

**Exhibit 5
Part 30
To Third Declaration of
Joseph N. Hosteny**

Applicability of the WO 98/19589 (Mentzelopoulous) Reference

At page 19, footnote 5 of the request, third party requester submits that the Mentzelopoulous reference is prior art to U.S. Patent No. 6,543,447 for two reasons. First, third party requester asserts that U.S. Patent No. 6,543,447 did not properly maintain its priority chain. U.S. Patent No. 6,543,447 claims priority to earlier filed application Serial No. 09/704,507 (now abandoned), which in turn claim priority to earlier filed application Serial No. 09/060,891 (now U.S. Patent No. 6,142,144). However, the specification of 09/704,507 was not amended to contain a specific reference to 09/060,891, as required by 35 U.S.C. § 120. Second, despite any established priority, third party requester asserts that the pivotal attachment (recited in claims 17, 19, 22 and 43) was not disclosed until the December 6, 2000 filing date of U.S. Patent No. 6,142,114 (as application Serial No. 09/732,139).

Without reaching the merits of third party requester's first argument, it is noted that a review of the files of each of the three related applications 09/060,891, 09/704,507 and 09/732,139 indicates that the pivotal attachment feature was indeed not disclosed until the December 6, 2000 filing of 09/732,139. Accordingly, the examiner concludes that the Mentzelopoulous reference is prior art as to claims 17, 19, 22 and 43 and the claims that depend therefrom.

Statutory Basis for Grounds of Rejections – 35 USC §§ 102 and 103

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:

Art Unit: 3993

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.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

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.

Third Party Requester's Grounds of Rejection

Re. Claim 1

Ground #1. The requester submits that claim 1 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by UK Patent Application No. GB 2086732 (hereinafter "GB '732").

Ground #2. The requester submits that claim 1 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wood, Sr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,800,334 (hereinafter "Wood").

Ground #3. The requester submits that claim 1 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Berall, U.S. Patent No. 5,827,178 (hereinafter "Berall").

Ground #4. The requester submits that claim 1 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Wood.

Ground #5. The requester submits that claim 1 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of Wood.

Re. Claim 2

Ground #6. The requester submits that claim 2 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by GB '732.

Ground #7. The requester submits that claim 2 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wood.

Ground #8. The requester submits that claim 2 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Berall.

Ground #9. The requester submits that claim 2 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Wood.

Ground #10. The requester submits that claim 2 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of Wood.

Re. Claim 3

Ground #11. The requester submits that claim 3 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Ough, U.S. Patent No. 5,433,058 (hereinafter "Ough").

Re. Claim 4

Ground #12. The requester submits that claim 4 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wood.

Ground #13. The requester submits that claim 4 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Berall.

Ground #14. The requester submits that claim 4 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB '732 in view of Wood.

Ground #15. The requester submits that claim 4 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB '732 in view of Berall.

Re. Claim 5

Ground #16. The requester submits that claim 5 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wood.

Ground #17. The requester submits that claim 5 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Berall.

Ground #18. The requester submits that claim 5 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB '732 in view of Wood.

Ground #19. The requester submits that claim 5 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB '732 in view of Berall.

Re. Claim 6

Ground #20. The requester submits that claim 6 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by GB '732.

Ground #21. The requester submits that claim 6 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wood.

Ground #22. The requester submits that claim 6 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Berall.

Ground #23. The requester submits that claim 6 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Wood.

Ground #24. The requester submits that claim 6 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of Wood.

Re. Claim 7

Ground #25. The requester submits that claim 7 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Levin, U.S. Patent No. 5,676,635 (hereinafter "Levin").

Ground #26. The requester submits that claim 7 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of Levin.

Ground #27. The requester submits that claim 7 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of Levin.

Re. Claim 8

Ground #28. The requester submits that claim 8 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wood.

Ground #29. The requester submits that claim 8 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Berall.

Ground #30. The requester submits that claim 8 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of WO 91/04703 (hereinafter "Kantor").

Ground #31. The requester submits that claim 8 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Wood.

Ground #32. The requester submits that claim 8 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Berall.

Re. Claim 9

Ground #33. The requester submits that claim 9 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wood.

Ground #34. The requester submits that claim 9 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Berall.

Ground #35. The requester submits that claim 9 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Kantor.

Ground #36. The requester submits that claim 9 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Wood.

Ground #37. The requester submits that claim 9 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Berall.

Re. Claim 10

Ground #38. The requester submits that claim 10 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by GB '732.

Ground #39. The requester submits that claim 10 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732.

Ground #40. The requester submits that claim 10 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732.

Re. Claim 11

Ground #41. The requester submits that claim 11 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by GB '732.

Ground #42. The requester submits that claim 11 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732.

Ground #43. The requester submits that claim 11 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732.

Re. Claim 12

Ground #44. The requester submits that claim 12 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by GB '732.

Ground #45. The requester submits that claim 12 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732.

Ground #46. The requester submits that claim 12 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732.

Re. Claim 13

Ground #47. The requester submits that claim 13 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by GB '732.

Ground #48. The requester submits that claim 13 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732.

Ground #49. The requester submits that claim 13 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732.

Re. Claim 14

Ground #50. The requester submits that claim 14 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by GB '732.

Ground #51. The requester submits that claim 14 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732.

Ground #52. The requester submits that claim 14 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732.

Re. Claim 15

Ground #53. The requester submits that claim 15 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by GB '732.

Ground #54. The requester submits that claim 15 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732.

Ground #55. The requester submits that claim 15 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732.

Re. Claim 16

Ground #56. The requester submits that claim 16 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by GB '732.

Ground #57. The requester submits that claim 16 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732.

Ground #58. The requester submits that claim 16 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732.

Re. Claim 17

Ground #59. The requester submits that claim 17 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Bauman, U.S. Patent No. 4,753,451 (hereinafter "Bauman").

Ground #60. The requester submits that claim 17 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of WO 98/19589 (hereinafter "Mentzelopoulous").

Ground #61. The requester submits that claim 17 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of Bauman.

Ground #62. The requester submits that claim 17 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of Mentzelopoulous.

Ground #63. The requester submits that claim 17 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of Bauman.

Ground #64. The requester submits that claim 17 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of Mentzelopoulous.

Re. Claim 18

Ground #65. The requester submits that claim 18 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Bauman.

Ground #66. The requester submits that claim 18 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Mentzelopoulous.

Ground #67. The requester submits that claim 18 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of Bauman.

Ground #68. The requester submits that claim 18 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of Mentzelopoulous.

Ground #69. The requester submits that claim 18 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of Bauman.

Ground #70. The requester submits that claim 18 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of Mentzelopoulous.

Re. Claim 19

Ground #71. The requester submits that claim 19 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by GB '732.

Ground #72. The requester submits that claim 19 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732.

Ground #73. The requester submits that claim 19 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732.

Re. Claim 20

Ground #74. The requester submits that claim 20 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Levin.

Ground #75. The requester submits that claim 20 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732 and further in view of Levin.

Ground #76. The requester submits that claim 20 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732 and further in view of Levin.

Re. Claim 21

Ground #77. The requester submits that claim 21 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Wood and further in view of Levin.

Ground #78. The requester submits that claim 21 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Berall and further in view of Levin.

Ground #79. The requester submits that claim 21 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732 and further in view of Levin.

Ground #80. The requester submits that claim 21 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732 and further in view of Levin.

Re. Claim 22

Ground #81. The requester submits that claim 22 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Bauman.

Ground #82. The requester submits that claim 22 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Mentzelopoulos.

Ground #83. The requester submits that claim 22 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732 and further in view of Bauman.

Ground #84. The requester submits that claim 22 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732 and further in view of Mentzelopoulos.

Ground #85. The requester submits that claim 22 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732 and further in view of Bauman.

Ground #86. The requester submits that claim 22 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732 and further in view of Mentzelopoulos.

Re. Claim 23

Ground #87. The requester submits that claim 23 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Bauman.

Ground #88. The requester submits that claim 23 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Mentzelopoulous.

Ground #89. The requester submits that claim 23 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732 and further in view of Bauman.

Ground #90. The requester submits that claim 23 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732 and further in view of Mentzelopoulous.

Ground #91. The requester submits that claim 23 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732 and further in view of Bauman.

Ground #92. The requester submits that claim 23 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732 and further in view of Mentzelopoulous.

Re. Claim 24

Ground #93. The requester submits that claim 24 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Bauman and further in view of Wood.

Ground #94. The requester submits that claim 24 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Mentzelopoulous and further in view of Wood.

Ground #95. The requester submits that claim 24 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Bauman and further in view of Berall

Ground #96. The requester submits that claim 24 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Mentzelopoulous and further in view of Berall.

Ground #97. The requester submits that claim 24 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Bauman and further in view of Kantor.

Ground #98. The requester submits that claim 24 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Mentzelopoulous and further in view of Kantor.

Re. Claim 25

Ground #99. The requester submits that claim 25 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Bauman and further in view of Wood..

Ground #100. The requester submits that claim 25 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Mentzelopoulous and further in view of Wood.

Ground #101. The requester submits that claim 25 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Bauman and further in view of Berall.

Ground #102. The requester submits that claim 25 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Mentzelopoulous and further in view of Berall.

Ground #103. The requester submits that claim 25 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Bauman and further in view of Kantor.

Ground #104. The requester submits that claim 25 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Mentzelopoulous and further in view of Kantor.

Re. Claim 26

Ground #105. The requester submits that claim 26 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by GB '732.

Ground #106. The requester submits that claim 26 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732.

Ground #107. The requester submits that claim 26 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732.

Re. Claim 27

Ground #108. The requester submits that claim 27 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by GB '732.

Ground #109. The requester submits that claim 27 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732.

Ground #110. The requester submits that claim 27 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732.

Re. Claim 28

Ground #111. The requester submits that claim 28 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Wood.

Ground #112. The requester submits that claim 28 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Berall.

Ground #113. The requester submits that claim 28 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732.

Ground #114. The requester submits that claim 28 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732.

Re. Claim 29

Ground #115. The requester submits that claim 29 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Wood.

Ground #116. The requester submits that claim 29 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Berall.

Ground #117. The requester submits that claim 29 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732.

Ground #118. The requester submits that claim 29 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732.

Re. Claim 30

Ground #119. The requester submits that claim 30 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by GB '732.

Ground #120. The requester submits that claim 30 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732.

Ground #121. The requester submits that claim 30 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732.

Re. Claim 31

Ground #122. The requester submits that claim 31 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Wood.

Ground #123. The requester submits that claim 31 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Berall.

Ground #124. The requester submits that claim 31 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732.

Ground #125. The requester submits that claim 31 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732.

Re. Claim 32

Ground #126. The requester submits that claim 32 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Wood and further in view of Levin.

Ground #127. The requester submits that claim 32 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Berall and further in view of Levin.

Ground #128. The requester submits that claim 32 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732 and further in view of Levin.

Ground #129. The requester submits that claim 32 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732 and further in view of Levin.

Re. Claim 33

Ground #130. The requester submits that claim 33 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Wood and further in view of Levin.

Ground #131. The requester submits that claim 33 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Berall and further in view of Levin.

Ground #132. The requester submits that claim 33 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732 and further in view of Levin.

Ground #133. The requester submits that claim 33 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732 and further in view of Levin.

Re. Claim 34

Ground #134. The requester submits that claim 34 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by GB '732.

Ground #135. The requester submits that claim 34 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732.

Ground #136. The requester submits that claim 34 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732.

Re. Claim 35

Ground #137. The requester submits that claim 35 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by GB '732.

Ground #138. The requester submits that claim 35 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732.

Ground #139. The requester submits that claim 35 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732.

Re. Claim 36

Ground #140. The requester submits that claim 36 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Wood.

Ground #141. The requester submits that claim 36 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Berall.

Ground #142. The requester submits that claim 36 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732.

Ground #143. The requester submits that claim 36 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732.

Re. Claim 37

Ground #144. The requester submits that claim 37 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Kantor.

Ground #145. The requester submits that claim 37 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Wood.

Ground #146. The requester submits that claim 37 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Berall.

Ground #147. The requester submits that claim 37 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732.

Ground #148. The requester submits that claim 37 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Berall in view of GB '732.

Re. Claim 38

Ground #149. The requester submits that claim 38 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Bauman.

Ground #150. The requester submits that claim 38 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over GB '732 in view of Mentzelopoulous.

Ground #151. The requester submits that claim 38 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732 and further in view of Bauman.

Ground #152. The requester submits that claim 38 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wood in view of GB '732 and further in view of Mentzelopoulous.