was relied upon for teaching the use of DTMF signaling via a dial-in portal in connection with a SIP-based unified messaging system with a web-based voicemail application.

The Examiner first notes that the Request did not point to any deficiency with the primary reference CINEMA.

The Examiner notes that under the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

With respect to CINEMA the Examiner agrees that the Requester determined the scope and contents of CINEMA. However, the Requester failed to ascertain the differences between CINEMA and the claims at issue.

The Requester's proposed rejection does not properly present a proper 103 rejection since it does not show what it considers to be deficient in CINEMA. As noted above, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter

Art Unit: 3992

sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

It is clear that the "differences" must be explained. Since the Request failed to address this aspect it is not know how CINEMA can be combined with Singh.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt the proposed rejection to these claims.

The Examiner notes that while the Request did not specifically set forth what was deficient in CINEMA the Examiner maintains that CINEMA does not anticipate claims 3 and 6. Thus, having noting this deficiency, the Examiner addresses this proposed rejection for only claims 3 and 6.

Regarding claim 3:

The system of claim 1, further comprising a voice mail application configured to record a voice mail message if said user does not accept said call and an email application configured to automatically generate an email message containing said voice mail message and then send said email message to an email address designated by said user.

Regarding claim 6:

The system of claim 5, wherein said email notification includes an attachment that comprises said voicemail message.

As noted above, CINEMA discloses on page 38 of sending an email notification when a new voice mail message arrives. The Examiner acknowledges that CINEMA does not disclose of the email message containing said voice mail message.

Art Unit: 3992

Nonetheless, as disclosed by Singh at col. 2, lines 29-40, Singh discloses that in response to a message being stored, an email notification can be transmitted to the message recipient. IN addition, the notification “can include a copy of the message as a file attachment.”

The Examiner notes that CINEMA, like Singh, clearly suggests of notifying the recipient of a pending message, thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of CINEMA by allow the message recipient to receive their voicemail message via email as disclosed by Singh so that the user can quickly listen to important messages that they are received. In CINEMA a user must access the disclosed user interface in order to listen to their messages. By allowing the user the freedom to listen to their message via their received email message, the user is provided greater access to their messages.

Issue 8 - Not Adopted

15. The rejection of claims 3 and 6 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CINEMA in view of Homan is not adopted.

As noted on page 60 of the Request, Homan was relied upon for disclosing an email notification system that automatically sends an email message, via a server connected to a network to a subscriber’s specified email address(es) to notify the subscriber that a voice mail and/or fax message is waiting on the system.

The Examiner first notes that the Request did not point to any deficiency with the primary reference CINEMA.

Art Unit: 3992

The Examiner notes that under the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

With respect to CINEMA the Examiner agrees that the Requester determined the scope and contents of CINEMA. However, the Requester failed to ascertain the differences between CINEMA and the claims at issue.

The Requester's proposed rejection does not properly present a proper 103 rejection since it does not show what it considers to be deficient in CINEMA. As noted above, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

It is clear that the "differences" must be explained. Since the Request failed to address this aspect it is not know how CINEMA can be combined with Homan.

In addition, as per the limitations set forth in claims 3 and 6, the Examiner notes that the Request notes that Homan discloses an e-mail notification system that automatically sends an email message, via a server connected to a network (such as the Internet), to a subscriber's

Art Unit: 3992

specified email address(es) to notify the subscriber that a voice and/or fax message is waiting on the system.”

Considering the citations cited in the Request the Examiner maintains that Homan does not meet the claim language of at least sending a voicemail message as an attachment to an email message. Homan's system operates similarly to that of CINEMA in that only a notification is provided to the message recipient.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt this proposed rejection.

Issue 9 - Not Adopted

16. The rejection of claim 3 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CINEMA in view of Ram is not adopted.

As set forth on page 61 of the Request, Ram was noted to disclose an email notification of received voicemail messages.

The Examiner first notes that the Request did not point to any deficiency with the primary reference CINEMA.

The Examiner notes that under the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 3992

With respect to CINEMA the Examiner agrees that the Requester determined the scope and contents of CINEMA. However, the Requester failed to ascertain the differences between CINEMA and the claims at issue.

The Requester's proposed rejection does not properly present a proper 103 rejection since it does not show what it considers to be deficient in CINEMA. As noted above, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

It is clear that the "differences" must be explained. Since the Request failed to address this aspect it is not know how CINEMA can be combined with Ram.

In addition, as per the limitations set forth in claims 3 and 6, the Examiner notes that the Request notes that Ram discloses an email notification of received voicemail messages.

Considering the citations cited in the Request the Examiner maintains that Ram does not meet the claim language of at least sending a voicemail message as an attachment to an email message. Ram's system operates similarly to that of CINEMA in that only a notification is provided to the message recipient.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt this proposed rejection.

Art Unit: 3992

Issue 10 - Not Adopted

17. The rejection of claim 3 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CINEMA in view of Lennox is not adopted.

As set forth on page 62 of the Request, Lennox was noted to disclose a voicemail/email application that alerts a user of various specifics of an incoming call that has been sent to voicemail and redirects the called party to a voicemail server to record a voicemail message.

The Examiner first notes that the Request did not point to any deficiency with the primary reference CINEMA.

The Examiner notes that under the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

With respect to CINEMA the Examiner agrees that the Requester determined the scope and contents of CINEMA. However, the Requester failed to ascertain the differences between CINEMA and the claims at issue.

The Requester's proposed rejection does not properly present a proper 103 rejection since it does not show what it considers to be deficient in CINEMA. As noted above, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter

Art Unit: 3992

sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

It is clear that the "differences" must be explained. Since the Request failed to address this aspect it is not know how CINEMA can be combined with Lennox.

In addition, as per the limitations set forth in claims 3 and 6, the Examiner notes that the Request notes that Lennox alerts a user of various specifics of an incoming call including the name of the caller, time of call and call subject. This information is sent via an email.

Considering the citations cited in the Request the Examiner maintains that Lennox does not meet the claim language of at least sending a voicemail message as an attachment to an email message.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt this proposed rejection.

Issue 11 - Not Adopted

18. The rejection of claim 4 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CINEMA in view of Hariri is not adopted.

As set forth on page 71 of the Request, Hariri was relied upon to teach the use of VoIP in connection with its one number system.

The Examiner first notes that the Request did not point to any deficiency with the primary reference CINEMA.

Art Unit: 3992

The Examiner notes that under the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

With respect to CINEMA the Examiner agrees that the Requester determined the scope and contents of CINEMA. However, the Requester failed to ascertain the differences between CINEMA and the claims at issue.

The Requester's proposed rejection does not properly present a proper 103 rejection since it does not show what it considers to be deficient in CINEMA. As noted above, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

It is clear that the "differences" must be explained. Since the Request failed to address this aspect it is not know how CINEMA can be combined with Hariri.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt this proposed rejection.

Art Unit: 3992

Issue 12 - Not Adopted

19. The rejection of claims 4 and 10 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CINEMA in view of Leung and Personal Reach is not adopted.

As set forth on page 72 of the Request, Leung and Personal Reach was relied upon to teach the use of VoIP in connection with its one number system and for claim 10 (page 116) a call answering application that establishes an initial communication session between the calling terminal and its server.

The Examiner first notes that the Request did not point to any deficiency with the primary reference CINEMA.

The Examiner notes that under the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

With respect to CINEMA the Examiner agrees that the Requester determined the scope and contents of CINEMA. However, the Requester failed to ascertain the differences between CINEMA and the claims at issue.

The Requester's proposed rejection does not properly present a proper 103 rejection since it does not show what it considers to be deficient in CINEMA. As noted above, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter

Art Unit: 3992

sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

It is clear that the "differences" must be explained. Since the Request failed to address this aspect it is not know how CINEMA can be combined with Leung and Personal Reach.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt this proposed rejection.

Issue 13 - Not Adopted

20. The rejection of claim 5 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CINEMA in view of Singh, Homan and HTML 4.01 Specification is not adopted.

In considering pages 85-86 of the Request, the Examiner notes that the Request did not point to any deficiency with the primary reference CINEMA.

The Examiner notes that under the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

With respect to CINEMA the Examiner agrees that the Requester determined the scope and contents of CINEMA. However, the Requester failed to ascertain the differences between CINEMA and the claims at issue.

Art Unit: 3992

The Requester's proposed rejection does not properly present a proper 103 rejection since it does not show what it considers to be deficient in CINEMA. As noted above, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

It is clear that the "differences" must be explained. Since the Request failed to address this aspect it is not know how CINEMA can be combined with Singh, Homan and HTML 4.01 Specification.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt this proposed rejection.

Issue 14 - Adopted in Part

21. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CINEMA in view of Hokusui.

As per claim 9,

As set forth on pages 11 of the Request, Hokusui was noted to describe a one number system using VoIP.

The Examiner first notes that the Request did not point to any deficiency with the primary reference CINEMA.

Art Unit: 3992

The Examiner notes that under the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

With respect to CINEMA the Examiner agrees that the Requester determined the scope and contents of CINEMA. However, the Requester failed to ascertain the differences between CINEMA and the claims at issue.

The Requester's proposed rejection does not properly present a proper 103 rejection since it does not show what it considers to be deficient in CINEMA. As noted above, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

It is clear that the "differences" must be explained. Since the Request failed to address this aspect it is not know how CINEMA can be combined with Hokusui.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt the proposed rejection over claim 9.

In addition, the Examiner notes that as per claim 7, while the Request also failed to ascertain the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue, the Examiner has

Art Unit: 3992

determined, as noted in Issue 1, that the Request was not sufficient in showing that CINEMA anticipated claim 7. Thus, the Examiner considers this proposed rejection over claim 7.

Regarding claim 7,

The system of claim 5, wherein said web based control panel includes a selection item associated with each of said plurality of contact numbers that allows said user to temporarily activate and deactivate respective one or more numbers contained in said plurality of contact numbers.

As explained above, CINEMA describes a web-based, one-number system for integrating voicemail, telephony and email in a unified messaging environment. CINEMA's disclosed system uses a single identifier--e.g., a phone number, SIP header, or email address--as a primary contact number for a user's home phone, office phone, email addresses, and voicemail, (pages 5-7, -15).

In addition, it was noted that CINEMA can activate and deactivate one or more numbers by editing the contact number list. The Examiner notes that the Request did not specifically address how CINEMA supported the "selection item" limitations in reference to temporarily activating and deactivating the numbers.

Nonetheless, Hokusui describes a "central number service" (among other things) that is configured to use a web-browser control panel. "In exemplary embodiments of the invention, the personal feature server includes a web-based interface that is configurable through the network interface 420 ... it is easy for the user to manage and configure the personal feature server using a traditional web browser," (col. 7, lines 28-33). Hokusui describes all functions of the system

Art Unit: 3992

being configurable by web-browser control panels, and exemplary web-browser control panels are presented in Figures 3, 4, and 5.

As shown in Figure 3, Hokusui's web-browser control panel permits "a user to designate a plurality of contact numbers correlated to a primary contact number assigned to said user." In Hokusui's Figure 3, above, the primary contact number is 1-(978) 500-1000 and the correlated contact numbers are 1-(978) 500-1001, 1-(978) 500-1002, 1-(978) 500-1003, and 1-(978) 500-1004. Hokusui's web browser includes a selection item allowing said user to activate and deactivate select contact numbers contained in said plurality of contact numbers, by, e.g., the drop-down scroll panel indicated by the downward-facing arrow next to each contact number on the right, permitting the user to switch between a contact number (e.g. "1-(978) 500-1004") and no contact number (indicated by "none" in the fifth box).

Hokusui explains:

If the user will be temporarily in a different location, then the user can easily reconfigure his or her personal feature server to forward or simultaneously ring to the expected location. If the user's cell phone number changes, the user can easily reconfigure his or her personal feature server to forward calls to the new cell phone. If the user is expecting a telephone call from a particular person, the user can reconfigure his or her personal feature server to interrupt when the telephone call is received.

(col. 9, lines 30-39).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a selection item for temporarily activating or deactivating contact numbers as disclosed by Hokusui so that the user can easily reconfigure their personal contact numbers in situations that they need to temporarily change one of their contact numbers.

Art Unit: 3992

In addition, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to look to the teachings of these references because they are in the same technological field and contain similar disclosures: each discloses a one number or unified messaging system in the field of telephony (including Internet telephony).

Moreover, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have combined the teachings of these references with one another because the references disclose and teach the basic functionality of one number systems incorporating the use of computer and software-based IP telephony (such as SIP) and web enabled access to modify or change information such as contact numbers.

Issue 15 - Not Adopted

22. The rejection of claim 7 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CINEMA in view of Ram and HTML 4.01 Specification is not adopted.

In considering pages 100-101 of the Request, the Examiner notes that the Request did not point to any deficiency with the primary reference CINEMA.

The Examiner notes that under the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 3992

With respect to CINEMA the Examiner agrees that the Requester determined the scope and contents of CINEMA. However, the Requester failed to ascertain the differences between CINEMA and the claims at issue.

The Requester's proposed rejection does not properly present a proper 103 rejection since it does not show what it considers to be deficient in CINEMA. As noted above, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

It is clear that the "differences" must be explained. Since the Request failed to address this aspect it is not know how CINEMA can be combined with Ram and HTML 4.0 Specification.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt this proposed rejection.

Issue 16 - Not Adopted

23. The rejection of claim 7 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CINEMA in view of Lennox and HTML 4.01 Specification is not adopted.

In considering pages 101-103 of the Request, the Examiner notes that the Request did not point to any deficiency with the primary reference CINEMA.

Art Unit: 3992

The Examiner notes that under the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

With respect to CINEMA the Examiner agrees that the Requester determined the scope and contents of CINEMA. However, the Requester failed to ascertain the differences between CINEMA and the claims at issue.

The Requester's proposed rejection does not properly present a proper 103 rejection since it does not show what it considers to be deficient in CINEMA. As noted above, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

It is clear that the "differences" must be explained. Since the Request failed to address this aspect it is not know how CINEMA can be combined with Lennox and HTML 4.0 Specification.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt this proposed rejection.

Art Unit: 3992

Issue 17 - Not Adopted

24. The rejection of claim 10 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CINEMA in view of Archer is not adopted.

In considering page 120 of the Request, the Examiner notes that the Request did not point to any deficiency with the primary reference CINEMA.

The Examiner notes that under the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

With respect to CINEMA the Examiner agrees that the Requester determined the scope and contents of CINEMA. However, the Requester failed to ascertain the differences between CINEMA and the claims at issue.

The Requester's proposed rejection does not properly present a proper 103 rejection since it does not show what it considers to be deficient in CINEMA. As noted above, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Art Unit: 3992

It is clear that the "differences" must be explained. Since the Request failed to address this aspect it is not know how CINEMA can be combined with Archer.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt this proposed rejection.

Issue 18 - Adopted

25: Claim 11 is rejected under 35-U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CINEMA in view of Straub.

Regarding claim 11,

The system of claim 5, further comprising a facsimile application configured to detect that said incoming call comprises a facsimile, wherein said facsimile application is configured to receive said facsimile

As explained above, CINEMA describes a web-based, one-number system for integrating voicemail, telephony and email in a unified messaging environment. CINEMA's disclosed system uses a single identifier--e.g., a phone number, SIP header, or email address--as a primary contact number for a user's home phone, office phone, email addresses, and voicemail, (Abstract, 5-7, 8-15). CINEMA expressly discloses that its "Internet-based voice mail system can be integrated easily with other Internet services like ... fax, giving a unified messaging environment," (pages 3-8). Providing such a combination would have been recognized as increasing the types of services available.

As noted above, CINEMA discloses of a unified messaging system which can work with a fax system. Thus, while CINEMA clearly suggests of using faxes, the Examiner acknowledges that CINEMA does not specifically describe a facsimile application.

Art Unit: 3992

Nonetheless, as is well known in the art and as shown by Straub, it is disclosed that Straub teaches detecting that an incoming call is a facsimile and an application configured to receive the facsimile, (abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to incorporate a facsimile system into CINEMA so that facsimile messages can be properly processed. That is, since CINEMA discloses the use of faxes, and since Straub shown that facsimile application were known, then one of ordinary skill in the art would look to Straub to develop a system to receive and process fax messages.

In addition, as noted in the Request, each of these references discloses a one number or unified messaging system in the field of telephony (including Internet telephony). Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have combined the teachings of these references with one another because the references disclose and teach the basic functionality of one number systems incorporating the use of computer and software-based IP telephony (such as SIP) and web enabled access to modify or change information such as contact numbers.

Issue 19 - Adopted

26. Claims 1, 4, 5 and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ram.

Regarding claim 1:

A system, comprising: a web browser based control panel allowing a user to designate a plurality of contact numbers correlated to a primary contact number assigned to said user, said web browser based control panel including means for allowing said user

Art Unit: 3992

to activate and deactivate select contact numbers contained in said plurality of contact numbers;

Ram's Virtual Assistant System (VAS) includes or supports a web browser control panel embodied in one or more information pages accessible through the Internet. Those pages provide the ability to edit and manage a user's individual personal information, e.g., activating and deactivating contact numbers and routing policies, (col. 13, line 30 - col. 14, line 9).

For example as disclosed in col. 14, lines 20-50:

"Typically, the reach list includes a plurality of entries and associated dates/times for the entries Associated with the reach list is the schedule, which activates and alters the reach list. Because the reach list and the schedule is easily accessible by either telephone or the Internet, the subscriber may alter the information as he or she desires to update the reach lists.

In a particular example of operation of the VAS, the subscriber establishes/alters his or her personal information. The personal information includes the name of the subscriber, the home address of the subscriber, the home phone number of the subscriber, the subscriber's VAS personal number, the subscriber's work phone number, the subscriber's mobile phone number, the subscriber's pager number, the subscriber's email address and the subscriber's personal IP address. The subscriber may alter any of this information from a personal information page provided by the VAS,"

As noted in the above teachings, Ram discloses that a subscriber's contact list may change based on whether they are e.g., traveling or based upon their schedule. Since their reach list changes, then Ram discloses that selected contact numbers can be activate/deactivated based on their schedule or based on the user updated their reach list to reflect their current activity.

a database for storing said plurality of contact numbers linked to said primary contact number in memory;

Art Unit: 3992

Ram's VAS utilizes a database server for storing subscriber data. That database includes a plurality of contact numbers associated or linked to a user's primary contact number, (abstract; col. 13, line 30 - col. 14, line 50) (discussing a user's reach list). In addition Ram discloses:

"The database server 324A provides a data repository for the subscriber, network, service and system information required to operate the CSPSN 302 and the services provided thereby."

(col. 8, lines 17-19)

a call processing server configured to receive a call from a calling terminal designating said primary contact number;

Ram teaches a call processing server configured to receive a call from a calling terminal. Ram utilizes a plurality of servers that each has the ability to perform call processing by receiving a call from a calling terminal designating a called party's primary contact number, (col. 3, lines 52-60). More specifically, Ram teaches a virtual assistant system comprises a plurality of computer software instructions that are executed by at least one computer server, (col. 4, line 37 - col. 5, line 15). Ram further teaches that the system uses a Network Services Controller (NSC) 316A that supports Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) for IP call control, (col. 7, lines 51-65).

Ram teaches that its virtual assistant system ("VAS") comprises computer software instructions executed by at least one computer server, (col. 4, line 37 - col. 5, line 15). Ram's server is connected to a communication network. Ram also discloses a call processing server, including an IVR, as part of its VAS. For example, Ram teaches that a gateway server (310A) and a media server (328A) may be coupled to a packet-switched data network (e.g., the Internet) and the telephone network to function as a call processing server for the VAS, (col. 8, lines 33-56). Ram's VAS and associated components are network-independent and do not need to be in

Art Unit: 3992

any particular location or associated with a particular telephone services provider, (col. 6, lines 13-21).

a lookup application configured to query said database to retrieve activated contact numbers from said plurality of contact numbers as a function of said primary contact number;

Ram uses a lookup application that queries a database to retrieve activated contact numbers. Ram also discloses a set of profile services 108 that uniquely identify each subscriber and provide contact information for that subscriber.

"A user's profile includes personal information for a corresponding subscriber, such personal information including the subscriber's name, the subscriber's address, and all pertinent contact information for the subscriber,, e.g., home phone number(s), work phone number(s), mobile phone number(s), email address(es), IP address(es), pager number(s) and other information that may be employed to contact the subscriber. The profile also includes a plurality of reach lists for the subscriber, each reach list including a set of contact numbers/addresses for the subscriber. Corresponding to each reach list is a schedule that indicates when the reach list is active.

All communications for the subscriber are received via a single telephone number, IP address (network address) and/or email address. Based upon the content of the reach lists and corresponding schedules, the VAS routes communications and messages to the subscriber and also notifies the subscriber of incoming communications,"

(col. 4, line 50 - col. 5, line 15; Abstract).

a calling application configured to forward said call to a plurality of call reception terminals that are each associated with a respective one of said activated contact numbers;

Ram uses calling application software that is configured to forward a call to a plurality of call reception terminals each associated with one of the activated contact numbers, (col. 4, line 50 - col. 5, line 15). Ram's virtual assistant system comprises that application software executed by at least one computer server, (col. 3, lines 52-60). Ram further teaches that the system uses a

Art Unit: 3992

Network Services Controller (NSC) 316A that supports Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) for IP call control. SIP forwards session invitation requests to multiple servers simultaneously via parallel forking, (col. 7, lines 51-65; abstract).

and a connection application for establishing a voice based communication session between said calling terminal and a respective one of said plurality of call reception terminals if said user accepts said call.

Ram uses a connection application for establishing a voice based communication session between a calling terminal and one of the call reception terminals. Ram's virtual assistant system comprises that software application executed by at least one computer server, (col. 7, lines 51-65; col. 4, line 37 - col. 5, line 15; abstract).

Regarding claim 4:

The system of claim 1, wherein said call includes a SIP message header containing a call origination field and a call destination field that is sent to said call processing server, said call destination field including said primary contact number, said call processing server using said primary contact number to obtain said plurality of contact numbers and said call origination field to establish said voice based communication session between said calling terminal and said call reception terminal.

Ram teaches a virtual assistant system using SIP, (col. 7, lines 51-65). Calls routed using SIP include a SIP message header containing a call origination field and a call destination field, as acknowledged in the '256 Patent, (col. 5, lines 29-43; col. 6, lines 10-22).

Art Unit: 3992

Ram's software for processing SIP call invitations uses the primary contact number to obtain a plurality of contact numbers and the call origination field to establish a voice based communication session between a calling terminal and a call reception terminal, (abstract; col. 4, line 37 - col. 5, line 15). Ram's VAS comprises a plurality of computer software instructions that are executed by at least one computer server. Ram further teaches that the system uses a Network Services Controller (NSC) 316A that supports Session-Initiation Protocol (SIP) for IP call control. SIP uses session invites that include a message header that includes call origination and destination fields, (col. 7, lines 51-65).

Regarding claim 5:

A system, comprising: a server in communication with a communication network operable receive an incoming call from a calling terminal, wherein said incoming call is calling a primary contact number;

Ram utilizes a plurality of servers that each has the ability to perform call processing by receiving a call from a calling terminal designating a called party's primary contact number, (col. 3, lines 52-60; col. 4, line 50 - col. 5, line 15; abstract).

More specifically, Ram teaches a virtual assistant system comprises a computer server connected to a communications network configured with a plurality of computer software instructions Ram further teaches that the system uses a Network Services Controller (NSC) 316A that supports Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) for IP call control. SIP uses session invites that include a message header that includes call origination and destination fields, (col. 7, lines 51-63).

Art Unit: 3992

Ram also discloses a call processing server, including an IVR, as part of its VAS. For example, Ram teaches that a gateway server (310A) and a media server (328A) may be coupled to a packet-switched data network (e.g., the Internet) and the telephone network to function as a call processing server for the VAS, (col. 8, lines 33-56). Ram's VAS and associated components are network-independent and do not need to be in any particular location or associated with a particular telephone services provider, (col. 6, lines 13-21).

a multiple contact lookup application executable by said server configured to obtain a plurality of contact numbers associated with said primary contact number;

Ram uses a lookup application that queries a database to retrieve activated contact numbers. Ram also discloses a set of profile services 108 that uniquely identify each subscriber and provide contact information for that subscriber.

"A user's profile includes personal information for a corresponding subscriber, such personal information including the subscriber's name, the subscriber's address, and all pertinent contact information for the subscriber, e.g., home phone number(s), work phone number(s), mobile phone number(s), email address(es), IP address(es), pager number(s) and other information that may be employed to contact the subscriber. The profile also includes a plurality of reach lists for the subscriber, each reach list including a set of contact numbers/addresses for the subscriber. Corresponding to each reach list is a schedule that indicates when the reach list is active.

All communications for the subscriber are received via a single telephone number, IP address (network address) and/or email address. Based upon the content of the reach lists and corresponding schedules, the VAS routes communications and messages to the subscriber and also notifies the subscriber of incoming communications,"

(col. 4, line 50 - col. 5, line 15).

a calling application executable by said server configured to simultaneously ring said plurality of contact numbers in response to said incoming call;

Art Unit: 3992

Ram uses calling application software that is configured to forward a call to a plurality of call reception terminals each associated with one of the activated contact numbers. Ram's virtual assistant system comprises that application software executed by at least one computer server. Ram further teaches that the system uses a Network Services Controller (NSC) 316A that supports Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) for IP call control. SIP supports parallel forking, which transmits session invite messages to multiple locations associated with a called party simultaneously, (col. 7, lines 51-63).

a call connection application executable by said server configured to establish a communication session between said calling terminal and a terminal associated with a respective one of said plurality of contact numbers if a user accepts said incoming call;

Ram uses a connection application for establishing a voice based communication session between a calling terminal and one of the call reception terminals. Ram's virtual assistant system comprises that software application executed by at least one computer server, (col. 7, lines 51-63).

a voicemail application configured to allow a calling party using said calling terminal to leave a voicemail message for said user if said incoming call is not accepted;

Ram's VAS 102 supports SIP as well as the functionality for a caller to leave voicemail for a called party if the called party fails to answer an incoming call.

"Further, if subscriber B is unavailable, or if subscriber B elects not to receive the call, the VAS 102 routes the call to a voice mail service of the message services 106 that is supported by the VAS 102,"

(col. 5, lines 64-68).

Art Unit: 3992

a voicemail email application configured to automatically generate an email notification that is sent to a designated email account of said user indicating receipt of said voicemail message; and

Ram teaches sending email notification of received voicemail messages.

As set forth on page (col. 5, lines 35-43):

"If subscriber B is unavailable, or if subscriber B elects not to receive the call, the VAS 102 routes the call to a voice mail service of the message services 106 so that the caller may leave a message. If a message is left, the VAS 102 may then send a notification to subscriber A in the form of a page, email message, or other notification communication. However, alternatively, no notification is provided,"

a web based control panel accessible by said user that includes a plurality of data input fields that allow said user to input said plurality of contact numbers associated with said primary contact number, wherein said plurality of contact numbers are stored in a database associated with said user, wherein said web based control panel is configured to allow said user to temporarily activate and deactivate one or more numbers contained in said plurality of contact numbers.

Ram's Virtual Assistant System (VAS) includes or supports one or more information pages that provide the ability to edit and manage a user's individual personal information.

As disclosed in Ram:

"In a particular example of operation of the VAS, the subscriber establishes/alters his or her personal information. The personal information includes the name of the subscriber, the home address of the subscriber, the home phone number of the subscriber, the subscriber's VAS personal number, the subscriber's work phone number, the subscriber's mobile phone number, the subscriber's pager number, the subscriber's email address and the subscriber's personal IP address. The subscriber may alter any of this information from a personal information page provided by the VAS."

(col. 14, lines 40-50).

Art Unit: 3992

As noted in the above teachings, Ram discloses that a subscriber's contact list may change based on whether they are e.g., traveling or based upon their schedule. Since their reach list changes, then Ram discloses that selected contact numbers can be activate/deactivated based on their schedule or based on the user updated their reach list to reflect their current activity. Ram give an example in which a schedule activates and alters the reach list. This will temporarily activate/deactivate selected numbers based on the schedule. As further disclosed in col. 14, lines 20-39 of Ram, the user via the Internet can manually update this information as they desire in order to update their reach list to reflect their current activity.

Regarding claim 9:

The system of claim 5, wherein said communication session comprises a VoIP communication session.

Although RAM does not use the term VoIP, it does refer to IP telephony which is encompasses VoIP and also refers to SIP, which is a protocol that supports VoIP communication sessions, (abstract).

Regarding claim 10:

The system of claim 5, further comprising a call answering application associated with said call processing server configured to establish an initial communication session between said calling terminal and said server.

Ram teaches a virtual assistant system comprises a plurality of computer software instructions that are executed by at least one computer server. Ram further teaches

Art Unit: 3992

that the system uses a Network Services Controller (NSC) 316A that supports Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) for IP call control, (col. 7, lines 51-65). Ram also teaches a call answering application, (col. 3, lines 52-60; col. 4, line 50 - col. 5, line 15; abstract).

Regarding claim 11:

The system of claim 5, further comprising a facsimile application configured to detect that said incoming call comprises a facsimile, wherein said facsimile application is configured to receive said facsimile.

Ram's VAS detects, receives and stores incoming faxes and either sends them via email to a recipient or simply notifies them of the received fax.

As disclosed by Ram:

"The VAS also receives Faxes for the subscriber, stores the Faxes and delivers the Faxes when requested. When the VAS receives a Fax intended for the subscriber (step 524), the VAS receives the Fax (step 526). The VAS then generates an email regarding the Fax (step 528), attaches the Fax to the email and stores the Fax with the email as an email attachment. In one embodiment, the Fax is placed into a ".tif" file and attached to the email as a file. The VAS may also notify the subscriber of the incoming Fax,"

(col. 11, lines 41-50).

Regarding claim 12:

The system of claim 11, wherein said facsimile application is configured to convert said facsimile to a digital file and forward said digital file to said designated email account of said user.

Art Unit: 3992

Ram's VAS uses an application that is configured to detect and convert a fax to a digital file and forward the file to the recipient via email. The VAS stores incoming faxes and either sends them via email to a recipient or simply notifies them of the received fax.

As disclosed in Ram:

"The VAS also receives Faxes for the subscriber, stores the Faxes and delivers the Faxes when requested. When the VAS receives a Fax intended for the subscriber (step 524), the VAS receives the Fax (step 526). The VAS then generates an email regarding the Fax (step 528), attaches the Fax to the email and stores the Fax with the email as an email attachment. In one embodiment, the Fax is placed into a ".tif" file and attached to the email as a file. The VAS may also notify the subscriber of the incoming Fax,"

(col. 11, lines 41-50).

Regarding claim 13:

A system, comprising: a server operable receive an incoming call to a primary contact number;

Ram utilizes a plurality of servers that each has the ability to perform call processing by receiving a call from a calling terminal designating a called party's primary contact number. More specifically, Ram teaches a virtual assistant system comprises a plurality of computer software instructions that are executed by at least one computer server, (col. 3, lines 52-60; col. 4, line 50 - col. 5, line 15; abstract).

Ram further teaches that the system uses a Network Services Controller (NSC) 316A that supports Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) for IP call control. SIP uses session invites that include a message header that includes call origination and destination fields, (col. 7, lines 51-63).

Art Unit: 3992

a multiple contact lookup application configured to obtain a plurality of contact numbers associated with said primary contact number;

Ram uses a lookup application that queries a database to retrieve activated contact numbers. Ram also discloses a set of profile services 108 that uniquely identify each subscriber and provide contact information for that subscriber.

"A user's profile includes personal information for a corresponding subscriber, such as personal information including the subscriber's name, the subscriber's address, and all pertinent contact information for the subscriber, e.g., home phone number(s), work phone number(s), mobile phone number(s), email address(es), IP address(es), pager number(s) and other information that may be employed to contact the subscriber. The profile also includes a plurality of reach lists for the subscriber, each reach list including a set of contact numbers/addresses for the subscriber. Corresponding to each reach list is a schedule that indicates when the reach list is active. All communications for the subscriber are received via a single telephone number, IP address (network address) and/or email address. Based upon the content of the reach lists and corresponding schedules, the VAS routes communications and messages to the subscriber and also notifies the subscriber of incoming communications."
(col. 4, line 50 - col. 5, line 15).

a calling application configured to simultaneously ring said plurality of contact numbers in response to said incoming call;

Ram uses calling application software that is configured to forward a call to a plurality of call reception terminals each associated with one of the activated contact numbers. Ram's virtual assistant system comprises that application software executed by at least one computer server.

Ram further teaches that the system uses a Network Services Controller (NSC) 316A that supports Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) for IP call control. SIP supports parallel forking, which transmits session invite messages to multiple locations associated with a called party simultaneously, (col. 7, lines 51-63).

Art Unit: 3992

a call connection application configured to establish a VoIP communication session between a calling terminal and a terminal associated with a respective one of said plurality of contact numbers if a user accepts said incoming call;

Ram uses a connection application for establishing a voice based communication session between a calling terminal and one of the call reception terminals. Ram's virtual assistant system comprises that software application executed by at least one computer server, (col. 7, lines 51-63).

Moreover, although RAM does not use the term VoIP, it does refer to IP telephony which is encompasses VoIP and also refers to SIP, which is a protocol that supports VoIP communication sessions, (abstract).

a voicemail application configured to allow a calling party using said calling terminal to leave a voicemail message for said user if said incoming call is not accepted;

Ram's VAS 102 supports SIP as well as the functionality for a caller to leave voicemail for a called party if the called party fails to answer an incoming call.

"Further, if subscriber B is unavailable, or if subscriber B elects not to receive the call, the VAS 102 routes the call to a voice mail service of the message services 106 that is supported by the VAS 102,"

(col. 5, lines 64-68).

a voicemail email application configured to automatically generate an email notification that is sent to a designated email account of said user indicating receipt of said voicemail message, wherein said voicemail email application is configured to attach said voicemail message to said email notification;

Ram teaches sending email notification of received voicemail messages.

Art Unit: 3992

"If subscriber A is unavailable, or elects not to receive the call, the VAS 102 routes the call to a voice mail service of the message services 106 so that the caller may leave a message. If a message is left, the VAS 102 may then send a notification to subscriber A in the form of a page, email message, or other notification communication. However, alternatively, no notification is provided,"

(col. 5, lines 35-46).

a facsimile application configured to detect if said incoming call comprises a facsimile, wherein said facsimile application is configured to receive said facsimile, wherein said facsimile application is configured to convert said facsimile to a digital file and forward said digital file to said designated email account of said user; and

Ram's VAS uses an application that is configured to detect and convert a fax to a digital file and forward the file to the recipient via email. The VAS stores incoming faxes and either sends them via email to a recipient or simply notifies them of the received fax.

"The VAS also receives Faxes for the subscriber, stores the Faxes and delivers the Faxes when requested. When the VAS receives a Fax intended for the subscriber (step 524), the VAS receives the Fax (step 526). The VAS then generates an email regarding the Fax (step 528), attaches the Fax to the email and stores the Fax with the email as an email attachment. In one embodiment, the Fax is placed into a ".tif" file and attached to the email as a file. The VAS may also notify the subscriber of the incoming Fax."

(col. 11, lines 41-50).

a web based control panel accessible by said user that includes a plurality of data input fields that allow said user to input said plurality of contact numbers associated with said primary contact number, wherein said plurality of contact numbers are stored in a database associated with said user, wherein said web based control panel is configured to allow said user to temporarily activate and deactivate one or more numbers contained in

Art Unit: 3992

said plurality of contact numbers, wherein said web based control panel is configured to allow said user to activate a call screening option.

Ram's Virtual Assistant System (VAS) includes or supports one or more information pages that provide the ability to edit and manage a user's individual personal information, (col. 13, line 30 -col. 14, line 9).

For example Ram discloses:

"Typically, the reach list includes a plurality of entries and associated dates/times for the entries Associated with the reach list is the schedule, which activates and alters the reach list. Because the reach list and the schedule is easily accessible by either telephone or the Internet, the subscriber may alter the information as he or she desires to update the reach lists. In a particular example of operation of the VAS, the subscriber establishes/alters his or her personal information. The personal information includes the name of the subscriber, the home address of the subscriber, the home phone number of the subscriber, the subscriber's VAS personal number, the subscriber's work phone number, the subscriber's mobile phone number, the subscriber's pager number, the subscriber's email address and the subscriber's personal IP address. The subscriber may alter any of this information from a personal information page provided by the VAS."

(col. 14, lines 20-50; abstract).

As noted in the above teachings, Ram discloses that a subscriber's contact list may change based on whether they are e.g., traveling or based upon their schedule. Since their reach list changes, then Ram discloses that selected contact numbers can be activate/deactivated based on their schedule or based on the user updated their reach list to reflect their current activity. Ram give an example in which a schedule activates and alters the reach list. This will temporarily activate/deactivate selected numbers based on the schedule. As further disclosed in col. 14, lines 20-39 of Ram, the user via the Internet can manually update this information as they desire in order to update their reach list to reflect their current activity.

Art Unit: 3992

Issue 20 - Adopted

27. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ram in view of Singh.

Regarding claim 6:

The system of claim 5, wherein said email notification includes an attachment that comprises said voicemail message.

As explained above, Ram discloses sending an email notification when a voicemail has been received.

The Examiner acknowledges that Ram does not specifically disclose of attaching the voicemail to the email; however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to attach a copy of the voicemail message to the email notification.

For example, Singh discloses a SIP-based telephony system in which (1) a voicemail is recorded; (2) an email notification is sent to a user; and (3) a copy of the voicemail may be attached to the email, (col. 2, lines 29-40).

"When a message condition is detected, the media server provides a stored greeting message to the calling party as a prompt to leave a message. The media server preferably supports streaming media and operates in accordance with the real time streaming media protocol (RTSP). In response to a calling party storing a message on the media server, the media server can also provide a notification to a called party that a message is available. The notification can take the form of an electronic mail transmission which includes the address where the called party can retrieve the message. Alternatively, the notification can include a copy of the message as a file attachment."

(col. 6, lines 11-12; and Fig. 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a copy of the message with the notification so that the message

Art Unit: 3992

recipient can receive any potential important message as soon as it is received by the system. In addition, as noted in the Request it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to look to the teachings of these references because they are in the same technological field and contain similar disclosures: each discloses a one number or unified messaging system in the field of telephony (including Internet telephony) and discloses the basic functionality of the claimed one number systems of the '256 Patent.

Moreover, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have combined the teachings of these references with one another because the references disclose and teach the basic functionality of one number systems incorporating the use of computer and software-based IP telephony (such as SIP) and web enabled access to modify or change information such as contact numbers.

Issue 21 - Not Adopted

28. The rejection of claim 6 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ram in view of Homan is not adopted.

As noted above, Ram discloses sending an email notification when a voicemail has been received.

The Request maintains that Homan discloses an e-mail notification system that automatically sends an email message, via a server connected to a network (such as the Internet), to a subscriber's specified email address(es) to notify the subscriber that a voice and/or fax message is waiting on the system, (col. 2, lines 16-29; col. 9, lines 49-59; col. 11, lines 30-61; fig. 3 (flow diagram)).

Art Unit: 3992

However, considering the citations cited in the Request the Examiner maintains that Homan does not meet the claim language of at least sending a voicemail message as an attachment to an email message. Homan's system operates similarly to that of Ram in that only a notification is provided to the message recipient.

Issue 22 - Not Adopted

29. The rejection of claim 11 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ram in view of CINEMA is not adopted.

As set forth on page 123 of the Request, it was noted that Ram teaches a virtual assistance system which comprises a plurality of computer software instructions that are executed by a computer server. It was additionally noted that CINEMA discloses that its "Internet-based voice mail system can be integrated easily with other Internet services like...fax, giving a unified messaging environment."

As noted on page 122 of the Request Ram was already asserted as anticipating claim 11. Thus, this proposed rejection does not indicate what it considers Ram to not teach. As set forth above, rejections under 103(a) must indicate what the primary reference fails to disclose. In this case the Request did not show what was deficient within Ram. Thus, the proposed rejection does not properly reject the claim.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt the rejection to the claim as proposed.

Issue 23 - Not Adopted

30. The rejection of claims 12 and 13 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ram in view of CINEMA and Straub is not adopted.

Art Unit: 3992

In considering pages 126-127 of the Request, the Examiner notes that the Request did not point to any deficiency with the primary reference Ram.

The Examiner notes that under the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

With respect to Ram the Examiner agrees that the Requester determined the scope and contents of Ram. However, the Requester failed to ascertain the differences between Ram and the claims at issue.

The Requester's proposed rejection does not properly present a proper 103 rejection since it does not show what it considers to be deficient in Ram. As noted above, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

It is clear that the "differences" must be explained. Since the Request failed to address this aspect it is not known how Ram can be combined with CINEMA and Straub.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt this proposed rejection.

Art Unit: 3992

Issue 24 - Adopted

31. Claims 1, 4, 5, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lennox.

The rejection was proposed by the third party requester in the request for reexamination, and it is adopted for the reasons set forth in the request for reexamination at pages 92-93 for claim 1, pages 67-68 for claim 4, pages 80-83 for claim 5, page 108 for claim 9 and pages 114-115 for claim 10 which are hereby incorporated by reference.

Issue 25 - Adopted

32. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lennox in view of Singh.

The rejection was proposed by the third party requester in the request for reexamination, and it is adopted for the reasons set forth in the request for reexamination at pages 92-93 for claim 6 which is hereby incorporated by reference.

Issue 26 - Not Adopted

33. The rejection of claim 6 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lennox in view of Homan is not adopted.

As noted in the Request, Lennox discloses sending an email notification when a voicemail has been received, however Lennox does not disclose of sending the voicemail message attached to the email message.

Art Unit: 3992

The Request maintains that Homan discloses an e-mail notification system that automatically sends an email message, via a server connected to a network (such as the Internet), to a subscriber's specified email address(es) to notify the subscriber that a voice and/or fax message is waiting on the system, (col. 2, lines 16-29; col. 9, lines 49-59; col. 11, lines 30-61; fig. 3 (flow diagram)).

However, considering the citations cited in the Request the Examiner maintains that Homan does not meet the claim language of at least sending a voicemail message as an attachment to an email message. Homan's system operates similarly to that of Lennox in that only a notification is provided to the message recipient.

Issue 27 - Adopted

34. Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hariri.

The rejection was proposed by the third party requester in the request for reexamination, and it is adopted for the reasons set forth in the request for reexamination at pages 40-41 for claim 1, page 54 for claim 2, page 58 for claim 3, pages 83-85 for claim 5, page 89 for claim 6, pages 97-98 for claim 7, pages 108-109 for claim 9, pages 115-116 for claim 10, pages 122-123 for claim 11, pages 125-126 for claim 12 and pages 131-133 for claim 13 which are hereby incorporated by reference.

Art Unit: 3992

Issue 28- Not Adopted

35. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hariri in view of Hokusui.

The Request, on page 98, asserts that Hariri discloses a universal point of contact system that associates a plurality of contact numbers with a primary contact number assigned to a user. Hariri discloses a web browser based control panel that allows the user to edit his or her profile for Hariri's one number system. Hariri also describes the use of a web-enabled control panel to enter or modify the information held in Hariri's point of contact database(s). Likewise, Hokusui describes a "central number service" (among other things) that is configured to use a web-browser control panel. "In exemplary embodiments of the invention, the personal feature server includes a web-based interface that is configurable through the network interface 420 ... it is easy for the user to manage and configure the personal feature server using a traditional web browser."

It was also noted that Hokusui describes all functions of the system being configurable by web-browser control panels, and exemplary web-browser control panels are presented in Figures 3, 4, and 5.

The Examiner agrees with the citations in the Request, however, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), one must identify the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue. The Request did not indicate what Hariri failed to teach, thus, the proposed rejection is not a proper 103 rejection.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt the rejection as proposed by the Requester.

Issue 29- Adopted

36. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hariri in view of CINEMA and further in view of Straub.

On pages 127-128 of the Request, it was noted that Hariri discloses a facsimile application that automatically detects whether an incoming call comprises a facsimile and then receives that facsimile.

The Request then notes that CINEMA and Straub teaches the use of a facsimile system.

The Examiner agrees with the Request, however, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), one must identify the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue. The Request did not indicate what Hariri failed to teach, thus, the proposed rejection is not a proper 103 rejection.

Thus, the Examiner does not adopt the rejection as proposed by the Requester.

Issue 30 - Adopted

37. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hokusui.

The rejection was proposed by the third party requester in the request for reexamination, and it is adopted for the reasons set forth in the request for reexamination at pages 35-38 for claim 1 and page 68 for claim 4 which are hereby incorporated by reference.

Issue 31 - Not Adopted

38. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hokusui in view of CINEMA and Singh.

The Examiner notes that claim 8 depends upon claim 7. The Request failed to provide a base rejection in which Hokusui is the primary reference. Thus, this rejection is not proper since it does not provide a basis for rejecting claim 7 in which claim 8 depends upon.

Issue 32 - Adopted

39. Claims 1-2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Archer.

The rejection was proposed by the third party requester in the request for reexamination, and it is adopted for the reasons set forth in the request for reexamination at pages 39-40 for claim 1, page 53-54 for claim 2 and pages 69-70 for claim 4 which are hereby incorporated by reference.

Issue 33 - Adopted

40. Claim 1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leung in view of Personal Reach¹.

41. The rejection was proposed by the third party requester in the request for reexamination, and it is adopted for the reasons set forth in the request for reexamination at pages 42-43 for claim 1 which are hereby incorporated by reference.

¹ The Examiner notes that on page iv of the Request, it was noted that claims 4 and 10 are obvious over CINEMA in view of Leung and Personal Reach, however on page xiii CINEMA was not included. That is, claims 4 and 10 is rejected under Leung (as a base reference) in view of Personal Reach. Pages 72 and 116 of the Request treats the rejection as CINEMA in view of Leung and Personal Reach. Thus, claim 4 is not considered part of this proposed rejection. The Examiner treats the citation on page xii as a typographical error since it is inconsistent with the rest of the Request.

Art Unit: 3992

Conclusion

42. In order to ensure full consideration of any amendments, affidavits or declarations, or other documents as evidence of patentability, such documents must be submitted in response to this Office action. Submissions after the next Office action, which is intended to be an Action Closing Prosecution (ACP), will be governed by 37 CFR 1.116, which will be strictly enforced.

43. ~~Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) will not be permitted in *inter partes*~~ reexamination proceedings because the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 apply only to "an applicant" and not to the patent owner in a reexamination proceeding. Additionally, 35 U.S.C. 314(c) requires that *inter partes* reexamination proceedings "will be conducted with special dispatch" (37 CFR 1.937). Patent owner extensions of time in *inter partes* reexamination proceedings are provided for in 37 CFR 1.956. Extensions of time are not available for third party requester comments, because a comment period of 30 days from service of patent owner's response is set by statute. 35 U.S.C. 314(b)(3).

44. The Patent Owner is reminded of the continuing responsibility under 37 CFR 1.985(a) to apprise the Office of any litigation activity, or other prior or concurrent proceeding, involving the US Patent 7,680,256 throughout the course of this reexamination proceeding. The Third Party Requester is also reminded of the ability to similarly apprise the Office of any such activity or proceeding through the course of this reexamination proceeding. See MPEP § 2686 and 2686.04.

45. All correspondence relating to this *inter partes* reexamination proceeding should be directed:

By EFS: Registered users may submit via the electronic filing system EFS-Web, at <https://portal.uspto.gov/authenticate/authenticateuserlocalepf.html>.

Art Unit: 3992

By Mail to: Mail Stop Inter Partes Reexam
Attn: Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

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

By hand: Customer Service Window
Attn: Central Reexamination Unit
Randolph Building, Lobby Level
401 Dulany Street
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 data 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 examiner, or as to the status of this proceeding, should be directed to the Central Reexamination Unit at telephone number (571) 272-7705.

/Ovidio Escalante/
Ovidio Escalante
Primary Examiner
Central Reexamination Unit - Art Unit 3992
(571) 272-7537

Conferee:



Conferee:

