



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

Table with 5 columns: APPLICATION NO., FILING DATE, FIRST NAMED INVENTOR, ATTORNEY DOCKET NO., CONFIRMATION NO. Includes details for application 18/329,450, inventor Ben Merritt, and examiner RASSAVONG, ERIC.

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.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentprocurement@perkinscoie.com

Imperative Care v. Inari Medical
U.S. Patent 11,974,910
Imperative Care Ex. 1052

<b><i>Applicant-Initiated Interview Summary</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b> 18/329,450	<b>Applicant(s)</b> Merritt et al.		
	<b>Examiner</b> ERIC RASSAVONG	<b>Art Unit</b> 3781	<b>AIA (First Inventor to File) Status</b> Yes	<b>Page</b> <b>1 of 2</b>

<b>All Participants</b> (applicant, applicants representative, PTO personnel)	<b>Title</b>	<b>Type</b>
ERIC RASSAVONG	Examiner	Video Conference
Susan Su	Primary Examiner	
Matthew S. Williams	Attorney	
Paul T. Parker	Attorney	
Dr. Thomas Tu	Inventor	

**Date of Interview:** 25 January 2024

**Issues Discussed:**

**Proposed Amendment(s)**

Attorney and Examiner agree that incorporating more structural claim language, i.e. diameter of the catheter, would make the claim 1 allowable over the prior art Garrison.

Attorney and Examiner agree that the newly added method claims would be allowable for reciting the specific use in pulmonary embolism applications.

**Other**

Dr. Tu discussed the differences between catheters used in cerebral occlusions vs. pulmonary embolisms and deep vein thrombosis.

Attachment

/E.R./ Examiner, Art Unit 3781	/SUSAN S SU/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3781
<p><b>Applicant is reminded that a complete written statement as to the substance of the interview must be made of record in the application file. It is the applicants responsibility to provide the written statement, unless the interview was initiated by the Examiner and the Examiner has indicated that a written summary will be provided. See MPEP 713.04</b></p> <p>Please further see: MPEP 713.04 Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews, paragraph (b) 37 CFR § 1.2 Business to be transacted in writing</p>	

**Applicant recordation instructions:** The formal written reply to the last Office action must include the substance of the interview. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, applicant is given a non-extendable period of the longer of one month or thirty days from this interview date, or the mailing date of this interview summary form, whichever is later, to file a statement of the substance of the interview.

**Examiner recordation instructions:** Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recordation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general

<b><i>Applicant-Initiated Interview Summary</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b> 18/329,450	<b>Applicant(s)</b> Merritt et al.		
	<b>Examiner</b> ERIC RASSAVONG	<b>Art Unit</b> 3781	<b>AIA (First Inventor to File) Status</b> Yes	<b>Page</b> <b>2 of 2</b>

indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.