

Bilski Diagnostic Methods Big Sample

| S.No | Publication | Rejection type | 101 Rejection | 102 Rejection | 103 Rejection | 112 Rejection |
|------|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| 1 | US20090037305A1 | 102, 103 and 112 rejection | N/A | Claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 10-14, 16, 18-20, and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Regan (US 7,234,103). | Claims 3, 5, 9, 15, 17, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Regan (US 7,234,103). | Claims 12 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. |
| 2 | US20080004939A1 | 102 rejection | N/A | Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Santos et al. (US 2002101 43665 A1). | N/A | N/A |
| 3 | US20080005623A1 | 101 and 102 rejections | Claims 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. | Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Przinzing, US 6,496,202 (Hereinafter, Prinzing). | N/A | N/A |
| 4 | US20080028328A1 | 101, 102 and 112 rejections | Claims 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. | Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Arend et al, US PG PUB 200410230914 A1 (hereinafter Arend). | N/A | Claim 6 contains the trademark/trade name SAP Netweaver Visual Composer. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See Ex parte Simpson, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. |
| 5 | US20080127101A1 | 101 and 102 rejections | Claim 4 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 5. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co., 151 U.S. 186 (1894); In re Ockert, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 | Claims 8, 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Barnes et al., (U.S. Patent number 733743 1). | N/A | N/A |

| | | | | | | |
|----|-----------------|------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| | | | (CCPA 1957); and In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438,164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970). | | | |
| 6 | US20080071589A1 | 102 and 103 rejections | N/A | Claims 1-3 and 5-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 7,031,901 to Abu El Ata (hereafter "Abu El Ata"). | Claims 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abu El Ata as applied to claims 1-3 and 5-22 above, and further in view of US Patent Application Publication No. 20041004461 7 to Lu (hereafter "Lu"). | N/A |
| 7 | US20080059517A1 | 101 and 102 rejections | Claims 16-21, 22 are rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter | Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated: by US 2010180075 issued to Doug Chasman et al ("Chasman"). | N/A | N/A |
| 8 | US20080077549A1 | 103 and 112 rejections | N/A | N/A | 1. Claims 1-20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over NPL Java and SOAP by Englander, in view of US PGPUB 200510080661 by Casati et al. (hereinafter "Casati"), and in further view of US PGPUB 200610242489 by Brockway et al. (hereinafter "Brockway"). 2. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over NPL Java and SOAP by Englander, in view of US PGPUB 200510080661 by Casati et al. (hereinafter "Casati"), and in further view of US PGPUB 200610242489 by Brockway et al. (hereinafter "Brockway"), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US PGPUB 200410267834 by Sasaki et al. (hereinafter "Sasaki"). | 1. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 1 recites "a message including data copied from a first data set" and claim 2 recites "the first data set is a business object". 2. Claim 13, a system claim, contains subject matter similar to claim 1 and is objected on the same ground. 3. New claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1 12, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. |
| 9 | US20080075246A1 | 103 rejection | N/A | N/A | 1. Claims 1-6, 9-14, and 17-19, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over NPL Java and SOAP by Englander, in view of US PGPUB 200410267834 by Sasaki et al. (hereinafter "Sasaki") 2. Claims 8, 16, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over NPL Java and SOAP by Englander, in view of US PGPUB 200410267834 by Sasaki et al. (hereinafter "Sasaki"), as applied to claims 1, 9, and 17 above, and further in view of Patent 6898618 by Slaughter et al. (hereinafter "Slaughter"). | N/A |
| 10 | US20080065262A1 | 102 and 103 rejections | N/A | Claims 1-2, 4, 7, 11 -15, 17-1 8, 20 and 23-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent to Hunt et al. (5,835,716). | 1. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt et al. 2. Claims 5-6, 8-10, 16, 19 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt et al. in view of the U.S. Patent to Ross et al. (6,332,098 B2). | N/A |
| 11 | US20080188955A1 | 112 rejection | N/A | N/A | N/A | Claims 1-1 7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 11 2, first paragraph, as failing to comply |

| | | | | | | with the written description requirement. |
|----|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 12 | US20080082679A1 | 103 rejection | N/A | N/A | 1. Claims 1-2, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lindholm et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 200410019801 [hereinafter Lindholm] in view of Brauneis et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication 200810140832[hereinafter Brauneis]. 2. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lindholm et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 200410019801 [hereinafter Lindholm] in view of Brauneis et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication 200810140832[hereinafter Brauneis]. | N/A |
| 13 | US20080109436A1 | 103 rejection | N/A | N/A | Claims 1-2, 4-10 and 12-20 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious over Jeffrey David Calusinski (U.S. Pub. No. 200510071342) in view of Gorur et al (U.S. Pub. No. 200810065443). | N/A |
| 14 | US20080109732A1 | 102 and 103 rejections | N/A | Claims 1-1 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Li, US Patent 7089500. | Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pullara et al (hereinafter Pullara) US 20030014526. | N/A |
| 15 | US20080082691A1 | 102, 103 and 112 rejection | N/A | Claims 1-3 and 5-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Diesel et al. (2004001401 3: hereinafter Diesel) | Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Diesel, in view of Beigel (200401 50662: hereinafter Beigel). | Claims 1, 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 11 2, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. |
| 16 | US20080120265A1 | 101 rejection | The invention as disclosed in claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being non-statutory subject matter. | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 17 | US20080120279A1 | 103 rejection | N/A | N/A | Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang (US Pub. 200510160107 Al) in view of Omoigui (US 200410230572 Al). | N/A |
| 18 | US20080133478A1 | 101, 103 and 112 rejections | Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. | N/A | Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sklarz et al. (US 200210087389). | Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. |
| 19 | US20080134059A1 | 101, 102 and 103 rejections | Claims 8-1 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. | Claims 1-1 5, 17-1 8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Watts, US 6,614,433 (Hereinafter, Watts). | Claims 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watts, US 6,614,433 (Hereinafter, Watts) in view of Jiang, US 200710250764 (Hereinafter, Jiang). | N/A |
| 20 | US20080141237A1 | 101, 102, 103 and 112 | Claims 1 - 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because | Claims 1 - 3, 10 - 14, 16 - 17, 19 - 20, 22 - 23, and 25 - 27 are | Claims 4, 6, 15, 18, 21, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable | Claims 1 - 9, 14 - 19, and 26 - 27 are rejected under 35 |

| | | | | | | |
|----|-----------------|-----------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | | rejections | the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. | rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bharati et al. (Bharati hereinafter) (US 2004/0040021) | over Bharati et al. (Bharati hereinafter) (US 200410040021) in view of Hayton et al. (Hayton hereinafter) (US 2002101 20679). | U.S.C. 11 2, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. |
| 21 | US20080155431A1 | 102 rejection | N/A | Claims 1-1 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barton (US 6031 535). | | N/A |
| 22 | US20080155038A1 | 101, 102 and 103 rejections | 1. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. 2. Claims 8-1 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. | Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shah et al., U.S. PGPub 200310208572 (hereinafter "Shah"). | Claims 5, 7-10 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shah et al., U.S. PGPub 200310208572 (hereinafter "Shah") in view of Sugihara et al., U.S. PGPub 200510038771 (hereinafter "Sugihara"). | N/A |
| 23 | US20080155105A1 | 102 and 103 rejections | N/A | Claims 1-8, 11 -1 8 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moore et al (Hereafter, Moore), U.S. Pat. Application Pub. No. US 2006/0171402 A1 | Claims 9-1 0 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al (Hereafter, Moore), U.S. Pat. Application Pub. No. US 2006101 71 402 A1 . | N/A |
| 24 | US20080154948A1 | 101 and 102 rejections | Claims 11 -21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. | Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Spence et al. (Patent No. 6,591,277 B2 filed December 27, 2000, hereinafter Spence). | N/A | N/A |
| 25 | US20080154937A1 | 102 rejection | N/A | Claims 1-1 3 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Paoli (US 7,275,216) | N/A | N/A |
| 26 | US20080154854A1 | 101, 102 and 103 rejections | Claims 10-1 9 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. | Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 10-1 2, 14, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Grimes et al (U.S. Patent Application 200510144895 A1 hereinafter, "Grimes"). | Claims 4, 6-7, 20, 12, 15-1 6 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious by Grimes et al as applied to claims 1-3, 5, 8, 10-1 2, 14, 17 and 19, and in view of Friend et al (U.S. Patent Application 2006101 07224 A1 hereinafter, "Friend"). | N/A |
| 27 | US20080154753A1 | 102 and 103 rejections | N/A | Claims 1, 3-10 and 21 -29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lo et al. (US 2006/0095374 A1, hereinafter "Lo"). | Claims 11 -20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lo in view of Argenbriht (US 7,454,376 B1). | N/A |
| 28 | US20080154688A1 | 102 and 103 rejections | N/A | Claims 1, 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Oral et al. (US 2008101 40488 A1). | 1. Claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 13, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oral et al. (US 200810140488 A1) in view of Kaufman et al. (US2007/0072156 A1) 2. Claims 4-6, 11 -1 3, 18-20 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oral et al. (US 200810140488 A1) in view of Brush et al. ("Brush", US 200810082925 A1). 3. Claims 7 and 21 are rejected under 35 | N/A |

| | | | | | | |
|----|-----------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| | | | | | U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oral et al. (US 2008101 40488 A1) in view of Forth (US 200710282660). | |
| 29 | US20080149712A1 | 101, 102, 103 and 112 rejections | Claims 1-3 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to nonstatutory subject matter. | Claims 1-3, 18-21, and 24-25 are rejected under U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Quinn et al. (Quinn hereinafter) (U.S. PG Pub No. 200610026197). | Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quinn et al. (U.S. PG Pub No. 200610026197) as applied to claims 1-3, 18-21, and 24-25 in view of Falls et al. (Falls hereinafter) (U.S. Patent No 7,287,001). | Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. |
| 30 | US20080154994A1 | 101, 102 and 103 rejections | Claims 1-13 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. | Claims 1-8, and 11-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Stata et al. (US 200610036580) | Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stata et al. (US 200610036580) and OFFICIAL NOTICE. | N/A |
| 31 | US20080162458A1 | 101 and 103 rejections | Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. | N/A | 1. Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shurtleff et al. (U.S. Pub. No.: U.S. 200610282427, hereinafter, Shurtleff), in view of Steinmaier et al. (U.S. Pub. No.: U.S. 200510198052, hereinafter, Steinmaier). 2. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shurtleff et al. (U.S. Pub. No.: U.S. 200610282427, hereinafter, Shurtleff), in view of Steinmaier et al. (U.S. Pub. No.: U.S. 200510198052, hereinafter, Steinmaier), and further in view of Owens et al. (U.S. Pub. No.: U.S. 200610265518, hereinafter, Owens). 3. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shurtleff et al. (U.S. Pub. No.: U.S. 200610282427, hereinafter, Shurtleff), in view of Steinmaier et al. (U.S. Pub. No.: U.S. 200510198052, hereinafter, Steinmaier), and further in view of Annau et al. (U.S. Patent No.: U.S. 6,804,662, hereinafter, Annau). 4. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shurtleff et al. (U.S. Pub. No.: U.S. 200610282427, hereinafter, Shurtleff), in view of Steinmaier et al. (U.S. Pub. No.: U.S. 200510198052, hereinafter, Steinmaier), and further in view of Boyle et al. (U.S. Patent No.: U.S. 7,451,103, hereinafter, Boyle). 5. Claims 12, 13, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shurtleff et al. (U.S. Pub. No.: U.S. 200610282427, hereinafter, Shurtleff), in view of Steinmaier et al. (U.S. Pub. No.: U.S. 200510198052, hereinafter, Steinmaier), and further in view of Davis et al. (U.S. Patent No.: U.S. 2002101 3351 6 A1, hereinafter, Davis). 6. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shurtleff et al. (U.S. Pub. No.: U.S. 200610282427, hereinafter, Shurtleff), in view of Steinmaier et al. (U.S. Pub. No.: U.S. 200510198052, hereinafter, Steinmaier), and further in view of Hanson et al. (U.S. Patent No.: U.S. 5,956,736 A1, | N/A |

| | | | | | | |
|----|-----------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | hereinafter, Hanson). | |
| 32 | US20080162457A1 | 101, 102, 103 and 112 rejections | 1. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. 2. Claim 1, 16, 24 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1, 8, 14 of co-pending application 11/647,768. | 1. Claims 1-7, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Berner et al [hereafter Berner], US Patent No. 5907846 published on May 25, 1999. 2. Claims 8-12, 15-20, 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cazemier et al [hereafter Cazemier], US Patent No. 6609123 published on Aug 19, 2003 | Claims 13-14, 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cazemier et al [hereafter Cazemier], US Patent No. 6609123 published on Aug 19, 2003 as applied to claim 8, 16, above, and further in view of Berner et al [hereafter Berner], US Patent No. 5907846 published on May 25, 1999. | In claim 24, applicant appear to be invoking 112, sixth paragraph "means for" type language, but it is unclear what "structures" are being used to perform the functions. |
| 33 | US20080162426A1 | 101, 102, 103 and 112 rejections | Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. | 1. Claims 1, 2, 6-10, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brown (US 6,334,122). 2. Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Raciborski (US 2005101 77562). | Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Raciborski (US 2005/0177562) | Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. |
| 34 | US20080162415A1 | 101, 102 and 103 rejections | Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. | Claims 1-3, 8-10 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,356,901 B1 (MacLeod et al., hereinafter as MacLeod). | 1. Claims 4-5, 11-12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,356,901 B1 (MacLeod et al., hereinafter as MacLeod) in view of US Patent No. 6,460,052 B1 (Thomas et al., hereinafter as Thomas). 2. Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,356,901 B1 (MacLeod et al., hereinafter as MacLeod) in view of Pub. No.: US 200610288036 A1 (Sadovski et al., hereinafter as Sadovski). | N/A |
| 35 | US20080162563A1 | 101, 102 and 103 rejections | 1. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. 2. Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. 3. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. | Claims 1, 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Aubel et al. (U.S. Patent No.: US 5,696,693, hereinafter, Aubel). | Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wesemann (U.S. Pub. No.: US 200410186842 A1), in view of Cook et al. (U.S. Pub. No.: US 200610150169 A1, hereinafter, Cook). | N/A |
| 36 | US20080162344A1 | 103 rejection | N/A | N/A | 1. Claim 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKenney et al. (US 200610004670), in view of Der Emde et al. (US 200710233598). 2. Claim 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKenney et al. (US 200610004670), in view of Der Emde et al. (US 200710233598) and further in view of Matena et al. (US 2004101 58549). | N/A |

| | | | | | | |
|----|-----------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| 37 | US20080162610A1 | 103 rejection | N/A | N/A | Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiser et al. (US 200510149526) in view of Roy et al. (US 6363403). | N/A |
| 38 | US20080162279A1 | 101, 102, 103 and 112 rejections | Claims 14-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. | Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-12, 14, 16-23 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Katz et al. (US 2002/0138316 A1) (hereinafter Katz) | 1. Claims 3, 10 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katz et al. (US 2002/0138316 A1) (hereinafter Katz) 2. Claims 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katz et al. (US 2002/0138316 A1) (hereinafter Katz) in view of Irby et al. (US 2005/0209934 A1) (hereinafter Irby) . | Claims 7-9 and 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. |
| 39 | US20080163126A1 | 101 and 103 rejections | 1. Claims 1 - 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. 2. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter | N/A | 1. Claims 1 - 11, and 13 - 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guido et al. (US PGPub 2005/0149873), hereinafter ?Guido?, in view of Glatfelter et al. (US PGPub 2008/0091942), hereinafter ?Glatfelter?. 2. Claims 12, and 15 - 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guido et al. (US PGPub 200510149873), hereinafter ?Guido?, in view of Glatfelter et al. (US PGPub 200810091942), hereinafter ?Glatfelter?, in further view of Lunawat (US PGPub 200710168940). | N/A |
| 40 | US20080162558A1 | 101 and 102 rejections | Claims 16-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. | Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hughes et al. (PGPub. No. 200610136906; Filing date: Dec. 20, 2004) (hereinafter Hughes). | N/A | N/A |
| 41 | US20080195586A1 | 101 and 102 rejections | Claim 15 is rejected under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. | Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Budzik et al. (US Publication No. 2007101 85847), herein referred to as "Budzik". | N/A | N/A |
| 42 | US20080243781A1 | 101 and 103 rejections | Claims 1 - 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. | N/A | 1. Claims 1 - 4, 6, 8 - 10, 13 - 15, 18, 19 and 21 - 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,178,418 issued to Richard E. Singer (hereinafter "Singer") in view of US Patent Number 5,960,194 issued to David Mun-Hien Choy et al. (hereinafter "Choy"). 2. Claims 5, 7, 12, 16, 17 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singer and Choy as applied to claims 4, 1, 15 and 24 above respectfully, and further in view of US Patent Number 7,451,148 issued to Allen B. Childress et al. (hereinafter "Childress"). 3. Claims 11 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singer and Choy as applied to claims 10 and 19 above respectfully, and further in view of US Patent Number 6,901,418 issued to Dan G. Gonos (hereinafter "Gonos"). | N/A |
| 43 | US20080243564A1 | | | | | N/A |

| | | | | | | |
|----|-----------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | 101, 102 and 103 rejections | Claims 1-11 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. | Claims 1, 3-12, and 14-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sladky et al. (US 2006/0173617). | Claims 2 and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sladky et al. in view of Examiner's Official Notice. | |
| 44 | US20080255968A1 | 101, 102, 103 and 112 rejections | 1. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to nonstatutory subject matter 2. Claims 1 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 based on Supreme Court precedent, and recent Federal Circuit decisions, the Office's guidance to examiners is that a 5 101 process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. | Claims 1, 9, 11, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Lenk et al. (US 2004/006845 1). | Claims 2- 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lenk et al. (US 20041006845 1) in view of LeMasters ET a1 (US 200810027835" . | Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. |
| 45 | US20080148161A1 | 102 and 112 rejections | N/A | Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Diorio et al. (US7,028,264) | N/A | Claims 1 - 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 10 1 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. |
| 46 | US20080163063A1 | 101, 102 and 103 rejections | Claims 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. | Claims 1-4, 6-1 1, 13-18 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ho et al ("Ho" US 200710261 043). | Claims 5, 12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ho in view of Wen et al ("Wen" US 20061023581 0). | N/A |
| 47 | US20080162552A1 | 101, 102 and 103 rejections | 1. Claims 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. 2. Claims 1-21 of this application conflict with claims 1-21 of Application No. 111647,979. 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. | Claims 1-4, 6-1 1, 13-18 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ho et al ("Ho" US 200710261 043). | Claims 5, 12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ho in view of Wen et al ("Wen" US 20061023581 0). | N/A |
| 48 | US20080162547A1 | 101, 102, 103 and 112 rejections | Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 10 1 because the claimed invention is directed to nonstatutory subject matter. | Claims 1, 5-8, 12-15, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ho et a1 (US 20070261043), hereafter known as Ho. | Claims 2, 9, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ho in view of Stoodley et a1 (US 20070226683), hereafter known as Stoodley. | Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------------|
| | | | | | regards as the invention. |
|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------------|