

## First half sheet

Sl.No.	Patent/Publication No.	Date of Publication	Application Date	Date of Rejection	Rejection type	101 Rejection	102 Rejection	103 Rejection
1	US20080201671A1	8/21/2008	2/16/2007	2/25/2009	101 and 103 rejections	Claims 1-1 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beausang et al, US Patent No. 5,696,771 in view of Higuchi, US Patent No. 7,299,437
2	US20080155477A1	6/26/2008	12/22/2006	3/4/2009	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 1-1 1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-5, 7-14, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by "Optimize Your PocketPC Development" by MSDN Magazine (hereafter MSDN).	Claims 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Optimize Your PocketPC Development" by MSDN Magazine (hereafter MSDN) in view of XP002434133.
3	US20080155460A1	6/26/2008	12/22/2006	3/17/2009	101 and 102 rejections	Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by "Maps Tour" by Google Maps Help Center (hereafter Google Maps).	N/A
4	US20080127018A1	5/29/2008	10/31/2006	2/6/2009	101 and 103 rejections	Claims 1-1 0 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naganuma et al., US Patent No. 5,917,729 in view of Viswanathan et al., Page 2 "Fastplace: Efficient Analytical Placement using CellShifting, Iterative Local Refinement and a Hybrid Net Model", ISPD'04, April 18-21, 2004, Phoenix, Arizona, USA. Copyright 2004 ACM 1-581 13-81 7-2/04/0004.
5	US20080127013A1	5/29/2008	10/25/2006	1/29/2009	101, 102 and 112 rejections	1. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. 2. Claims 1-1 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-3, 7-1 0, 12-21, 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Levy (US 200610095869 A1 ).	N/A

6	US20080127005A1	5/29/2008	9/7/2006	12/17/2008	101 rejection	Claims 1, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The invention claims a method for analyzing a circuit.	N/A	N/A
7	US20080097923A1	4/24/2008	3/9/2007	1/6/2009	101, 102 and 112 rejections	Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §1 01 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-16 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ginter (US 5892900).	N/A
8	US20080235616A1	9/25/2008	12/6/2006	3/2/2009	103 rejection	N/A	N/A	Claims 1 - 1 1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinckley et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 200410140984) in view of Kelts (US Patent Application Publication No. 200 110030667).
9	US20080235810A1	9/25/2008	7/18/2006	10/7/2008	102 rejection	N/A	Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ripley et al. (U. S. Publication No.: 200410205345 AI).	N/A
10	US20080235739A1	9/25/2008	11/13/2006	11/25/2008	101, 102, 103 and 112 rejections	Claims 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because computer programs per se cannot be patentable.	Claims 1-3, 10-15, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dureau et al. (U.S. Publication No. 200310093806).	1. Claims 4-6, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau et al. (U.S. Publication No. 200310093806) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Sano et al. (U.S. Publication No. 200210059596). 2. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau et al. (U.S.

								Publication No. 200310093806) and Sano et al. (U.S. Publication No. 200210059596) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Rowe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,623,613).
11	US20080235429A1	9/25/2008	3/23/2007	12/5/2008	101 and 103 rejections	Claims 13, 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 13 and 15 are directed to a program on a propagating signal13	N/A	Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landis et al WO-20051036358-A2 in view of Johnsen et al PN 7,293,129.
12	US20080235259A1	9/25/2008	3/23/2007	2/20/2009	101 and 103 rejections	1. Claim 1 and its dependent claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. 2. Claim 9 and its dependent claims 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 Collins-Rector et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,188,398), ("Collins-Rector" hereinafter) in view of Dunn et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,721,829), ("Dunn" hereinafter).
13	US20080235234A1	9/25/2008	6/5/2008	2/13/2009	103 rejection	N/A	N/A	Claims 1 and 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swift et al. (U.S. Patent 5,768,519, also cited on the IDS dated 06/05/2008) hereinafter "Swift" and Vasic et al. (US 2003/0021 41 7 A1, also cited on the IDS dated 06/05/2008) hereinafter "Vasic", further in view of Holbrook (US 7,133,914 B1, also cited on the IDS dated 06/05/2008) hereinafter "Hol brook".
14	US20080235189A1	9/25/2008	9/14/2007	6/11/2008	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 17-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-3, 5-1 8 and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lauffer, U.S. Patent No. 6,223,165 (hereinafter Lauffer).	Claims 4 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauffer as applied to claims 1 and 17 above, and further in view of Lanq et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,029,161 (hereinafter Lanq).
15	US20080235177A1	9/25/2008	3/22/2007	1/27/2009	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.101 because the language of	Claims 1, 9-1 1 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lawrence et al. (US Patent No. 7,389,265	Claims 2-8, 12-1 3 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawrence et al. (US Patent No. 7,389,265

						the claim raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine which would result in a practice application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C 101.	B2, hereinafter "Lawrence").	B2) as applied to claims 1, 9 and 15 above, and further in view of Ainsbury et al. (US Patent No. 6,078,924 A, hereinafter "Ainsbury").
16	US20080208853A1	8/28/2008	2/28/2007	4/2/2009	101, 102 and 112 rejections	Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-6, and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lipkin et al. (US 2005/0154699), hereafter referred to as Lipkinr699.	N/A
17	US20080204773A1	8/28/2008	2/26/2007	3/19/2009	101 rejection	1. Claims 1-4, 7-10, 13-14 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. 2. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. 3. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venable et al. (6,972,867) in view of Kanamori et al. (4,929,978).	N/A	N/A
18	US20080201587A1	8/21/2008	2/16/2007	2/26/2008	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 1, 3-8, 31-33, and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by	1. Claims 1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranganathan, U.S.

							Ranganathan, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 200510240786 AI.	Patent Application Publication No. 200510240786 AI, in view of Anderson, U.S. Patent No. 6,189,106 B1. 2. Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranganathan/Anderson as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Chen et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 200610149908 A1 . 3. Claims 9, 21, 22, 24, 34, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranganathan/Anderson in view of Kim, U.S. Patent No. 6,943,693 B2. 4. Claims 2, 11-20, 23, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranganathan in view of Anderson, U.S. Patent No. 6,189,106 B1. 5. Claims 9, 10, 21, 22, 24, 29, 30, 34, 35, 39, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranganathan/Anderson in view of Kim, U.S. Patent No. 6,943,693 B2.
19	US20080197846A1	8/21/2008	3/10/2008	12/17/2008	101 and 103 rejections	Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	Claims 1, 3, 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hurd et al (US 5,657,757), and further in view of Haase et al (US 6,400,151).
20	US20080209365A1	8/28/2008	2/28/2007	10/1/2008	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	1. Claims 1-3, 6-1 2, 15-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Allen et al. [U.S. Patent 6,738,954 B1]. 2. Claims 1, 3, 6, 8-1 2, 15-1 7, 20-22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wisniewski et al. [U.S. Patent 7,346,470 B2].	Claims 4, 13 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen et al. or Wisniewski et al. in view of Foreman et al. [U.S. Patent 7,401,307 B2].
21	US20080205254A1	8/28/2008	5/30/2006	10/2/2008	101, 102, 103 and 112 rejections	Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-5 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sako et al. (U.S. Patent 7,142,494).	Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sako (U.S. Patent 7,142,494) in view of Ishiguro et al. (U.S. Patent 7,010,124) .
22	US20080205122A1	8/28/2008	2/23/2007	6/3/2008		N/A		N/A

					102 and 112 rejections		Claims 1-20 are, insofar as understood, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Min et al., 7,072,208.	
23	US20080201357A1	8/21/2008	1/30/2008	6/12/2008	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-3,5,6,12-14,19-21,23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kasriel et al. (US 20031012823 1, hereinafter "Kasriel").	1. Claims 4 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kasriel. 2. Claims 7 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kasriel in view of Arora et al. (US 200410205594, hereinafter "Arora").
24	US20080209464A1	8/28/2008	2/23/2007	3/17/2009	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claim (s) 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a process, machines, manufactures and composition of matter asserted utility or a well established utility.	Claims 1-9, 11-15 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Broussard et al. (US 200410221305 A1), here in refer to as Broussard.	1. Claims 10 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broussard et al. (US 200410221305 A1), here in refer to as Broussard In view of Pinder et al. (US 200410237 100 A1), herein refer to as Pinder. 2. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broussard et al. (US 200410221305 A1), here in refer to as Broussard In view of Pinder et al. (US 200410237100 A1), herein refer to as Pinder and further in view of Vandermolen (US 200610136732 A1).
25	US20080183372A1	7/31/2008	1/31/2007	9/5/2008	101 and 103 rejections	Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	Claims 1 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kuo et al (USP 7,367,319).
26	US20080182696A1	7/31/2008	8/4/2006	11/14/2008	103 and 112 rejections	N/A	N/A	Claims 1,24 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent Application Publication No. US 200510080527 A1 to Tao et al. (hereinafter referred to as Tao) in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,709,362 to Tomohiro et al. (hereinafter referred to as Tomohiro).

27	US20080177702A1	7/24/2008	1/23/2007	1/7/2009	101 and 103 rejections	Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed Page 3 invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	Claims 1-23 of the current application (effective filing date: Jan. 23, 2007) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heckerman et al. (US 571 5374; date of patent: Feb. 03, 1998), hereinafter "Heckerman" in view of Yemini et al. (US 200501 37832; pub date: Jun. 23, 2005), hereinafter "Yemini".
28	US20080176708A1	7/24/2008	1/23/2007	3/17/2009	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	1. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-1 0, 14, 18, 19, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tamai et al 741 5342. 2. Claims 1, 4-7, 9-1 2, 14, 15 and 18-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimada et al 5233530.	1. Claims 2 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada et al in view of Ishizu 5829544. 2. Claims 3 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada et al in view of Tabata et al 5923093 3. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada et al in view of Buglione et al 681 7328 and Kadota et al 71 0231 3.
29	US20080176706A1	7/24/2008	1/24/2007	4/2/2009	103 and 112 rejections	N/A	N/A	1. Claims 1-1 0, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oba et al 5957800 in view of Wakahara 6375591. 2. Claims 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bucknor in view of Oba and Wakahara.
30	US20080176705A1	7/24/2008	1/23/2007	4/2/2009	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 1, 6, 10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Niki et al 7059435.	1. Claims 2-4 and 11 -1 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niki et al in view of Lux et al 5484353. 2. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niki in view of Tabata 61 83389. 3. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niki in view of Robichaux et al 6220987. 4. Claims 16-1 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niki in view of

									Buglione et al 681 7328 5. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niki in view of Buglione as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Lux. 6. Claims 1-4, 6, 10-13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitano et al 200601 08163 in view of Lux et al. 7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitano in view of Lux as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Tabata. 8. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitano in view of Lux as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Buglione.
31	US20080184184A1	7/31/2008	1/30/2007	1/22/2009	102 rejection	N/A	Claims 1 - 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,901,562 B2 to Cooke et al. (hereinafter, "Cooke").	N/A	
32	US20080181272A1	7/31/2008	1/25/2007	10/3/2008	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Diaz et al (Pub No 20050030985).	Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Diaz et al. (Pub No 20050030985).	
33	US20080178295A1	7/24/2008	1/10/2007	9/19/2007	103 rejection	N/A	N/A	Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al U.S.2005/0091167 in view of Luo Lin et al U.S. 200610048237.	
34	US20080178128A1	7/24/2008	1/24/2007	9/19/2008	102 rejection	N/A	Claim 1-27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kerzman et al. (US Patent 6546532).	N/A	
35	US20080172640A1	7/17/2008	1/11/2007	9/4/2008	101, 102 and 112 rejections	Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1, 3, 5, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Batra et al. ("Hcompare: A Hierarchical Netlist Comparison Program", 29th ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference, 8 - 12 June 1992, pp.	N/A	
36	US20080172479A1	7/17/2008	11/19/2003	3/13/2008	103 and 112 rejections	N/A	N/A	Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lea (US Patent No 6,085,236) in view of Gandhi et al. (International	

								Publication No.WO 00178001 A2).
37	US20080168409A1	7/10/2008	1/9/2007	2/3/2009	101, 102, 103 and 112 rejections	Claims 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because claim 15 recites a computer program product comprising a computer readable medium.	Claims 1, 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tieg et al. (US 6526555).	1. Claims 2, 9, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teig et al. in view of Na. et al. (The effects of on-chip and package decoupling capacitors and efficient ASIC decoupling methodology). 2. Claims 3, 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teig et al. in view of Na et al. as applied to claims 2, 9 and 16 above, and further in view of Dourier (US200601 23374). 3. Claims 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teig et al. in view of Na. et al. further in view Dourier et al. as applied to claims 4, 9 and 16 above, and further in view of Gasparik et al. (US 200501 14806).
38	US20080168193A1	7/10/2008	1/10/2007	11/28/2008	103 rejection	N/A	N/A	1. Claims 1-8,34, and 35, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies et al. (US pub. 200510097271) in view of Schreiber (US pub. 2006/0140108). 2. Claims 9-11, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies et al. (US pub. 200510097271) in view of Schreiber (US pub. 2006/0140108), as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Kuhar (US pub. 200610262441).
39	US20080163148A1	7/3/2008	10/2/2007	2/3/2009	101 and 102 rejections	Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pub. No. 200310237064 to White et al. (Hereinafter: White).	N/A
40	US20080162456A1	7/3/2008	12/27/2006	10/27/2008	101 and 102 rejections	Claims 1-1 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory	Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. 2007101 12898 A1 issued to David Evans et al. ("Evans").	N/A

						subject matter.		
41	US20080162427A1	7/3/2008	12/28/2006	12/10/2008	101 and 102 rejections	Claims 15- 20 are 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(b) as being unpatentable over Choi et al (US Pub. No. 2004101 86826), herein after "Choi".	N/A
42	US20080162386A1	7/3/2008	11/16/2007	10/6/2008	101, 102 and 112 rejections	1. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter: abstraction and/or algorithm. 2. Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention has no practical application.	Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (a) as being anticipated by Sofman et al. (Sofman), "Improving Robot Navigation Through Self-supervised Online Learning", Robotics: Science and Systems 11, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, August 16-19, 2006.	N/A
43	US20080162377A1	7/3/2008	12/19/2007	1/7/2009	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 26-49 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because based on Supreme Court precedent (Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1 981 ); Parker v. Flook, 437	Claims 1-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being disclosed by Cifrese et al., USPAP 2007101 92223.	Claim 1-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cifrese et al., USPAP 2007101 92223 and further in view of Hodgdon et al., USPAP 200510246260.
44	US20080154907A1	6/26/2008	12/22/2006	1/15/2009	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claim 23 and depending claims 24-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they pertain to nonstatutory subject matter.	Claims 1-18, 21-40, and 43-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Plastina et al. (?Plastina? hereafter) which filed U.S. Patent Application 20041001 9658.	Claims 19-20 and similar claims 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Plastina as applied to claims 1-18, 21-40, and 43-51 above, and further in view of New et al. (?New? hereafter) who filed U.S. Patent Application 2006/0195864

SI.No.	Patent/Publication No.	Date of Publication	Application Date	Date of Rejection	Rejection type	101 Rejection	102 Rejection	103 Rejection
45	US20080154903A1	6/26/2008	12/21/2006	11/25/2008	102 rejection	N/A	Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Marek Podgorny et al. (US Patent No. 6,078,948 and Podgorny hereinafter).	N/A
46	US20080154711A1	6/26/2008	12/22/2006	3/20/2008	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 15- 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 10 1 because the claimed invention is directed to	Claims 1-6, 8, 10-11 and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.102(e) as being anticipated by Grant et al. (U.S. 200710143 169).	Claims 7, 9, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grant et al. (U.S. 200710143 169) in view of Hunter et al. (U.S.

						non-statutory subject matter.		200210040413).
47	US20080155672A1	6/26/2008	12/22/2006	10/8/2008	102 rejection	N/A	Claims 1, 10, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sibal et al. (Patent No. 7,210,098 B2 filed February 18, 2003, hereinafter Sibal).	N/A
48	US20080155641A1	6/26/2008	12/20/2006	3/18/2009	101 and 102 rejections	Claims 1-1 4, 15, 16-25, 26, and 27-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Heim (US Publication 2006101 84490).	N/A
49	US20080155592A1	6/26/2008	12/22/2006	2/3/2009	101 and 103 rejections	Claims 15-21 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter as follows: Claims 15-21 claim "a computer readable medium containing a computer program for. ...." and Claims 25-27 claim "a data structure stored in memory".	N/A	Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pelkey (US 7,032,235) in view of Bove (US 2004101 2331 4).
50	US20080155539A1	6/26/2008	12/20/2006	12/5/2008	103 and 112 rejections	N/A	N/A	1. Claims 1-4, 13-1 6, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halstead (US printed publication 200510268304) in view of Burton et al. (US patent 6,874,074) and Yoshizawa et al. (US patent 5,734,381). 2. Claims 5-1 1, 17-23, and 29-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halstead, Burton, and Yoshizawa as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Coombs (US printed publication 2003101 77149). 3. Claims 12, 24, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halstead, Burton, and Yoshizawa as applied to claim 1 above in further view

									of Boyce et al. (US printed publication 2004101 391 03).
51	US20080155476A1	6/26/2008	12/20/2006	11/26/2008	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1, 4-6, 9-12, 17-18, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Callegari (PGPub. No. 200310004802).	1. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Callegari (PGPub. No. 200310004802) in view of Northcutt (PGPub No. 200510130680). 2. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Callegari (PGPub. No. 200310004802) in view of Maes (PGPub No. 200710291859; Filing date: Jun. 15, 2006). 3. Claims 7-8, 13, 15-16, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Callegari (PGPub. No. 200310004802) in view of Eliezerov (PGPub No. 200810086361; Provisional filing date: Oct. 10, 2006). 4. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Callegari (PGPub. No. 200310004802) in view of Eliezerov (PGPub No. 200810086361; Provisional filing date: Oct. 10, 2006) and further in view of Northcutt (PGPub No. 200510130680).	
52	US20080155471A1	6/26/2008	12/20/2006	3/6/2009	101 and 102 rejections	Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter (i.e., computer data signal that is not tied to any machine).	Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. App. Pub. 200310065721 to Roskind.	N/A	
53	US20080155432A1	6/26/2008	12/21/2006	10/6/2008	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-18, 20, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(a) as being anticipated by Beausang (5,828,579).	Claim 19 is rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beausang (5,828,579) in view of Berni (5,070,483).	
54	US20080155353A1	6/26/2008	10/24/2006	3/5/2009	102 and 112 rejections	N/A	Claims 1 - 11, 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Edwards (U.S. Patent number 6732307).	N/A	

55	US20080155352A1	6/26/2008	11/1/2006	12/31/2008	102 rejection	N/A	Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lange (US 6,947,957 B1)	N/A
56	US20080155349A1	6/26/2008	9/30/2006	12/23/2008	102, 103 and 112 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-4, 8-12, 14, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Blakely (U.S. Patent No. 5,124,909).	1. Claims 5-6 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blakely in view of Ruuth (U.S. Patent No. 6,978,396). 2. Claims 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blakely in view of Official Notice. 3. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blakely in view of Sang (U.S. PGPub 200610242319).
57	US20080155342A1	6/26/2008	12/21/2006	4/2/2009	101, 103 and 112 rejections	Claims 7, 9-14 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to nonstatutory subject matter	N/A	1. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thekkath (US Patent Application Publication 200610225050).
58	US20080155339A1	6/26/2008	10/25/2006	1/26/2009	103 rejection	N/A	N/A	1. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Lindsey (US 5,896,536) in view of Diec (US 6,083,281). 2. Claims 2, 8, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Lindsey (US 5,896,536) in view of Diec (US 6,083,281), and in further view of Klotz (US 2005100761 13 A1 ).
59	US20080155332A1	6/26/2008	10/30/2006	12/29/2008	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-2, 4, 6-7, 11-12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Loison (US 200310046529 A1).	1. Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loison (US 200310046529 A1 ) in view of Tami (US 2004101 33474 A1 ). 2. Claims 5 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loison (US 200310046529 A1 ) in view of Bailey (US 2002101 50086 A1 ). 3. Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

								over Loison (US 200310046529 A1) in view of Mann (US 6,922,722 B1).
60	US20080155305A1	6/26/2008	12/22/2006	3/17/2009	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-3, 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Alaniz et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication US200810 195887A1.	Claims 4, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alaniz et al. in view of Ansari U.S. Patent 7,293,201.
61	US20080155301A1	6/26/2008	12/20/2006	7/29/2008	103 and 112 rejections	N/A	N/A	Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sinclair et al (US 6,725,321).
62	US20080127326A1	5/29/2008	8/8/2006	9/11/2008	103 and 112 rejections	N/A	N/A	Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Blumenau et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0194294), hereinafter Blumenau ?294 in view of Smart (U.S. Publication 2007/0174851), hereinafter Smart ?851.
63	US20080127261A1	5/29/2008	9/21/2006	3/26/2009	103 rejection	N/A	N/A	1. Claims 1, 4-7, 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White (US Pub. 2002/0056098), in view of Ellis (US Pub. 2004/0226042), and in further view of Harada et al. (US Pat. 6,246,442), herein referenced as White, Ellis, and Harada, respectively. 2. Claims 2-3, 8, 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White in view of Ellis, Harada, and in further view of Billmaier et al. (US Pub.2003/0028883), herein referenced as Billmaier.
64	US20080127229A1	5/29/2008	9/8/2006	3/5/2009	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the	1. Claims 1-2, 6, 11-12 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Garnett (US	1. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garnett (US

						claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	2003/0033459), hereafter referred to as Garnett?459. 2. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 11-14, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pecone et al. (US 6,098,140), hereafter referred to as Pecone et al.?140.	2003/0033459), hereafter referred to as Garnett?459, in view of Pecone et al. (US 6,098,140), hereafter referred to as Peconer140. 2. Claims 3-5, 7-10, 13-16, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garnetr459 in view of Pecone et al. (US 6,098,140), hereafter referred to as Pecone? 140. 3. Claims 5, 9-10, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pecone et al.?140.
65	US20080127224A1	5/29/2008	7/25/2006	4/18/2008	101, 102, 103 and 112 rejections	Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rochford, I1 et al. (US Patent No. 7,080,247 B2) hereafter referred to as Rochfordr247.	Claims 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rochfordr247
66	US20080127219A1	5/29/2008	9/15/2006	2/27/2009	101 and 102 rejections	Claims 10-18 are 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(b) as being anticipated by Upton (US 200310093471).	N/A
67	US20080127170A1	5/29/2008	8/29/2006	12/31/2008	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 11-16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	1. Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 10-13, 16, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fors et al. (hereinafter Fors), US 200810028390. 2. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wei, US 2005/0155027 3. Claims 1-6, 8, 10-16, 18, 20, 21-24, and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fors et al. (hereinafter Fors), US	1. Claims 9, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fors, in view of Wei. 2. Claims 22-24, and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wei, in view of Fors. 3. Claim 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wei, in view of Curtis et al. (hereinafter Curtis) Patent No. 6,687,902.
68	US20080127169A1	5/29/2008	8/29/2006	3/26/2009	102 rejection	N/A	Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-24 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ciccirelli (art of record, US Patent Publication No. 200310037328 A1).	N/A
69	US20080127111A1	5/29/2008	9/27/2006	3/20/2009	101, 102 and 112 rejections	Claims 5-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to	1. Claims 1-4 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Okbay et al., US 2005101 38471 A1. 2. Claims 5-7 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)	N/A

						non-statutory subject matter.	as being anticipated by Pietschker et al., US 2004101 53871 A1.	
70	US20080127103A1	5/29/2008	7/27/2006	12/10/2008	101 and 103 rejections	Claims 21 -30,34,35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	Claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voruganti (US Publication Number 20050137844A) in view of Parnell et al. (US Publication Number 200201 62090A1).
71	US20080127029A1	5/29/2008	10/31/2006	1/26/2009	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ferguson et al., US Patent No. 6,578,190.	Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al., US PGPUB 200310229881 in view of Zach, US 20061 0236271 A1.
72	US20080127027A1	5/29/2008	11/2/2006	6/12/2008	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-1 9, 21 -25, and 27-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mukherjee et al., (US Pub. 200510055658) (see entire document).	Claims 3, 9, 20, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukherjee et al., (US Pub. 200510055658) in view of Gallatin et al., (US Pub. 2005101 3231 0) (see entire document).
73	US20080127010A1	5/29/2008	11/28/2006	10/9/2008	103 rejection	N/A	N/A	1. Claims 1, 8-9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leonhardt (US 200310088393) in view of Van Horn et al. (US 200510024068). 2. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leonhardt (US 200310088393) in view of Van Horn et al. (US 200510024068) and in further view of Beattie et al. (US 200510065763).
74	US20080127006A1	5/29/2008	10/27/2006	9/24/2008	102 rejection	N/A	Claims 1, 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tseng et al. (US Patent Application Publication 200601 17274).	N/A
75	US20080126999A1	5/29/2008	10/26/2006	12/10/2008	103 and 112 rejections	N/A	N/A	1. Claims 1-4, 7-11, 14-18, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath et al., "Automatic Insertion of Low Power Annotations in RTL for Pipelined Microprocessors", Proceedings of Design, Automation, and Test in Europe 2006, vol. 1, pp. 1-6, March 2006 (hereinafter, "Viswanath"). 2.

								Claims 5,6,12,13,19,20,24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath in view of Usami et al., "Lowpower Design Methodology and Applications Utilizing Dual Supply Voltages", Proceedings of the Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conference, 2000, pp. 123-128 (hereinafter, "Usami").
76	US20080126959A1	5/29/2008	11/29/2006	10/29/2008	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-3, 7, 11-13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Redford et al. U.S. Patent 200310126298 (hereinafter "Redford").	1. Claims 4, 8-10, 14 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redford et al. U.S. Patent 200310126298 (hereinafter "Redford"), as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of ~icrosoft@Office outlook@.com copyright 2003 (hereinafter "Outlook"). 2. Claims 5 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redford et al. U.S. Patent 200310126298 (hereinafter "Redford"), as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and Kato U.S. Patent 7,124,209. 3. Claims 6 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redford et al. U.S. Patent 200310126298 (hereinafter "Redford"), as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and ~ i c r o s o f t ~ f f i c e W o r d , copyright 2003 (hereinafter "Word").
77	US20080098443A1	4/24/2008	1/11/2007	11/28/2008	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 17, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention.	Claims 2-4, 7-11, 13-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ellis et al. (US 200210174430).	1. Claims 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis et al. (US 200210174430) in view of Shimoji et al. (US 6,353,930). 2. Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis et al. (US 200210174430) in view of Knudson et al. (200510204387).
78	US20080098423A1	4/24/2008	10/20/2006	2/27/2009	101, 102, 103 and 112 rejections	Claims 1-9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the	Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-12, 14-17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zigmund et al. (US 6698020).	1. Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zigmund in view of Lu (US 2002101

						claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.		571 15). 2. Claims 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young in view of Palazzo et al. (US 2003101 15601).
79	US20080098395A1	4/24/2008	10/23/2006	3/30/2009	102 and 112 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vaitzblit et al. (hereafter Vaitzblit) (U.S. Patent No. 5528513).	N/A
80	US20080098296A1	4/24/2008	10/23/2006	12/18/2008	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-3, 7-9, 13-16, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Szlodovics et al. (Hereinafter Szlodovics) U.S. Patent No. 7340718 filed May 8, 2003.	1. Claims 4, 10, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szlodovics et al. (Hereinafter Szlodovics) U.S. Patent No. 7340718 filed May 8, 2003, in view of Beda et al (hereinafter Beda) U.S. Publication 20040194020 field Oct. 23, 2003. 2. Claims 5-6, 11-12 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szlodovics et al. (Hereinafter Szlodovics) U.S. Patent No. 7340718 filed May 8, 2003, in view of Lewallen et al (hereinafter Lewallen) U.S. Patent No. 6801224 filed Sept. 14, 2000.
81	US20080098242A1	4/24/2008	10/19/2006	3/31/2009	101 and 102 rejections	Claims 7-1 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-4, 7-1 0, 13-1 5 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pessolano, U.S. Patent No. 7,340,628.	N/A
82	US20080098187A1	4/24/2008	10/18/2006	1/16/2009	101 and 102 rejections	Claims 7-1 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed limitation lines 2-3, "computer usable medium" is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Micka (US. Pub. No. 2003101 58869).	N/A
83	US20080098131A1	4/24/2008	9/26/2007	1/22/2009	101 and 102 rejections	Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed	Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Application Publication No. US 200710033225 A1 to	N/A

						invention is directed to nonstatutory subject matter.	Davis.	
84	US20080098067A1	4/24/2008	10/20/2006	2/20/2009	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 21 -23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claim 1-1 8, 21 -24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Santos (US 2003/0158900 AI)	1. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Santos (US 200310158900 AI), in view of Dorenbosch et al. (US 200410064355 AI). Hereinafter "Dorenbosch". 2. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Santos (US 2003/0158900 AI), in view of Mannaru et al. (US 20060031290). Hereinafter "Mannaru".
85	US20080098066A1	4/24/2008	10/20/2006	2/19/2009	101 and 102 rejections	Claims 11 -1 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claim 1-1 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Durazo et al. (US 200510004990 AI). Hereinafter "Durazo".	N/A
86	US20080098062A1	4/24/2008	10/20/2006	12/10/2008	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	1. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Deng et al. (US 20060184609 AI). 2. Claims 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Deng et al. (US 20060184609 AI). 3. Claims 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Deng et al. (US 20060184609 AI).	Claims 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deng et al. (US 20060184609 AI), in view of Heinonen et al. (US 20050281237 AI).
87	US20080098051A1	4/24/2008	1/24/2007	1/12/2009	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 12-1 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 12 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Apple Inc - Technical Note TNI 150 - HFS Plus Volume Format dated March 5, 2004 - Applicant?s IDS (hereinafter, Technical note TNI 150).	1. Claims 13-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Apple Inc - Technical Note TNI 150 - HFS Plus Volume Format dated March 5, 2004 - Applicant?s IDS (hereinafter, Technical note TNI 150), in view of Okada (EP 1 300 850 A2 - Applicant?s IDS). 2. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Apple Inc - Technical Note TNI 150 - HFS Plus Volume Format dated March 5, 2004 - Applicant?s IDS (hereinafter, Technical note TNI 150), in view of Gotoh et al. (US 2003101 9421 8)

88	US20080098031A1	4/24/2008	10/23/2006	9/29/2008	101 and 102 rejections	Claims 8- 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1 - 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Johnston, Jr. et al. (US Patent No. 6,104,391).	N/A
89	US20080098027A1	4/24/2008	6/26/2007	1/7/2009	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kay (2007/0074620)	Claims 7, 8, and 11, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kay in view of Yoshikawa et al. (200710227337).
90	US20080097974A1	4/24/2008	10/18/2006	3/6/2009	101 and 102 rejections	Claim 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-9, and 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts Baumgartner et al. (U.S. Publication 20050022115 and Bumgartner hereinafter) in view of Humphreys et al. (U.S. Patent 7,003,445 and Humphreys hereinafter).
91	US20080097964A1	4/24/2008	10/24/2006	9/12/2008	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-3, 6-7, 10-13, 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Berger et al. US Publication 2006/0010113.	Claims 4- 5, 8-9, 14-15, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berger et al. US Publication 2006/0010113 in view of Auerbach et al. US Publication 2007/0027843.
92	US20080097897A1	4/24/2008	10/20/2006	9/16/2008	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, 15-18, 20-22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,135,349 (Zirkel ?349).	Claims 4, 9, 14, 19, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zirkel ?349 as applied to claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, 15-18, 20-22, and 24 above, alone.
93	US20080097879A1	4/24/2008	10/20/2006	3/4/2009	103 rejection	N/A	N/A	Claims 1-2, 5-7, 9-12, 14-18, and 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zirkel (US PAT: 6,135,349) in view of Stewart et al (Stewart hereinafter, US PUB NO.: 2002/0120846).
94	US20080097844A1	4/24/2008	5/17/2007	3/3/2008	103 rejection	N/A	N/A	Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beach et al (US 2002/0107738) in view of Register et al (US 2005/0234771).
95	US20080097731A1	4/24/2008	10/18/2006	2/18/2009	101 and 103 rejections	Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is	N/A	1. Claims 1-4, 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Planas et al. 6112015, hereinafter Planas and further in

						directed to non-statutory subject matter		view of Norman, 2006/0212327 AI. 2. Claims 5-12, 23-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Planas, Norman, and further in view of Swisher et al. 2004/0015309 AI, hereinafter Swisher. 3. Claims 13-15,31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Planas, Norman, and further in view of McDonough et al. 2004/0049345 AI, hereinafter McDonough. 4. Claims 16-18,34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Planas, Norman, McDonough, and further in view of Syrbe 2006/0148488 AI.
96	US20080097722A1	4/24/2008	8/31/2007	7/31/2008	101 and 102 rejections	Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 14-16, 18-21 and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Knight (US 5,296,861) (Hereafter referred to as Knight).	N/A
97	US20080097715A1	4/24/2008	10/23/2006	4/29/2008	101 rejection	Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	N/A
98	US20080097702A1	4/24/2008	10/20/2006	4/8/2008	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Willhoit, Jr. et al.	Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willhoit, Jr. et al.