



# 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](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

90/019,952

05/09/2025

9031537

MES537

6613

64064

7590

06/24/2025

Ortiz & Lopez, PLLC

P.O. BOX 4484

ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87196-4484

EXAMINER

RALIS, STEPHEN J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3992

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/24/2025

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 Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**DO NOT USE IN PALM PRINTER**

(THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS)

Unified Patents, LLC  
4445 Willard Ave.  
Suite 600  
Chevy Chase, MARYLAND 20815

***EX PARTE* REEXAMINATION COMMUNICATION TRANSMITTAL FORM**

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NO. 90/019,952 .

PATENT UNDER REEXAMINATION 9031537 .

ART UNIT 3992 .

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above identified *ex parte* reexamination proceeding (37 CFR 1.550(f)).

Where this copy is supplied after the reply by requester, 37 CFR 1.535, or the time for filing a reply has passed, no submission on behalf of the *ex parte* reexamination requester will be acknowledged or considered (37 CFR 1.550(g)).

<b>Order Granting Request For Ex Parte Reexamination</b>	<b>Control No.</b> 90/019,952	<b>Patent Under Reexamination</b> 9031537	
	<b>Examiner</b> STEPHEN J RALIS	<b>Art Unit</b> 3992	<b>AIA (FITF) Status</b> No

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

The request for *ex parte* reexamination filed 09 May 2025 has been considered and a determination has been made. An identification of the claims, the references relied upon, and the rationale supporting the determination are attached.

Attachments: a) ☐ PTO-892, b) ☒ PTO/SB/08, c) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

1. ☒ The request for *ex parte* reexamination is GRANTED.

**RESPONSE TIMES ARE SET AS FOLLOWS:**

For Patent Owner's Statement (Optional): TWO MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication (37 CFR 1.530 (b)). **EXTENSIONS OF TIME ARE GOVERNED BY 37 CFR 1.550(c).**

For Requester's Reply (optional): TWO MONTHS from the **date of service** of any timely filed Patent Owner's Statement (37 CFR 1.535). **NO EXTENSION OF THIS TIME PERIOD IS PERMITTED.** If Patent Owner does not file a timely statement under 37 CFR 1.530(b), then no reply by requester is permitted.

/Stephen J. Ralis/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3992

cc:Requester ( if third party requester )

**ORDER GRANTING REEXAMINATION OF U.S. PATENT 9,031,537**

***I. Notice of Pre-AIA or AIA Status***

The present reexamination is being examined under the pre-AIA first to invent

5 provisions.

***II. Decision on Request for Ex Parte Reexamination***

In the instant request for reexamination filed 09 May 2025 (“EP Request”),  
reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 9,031,537 (“‘537 Patent”) with respect to claims 1-37 was  
10 requested by a Third Party Requester (“EP Requester”) under 35 U.S.C. § 302 and C.F.R. §  
1.510. A substantial new question of patentability (“SNQ”) is raised by the EP Request for  
reexamination and prior art cited therein for the reasons set forth below. Accordingly, the EP  
Request for reexamination is **GRANTED**.

***III. Priority***

The ‘537 Patent issued on 12 May 2015, from U.S. Application No. 12/257,205 (“‘205  
Application”) filed on 23 October 2008. The ‘205 Application is a continuation of: U.S.  
Application No. 09/887,492 (“‘492 Application”) filed on 22 June 2001, now U.S. Patent No.  
7,630,721 (“‘721 Patent”); and U.S. Application No. 09/902,348 (“‘348 Application”) filed on  
20 10 July 2001, now U.S. Patent No. 7,812,856 (“‘856 Patent”). The ‘492 Application claims  
domestic priority to Provisional Application No. 60/214,339 (“339 Prov Application”), filed 27

June 2000; and the '348 Application claims domestic priority to Provisional Application No. 60/243,561 ("339 Prov Application"), filed 26 October 2000.

Thus, the Examiner concludes that for reexamination purposes the instant '537 Patent qualifies for an effective filing date of 27 June 2000.

5

#### ***IV. Original Prosecution History***

Owner filed the '205 Application with claims 1-39.

On 21 April 2010, the original examiner issued a non-Final Office action ("April 2010 Non Final Office Action") rejecting claims 1-39. Specifically, the original examiner rejected:

10 claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8-10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Bitran* (U.S. Publication No. 2007/0275746) ("***Bitran***") in view of *Wecker et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,464) ("***Wecker***"); claims 3, 11, 18, 23-25, 27, 29, 31-36 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Bitran*, *Wecker* in further view of *Dyer et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,433,387) ("***Dyer***"); claims 5, 14 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Bitran*, *Wecker* in further view of *Rautila et al.* (U.S. Patent No.

15 6,549,625) ("***Rautila***"); claims 26, 30 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Bitran*, *Wecker* in further view of *Dyer* and *Rautila*; claims 7, 16 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Bitran*, *Wecker* in further view of *Purdy et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,726,660) ("***Purdy***"); and claims 28, 32 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Bitran*, *Wecker*, *Dyer* in further view of *Purdy*<sup>1</sup> and *Rautila*. (April 2010 Non Final Office Action at 3-10). In addition, the original examiner asserted

20 that the prior filed '492 and '348 Applications did not provide adequate support for the first-fourth wireless transceivers as claimed. (*Id.* at 2).

---

<sup>1</sup> The April 2010 Non Final Office Action states this rejection is made over *Dyer* instead of *Purdy*. However, since the rejection is the same as claim 7, the examiner finds that this is just mislabeled. (April 2010 Non Final Office Action at 10).

On 15 July 2010, Owner filed a Response to the April 2010 Non Final Office Action (“July 2010 Owner Response”) including Remarks and no claim amendments. Specifically, the July 2010 Owner Response argued that: (1) the ‘492 and ‘348 Applications provide sufficient disclosure for the first-fourth wireless transceivers (July 2010 Owner Response at 12-15); (2) *Bitran* does not teach a telecommunication network and that *Bitran* was filed after Owner’s claimed priority date (*id.* at 18-19); and (3) *Dyer* does not teach a cartridge reader that can be properly combined with *Bitran* and *Wecker* (*id.* at 22-23).

On 06 October 2010, the original examiner issued a Final Office action (“Oct 2010 Final Office Action”) rejecting claims 1-39. Specifically, the original examiner disagreed with Owner’s arguments regarding priority (Oct 2010 Final Office Action at 2-3) and maintained the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection over the art of record provided in the April 2010 Non Final Office Action (*id.* at 4-11).

On 05 January 2011, Owner filed a Response to the Oct 2010 Final Office Action (“Jan 2011 Owner Response”) including Remarks and a Claim Amendment (“Jan 2011 Claim Amendment”). The Jan 2011 Claim Amendment: amended all of the independent claims (*i.e.*, claims 1, 9, 17, 23, 29, 34 and 36) to now require the transceivers to specifically be “a wireless cellular communication transceiver,” “a wireless local area network transceiver,” and “a Bluetooth transceiver,” and canceled claims 4 and 12.

On 29 September 2013, the original examiner issued a non-Final Office action (“Sept 2013 Non Final Office Action”) rejecting the remaining claims 1-3, 5-11 and 13-39. Specifically, the original examiner disagreed with Owner’s arguments regarding priority (Sept 2013 Non Final Office Action at 2-3) and maintained the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections over the art of record

provided in both the April 2010 Non Final Office Action and the Oct 2010 Final Office Action (*id.* at 4-11).

On 04 February 2014, Owner filed a Response to the Sept 2013 Non Final Office Action (“Feb 2014 Owner Response”) including Remarks and a Claim Amendment (“Feb 2014 Claim Amendment”). The Feb 2014 Claim Amendment: amended all of the independent claims (*i.e.*, claims 1, 9, 17, 23, 29, 34 and 36) to **remove** the claim requirements of the wireless local area network transceiver, and the Bluetooth transceiver and **replace** the claim requirement of the wireless cellular communication transceiver supporting data communication with remote data resources **only over cellular telecommunication networks** with “*at least one of a wireless unit and tuner unit*” supporting data communication with remote data resources **over cellular telecommunication networks**, **over wireless local area networks**, **and over a direct wireless connection with electronic devices located within short range using Bluetooth communications**.

On 16 April 2014, the original examiner issued a Final Office action (“April 2014 Final Office Action”) rejecting the remaining claims 1-3, 5-11 and 13-39. Specifically, the original examiner; (1) provided no discussion regarding the priority of the Jan 2011 Claim Amendment; and (2) rejected: claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8-10, 13-15, 17 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Rautila* and *Wecker*; claims 3, 11, 18, 23-25, 27, 29, 31-36 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Rautila*, *Wecker* in further view of *Dyer*; claims 26, 30 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Rautila*, *Wecker* in further view of *Dyer* and *Rautila*; claims 7, 16 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Rautila*, *Wecker* in further view of *Purdy*; and claims 28, 32 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Rautila*, *Wecker*, *Dyer* in further view of *Purdy*.

On 16 June 2014, Owner filed a Response to the April 2014 Final Office Action (“June 2014 Owner Response”) including Remarks and no claim amendments. Specifically, the July

2010 Owner Response argued that: (1) *Rautila* does not teach a display screen that is part of the hand held device (June 2014 Owner Response at 12); (2) *Wecker* does not teach video data at all (*id.* at 13); and (3) *Rautila* does not teach a global positioning system, nor a mobile payment module (*id.* at 14-15).

5           On 02 July 2014, the original examiner issued an Advisory Action (“July 2014 Adv Action”) maintaining the rejection of remaining claims 1-3, 5-11 and 13-39. Specifically, the original examiner disagreed with Owner’s arguments regarding the requirement of the display screen being part of the hand held device. (July 2014 Adv Action).

          On 12 August 2014, Owner filed a Notice of Appeal (“2014 Notice of Appeal”).

10           On 12 November 2014, Owner filed an Appeal Brief (“2014 Appeal Brief”).

          On 05 February 2015, the Office and Owner had an interview (“Feb 2015 Interview”) discussing the latest prosecution history of the ‘205 Application (see Interview Summary mailed 18 Feb 2015 (“Feb 2015 Int Summary”). In examination of the Feb 2015 Int Summary, the original examiner stated “applicant’s representative agreed to incorporate the suggested  
15   limitations in independent claims in order to allow the claims.” (Feb 2015 Int Summary).

          On 18 February 2015, the original examiner issued a Notice of Allowance (“Feb 2015 NoA”) providing an Examiner’s amendment (“Feb 2015 Examiners Amendment”) to all independent claims (*i.e.*, claims 1, 9, 17, 23, 29, 34 and 36) authorized by Owner. (Feb 2015 NoA at 2). The Feb 2015 Examiners Amendment provided an amendment to claim 1<sup>2</sup> to include  
20   new limitations, specifically,

[a]n electronic wireless hand held multimedia device, comprising  
at least one of a wireless unit and a tuner unit supporting bi-directional data  
communications of *data including video and text* for the electronic wireless hand  
held multimedia device with remote data resources over cellular

---

<sup>2</sup> The Examiner finds that claim 1 is representative of all independent claims (*i.e.*, claims 1, 8, 15, 21, 27, 32 and 34), respectively.



telecommunications networks, over wireless local area networks and over a direct wireless connection with electronic devices located within short range using Bluetooth communications *after accepting a passcode from a user of the multimedia device during the communications*;

5 a touch sensitive display screen configured to display the data including video and text received by the electronic wireless hand held multimedia device *by selecting a particular data represented by a soft button on the touch sensitive display screen of the multimedia device*; and

10 a microprocessor configured to facilitate operation of and communications by the electronic wireless hand held multimedia device.

(Feb 2015 Examiners Amendment at claim 1; emphasis added). During the original prosecution of the '205 Application, the Examiner finds that issued claim 1 was number 1, issued claim 8 was claim 9, issued claim 15 was claim 17, issued claim 21 was claim 23, issued claim 27 was claim 29, issued claim 32 was claim 34, and issued claim 34 was claim 36, respectively. Moreover, the Examiner finds that claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-20, 22-26, 28-31, 33 and 35-37 are all dependent from issued claims 1, 8, 15, 21, 27, 32 and 34, respectively.

Thus, it appears from the record that the key features missing from the prior art at the time of allowance of independent claim 1 (*i.e.*, issued claim 1) was:

20 *at least one of a wireless unit and a tuner unit supporting bi-directional data communications of data* including video and text for the electronic wireless hand held multimedia device with remote data resources ... *after accepting a passcode from a user of the multimedia device during the communication*

25 and/or

30 *a touch sensitive display screen configured to display the data* including video and text received by the electronic wireless hand held multimedia device *by selecting a particular data represented by a soft button on the touch sensitive display screen of the multimedia device*;

in combination with remaining claims limitations (claim 1; emphasis added).

**V. Information Disclosure Statement(s)**

Requesters' Information Disclosure Statement, filed on 31 March 2025 ("Mar 2025 IDS") has been received, and entered into the record.

**VI. References Cited in EP Request**

A total of three (3) references, in certain combinations, have been asserted in the EP Request as providing teachings relevant to the claims of the '537 Patent. The proposed references which make up the combinations are as follows:

- U.S. Patent No. 6,886,036 to *Santamäki et al.* ("***Santamäki***") – **NEW**.<sup>3</sup>
- U.S. Patent No. 6,282,433 to *Holshouser* ("***Holshouser***") – **NEW**.<sup>4</sup>
- U.S. Patent No. 9,604,359 to *Heutschi* ("***Heutschi***") – **NEW**.<sup>5</sup>

**VII. Substantial New Questions (SNQ) of Patentability**

In view of the prosecution history asserted above, the Feb 2015 NoA from the '205 Application, as applied to the requested claims, will be utilized to determine whether the cited references raise an SNQ.

The italicized/underlined sections of the exemplary claim 1 below are utilized by the Examiner to determine whether specific teachings of the cited references create a substantial new question of patentability in light of the prosecution history above.

Claim 1:

---

<sup>3</sup> This prior art reference has not been previously cited/considered in the original prosecution. Thus, the prior art is considered new art and not "old art." (See MPEP § 2242).

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*

An electronic wireless hand held multimedia device, comprising

5        at least one of a wireless unit and a tuner unit supporting bi-directional data  
communications of data including video and text for the electronic wireless hand  
held multimedia device with remote data resources over cellular  
telecommunications networks, over wireless local area networks and over a direct  
wireless connection with electronic devices located within short range using  
Bluetooth communications after accepting a passcode from a user of the  
10        multimedia device during the communications;

15        a touch sensitive display screen configured to display the data including video  
and text received by the electronic wireless hand held multimedia device by  
selecting a particular data represented by a soft button on the touch sensitive  
display screen of the multimedia device; and

a microprocessor configured to facilitate operation of and communications by  
the electronic wireless hand held multimedia device.

20        The Examiner finds that prior art which teaches at least one of the italicized/underlined  
sections of the claim above which is **different** than the teachings discussed in the ‘205  
Application would provide a new, non-cumulative technological teaching raising a substantial  
new question of patentability.

25        A.        ***Santamäki* (SNQ1 for Grounds 1 and 2 – EP Requester designated – See EP  
Request at § II.B.1, also see Appendix at claims 1, 8, 15, 21, 27, 32 and 34)**

In the present instance, there exists an SNQ based the publications of *Santamäki*, alone,  
and/or when taken with *Holshouser*. A discussion of the specifics now follows:

The EP Request alleges to show that *Santamäki*, alone, and/or when taken with  
30        *Holshouser*, for claim 1, teaches an electronic wireless hand held multimedia device comprising:

at least one of a wireless unit and a tuner unit supporting bi-directional data  
communications of data including video and text for the electronic wireless hand held  
multimedia device with remote data resources over cellular telecommunications networks, over

wireless local area networks and over a direct wireless connection with electronic devices located within short range using Bluetooth communications after accepting a passcode from a user of the multimedia device during the communications;

(EP Request at § II.B.1; Appendix at Claim 1, sections [1.0]-[1.1], [1.5]).

5           The Examiner finds that *Santamäki* was filed on 02 November 1999, which predates the effective filing date of the claimed invention of the ‘537 Patent. As such, *Santamäki* qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

          The EP Request specifically alleges to show that *Santamäki* teaches an electronic wireless hand held multimedia device and method comprising: a wireless unit that supports bi-  
10   directional communications of data after accepting a passcode from a user of the multimedia device during the communications. (EP Request at § II.B.1, Appendix at Claim 1, sections [1.0]-[1.1], [1.5]). From this perspective, the Examiner finds that *Santamäki* teaches an electronic book (“e-book”) system utilizing e-book servers to provide communications of data over many different data networks. (*Santamäki* at Abstract; c.4, ll.46-67; c.8, ll.24-41; c.11, l.59 – c.12, l.10;  
15   c12, ll.11-21; see Figures 1, 5A, 5B). The Examiner finds that *Santamäki* further teaches specifically accepting a passcode from a user of an e-book terminal during the communications in order to facilitate the supporting of bi-directional data communications of data over the data networks. (*Id.* at c.11, ll.8-20; c.11, l.59 – c.12, l.10; see Figure 6).

          Accordingly, *Santamäki*, alone, teaches the material that as described above was deemed  
20   to be missing from the prior art during the original prosecution. The references therefore would have been important to a reasonable examiner in determining the patentability of the claims and an SNQ is raised. These teachings are not cumulative to any written discussion on the record of the teachings of the prior art, were not previously considered or addressed during a prior

examination, and the same question was not the subject of a final holding of invalidity in the Federal Courts

Thus, it is **AGREED** that the consideration of *Santamäki*, alone, raises a substantial new question of patentability of at least claims 1, 8, 15, 21, 27, 32 and 34 as pointed out above. There is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider these teachings important in deciding whether or not these claims are patentable.

**B. *Santamäki* (SNQ2 for Grounds 1 and 2 – EP Requester designated – See EP Request at § II.B.1, also see Appendix at claims 1, 8, 15, 21, 27, 32 and 34)**

In the present instance, there exists another SNQ based the publications of *Santamäki*, alone. A discussion of the specifics now follows:

The EP Request alleges to show that *Santamäki*, alone, for claim 1, teaches an electronic wireless hand held multimedia device comprising:

a touch sensitive display screen configured to display the data including video and text received by the electronic wireless hand held multimedia device by selecting a particular data represented by a soft button on the touch sensitive display screen of the multimedia device. (EP Request at § II.B.1; Appendix at Claim 1, sections [1.0], [1.6]).

As set forth above, the Examiner finds that *Santamäki* was filed on 02 November 1999, which predates the effective filing date of the claimed invention of the '537 Patent. As such, *Santamäki* qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

The EP Request specifically alleges to show that *Santamäki* teaches an electronic wireless hand held multimedia device and method comprising: a touch sensitive display screen configured to display the data including video and text received by the electronic wireless hand

held multimedia device by selecting a particular data represented by a soft button on the touch sensitive display screen of the multimedia device. (EP Request at § II.B.1, Appendix at Claim 1, sections [1.0], [1.6]). From this perspective, the Examiner finds that *Santamäki* teaches an electronic book (“e-book”) system utilizing an e-book servers to provide communications of data over many different data networks. (*Santamäki* at Abstract; c.4, ll.46-67; c.8, ll.24-41; c.11, l.59 – c.12, l.10; c.12, ll.11-21; see Figures 1, 5A, 5B). The Examiner finds that *Santamäki* further teaches the e-book system specifically having a touch sensitive display with respective icons thereon that may be selected to provide user-selectable functions and/or actions. (*Santamäki* at c.9, ll.13-45; see Figure 5A-5B).

Accordingly, *Santamäki*, alone, teaches the material that as described above was deemed to be missing from the prior art during the original prosecution. The references therefore would have been important to a reasonable examiner in determining the patentability of the claims and an SNQ is raised. These teachings are not cumulative to any written discussion on the record of the teachings of the prior art, were not previously considered or addressed during a prior examination, and the same question was not the subject of a final holding of invalidity in the Federal Courts.

Thus, it is **AGREED** that the consideration of *Santamäki*, alone, raises a substantial new question of patentability of at least claims 1, 8, 15, 21, 27, 32 and 34 as pointed out above. There is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider these teachings important in deciding whether or not these claims are patentable.

**C. *Holshouser***

The Examiner finds that *Holshouser* is utilized by EP Requester for reading on non-SNQ claim requirements of claims 1, 8, 15, 21, 27, 32 and 34. (See EP Request at §§ II.B; Appendix at 2, and at claims 1, 8, 15, 21, 27, 32 and 34). The non-SNQ claim requirements depend on the SNQ claim requirements of *Santamäki*, alone, which have raised an SNQ as asserted above (see §§ VII.A-B, *supra*).

The Examiner finds that *Holshouser* was filed on 14 April 1999, which predates the effective filing date of the claimed invention of the '537 Patent. As such, *Holshouser* qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Accordingly, the proposals based on *Holshouser* in combination with *Santamäki* are granted for the same reasons as those based on *Santamäki*, alone.

**D. *Heutschi***

The Examiner finds that *Heutschi* is utilized by EP Requester for reading on non-SNQ claim requirements of claims 4, 6, 12, 14, 18, 20, 24, 26, 28, 30, 35 and 37. (See EP Request at §§ II.C; Appendix at 2, and at claims 4, 6, 12, 14, 18, 20, 24, 26, 28, 30, 35 and 37). The non-SNQ claim requirements depend on the SNQ claim requirements of *Santamäki*, alone, which have raised an SNQ as asserted above (see §§ VII.A-B, *supra*).

The Examiner finds that *Heutschi* was filed on 20 February 1999, which predates the effective filing date of the claimed invention of the '537 Patent. As such, *Heutschi* qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Accordingly, the proposals based on *Heutschi* in combination with *Santamäki* are granted for the same reasons as those based on *Santamäki*, alone.

***VIII. 35 U.S.C. § 325(d)***

A review of the post grant history for the '537 Patent indicates that there have been no other Office post grant challenges made to the patent (Reexamination Proceedings or *Inter Partes* Review, Post Grant Review, Covered Business Method trials). Accordingly, a  
5 discretionary denial of reexamination pursuant to 35 USC 325(d) is not applicable.

***IX. Summary***

Claims 1-37 of the '537 Patent will be reexamined as requested in the instant Order.



## **X. Conclusion**

### **Extensions of Time**

Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) will not be permitted in these proceedings because the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 apply only to "an applicant" and not to parties in a reexamination proceeding. Additionally, 35 U.S.C. 305 requires that *ex parte* reexamination proceedings "will be conducted with special dispatch" (37 CFR 1.550(a)). Extensions of time in *ex parte* reexamination proceedings are provided for in 37 CFR 1.550(c).

### **Waiver of Right to File Patent Owner Statement**

In a reexamination proceeding, Patent Owner may waive the right under 37 C.F.R. 1.530 to file a Patent Owner Statement. The document needs to contain a statement that Patent Owner waives the right under 37 C.F.R. 1.530 to file a Patent Owner Statement and proof of service in the manner provided by 37 C.F.R. 1.248, if the request for reexamination was made by a third party requester, see 37 C.F.R. 1.550. The Patent Owner may consider using the following statement in a document waiving the right to file a Patent Owner Statement:

Patent Owner waives the right under 37 C.F.R. 1.530 to file a Patent Owner Statement.

### **Amendment in Reexamination Proceedings**

Patent owner is notified that any proposed amendment to the specification and/or claims in this reexamination proceeding must comply with 37 CFR 1.530(d)-(j), must be formally presented pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.52(a) and (b), and must contain any fees required by 37 CFR § 1.20(c). See MPEP § 2250(IV) for examples to assist in the preparation of proper proposed amendments in reexamination proceedings.

## Service of Papers

After the filing of a request for reexamination by a third party requester, any document filed by either the patent owner or the third party requester must be served on the other party (or parties where two or more third party requester proceedings are merged) in the reexamination proceeding in the manner provided in 37 CFR 1.248. See 37 CFR 1.550.

## Notification of Concurrent Proceedings

The patent owner is reminded of the continuing responsibility under 37 CFR 1.565(a) to apprise the Office of any litigation activity, or other prior or concurrent proceeding, involving Patent No. 9,031,537 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 throughout the course of this reexamination proceeding. See MPEP §§ 2207, 2282 and 2286.

**All** correspondence relating to this ex parte reexamination proceeding should be directed:

By Mail to: Mail Stop *Ex Parte* Reexam  
Central Reexamination Unit  
Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent & Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

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

By hand: Customer Service Window, Mail Stop *Ex Parte* Reexam  
Knox Building  
501 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

By Patent Center: To file and manage patent submissions in Patent Center, visit:  
<https://patentcenter.uspto.gov>.  
Visit <https://www.uspto.gov/patents/apply/patent-center>

for more information about Patent Center and

<https://www.uspto.gov/patents/docx>

for information about filing in DOCX format.

For additional questions, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at  
866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the  
Reexamination Legal Advisor or Examiner, or as to the status of this proceeding, should be  
directed to the Central Reexamination Unit at telephone number (571) 272-7705.

/Stephen J. Ralis/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3992  
(571) 272-6227

Conferees:

/LUKE S WASSUM/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3992

/H.B.P/  
Hetul Patel  
Supervisory Patent Reexamination Specialist, Art Unit 3992

SJR  
6/16/2025