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

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
15/278,735	09/28/2016	Thibault Pierre Seillier	AM2-2241US	2129

136607 7590 05/17/2018

Lee & Hayes PLLC
601 West Riverside Avenue
Suite 1400
Spokane, WA 99201

EXAMINER
HE, JIALONG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2659	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/17/2018	ELECTRONIC

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):

lhpto@leehayes.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 15/278,735	Applicant(s) SEILLIER ET AL.	
	Examiner JIALONG HE	Art Unit 2659	AIA (First Inventor to File) Status Yes

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

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04/17/2018*.

☐ A declaration(s)/affidavit(s) under **37 CFR 1.130(b)** was/were filed on _____.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.

4)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims*

5)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

7)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

9)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

* If any claims have been determined allowable, you may be eligible to benefit from the **Patent Prosecution Highway** program at a participating intellectual property office for the corresponding application. For more information, please see http://www.uspto.gov/patents/init_events/pph/index.jsp or send an inquiry to PPHfeedback@uspto.gov.

Application Papers

10)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

11)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

Certified copies:

a)☐ All b)☐ Some** c)☐ None of the:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

** See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08a and/or PTO/SB/08b) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

3) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

4) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The present application, filed on or after March 16, 2013, is being examined under the first inventor to file provisions of the AIA.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 04/17/2018 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Response to Amendments and Arguments

4. Regarding rejection to claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. 112(d), applicant corrected the dependency issue. The rejection has been withdrawn.

5. Regarding rejection to claims under 35 U.S.C. 101, applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant first cited paragraphs from *MPEP §2106, 2014 Interim Guidance on Patent Subject Matter Eligibility, 79 Fed. Reg. 74618 (December 16, 2014) (hereinafter "Interim Guidance")*. (**Remarks, pages 8-10**). Applicant further argued (**Remarks, page**

10) that "*In the instant application, claims 1-20 are patentable under §101 at least because (I) they fall into the statutory categories of eligible subject matter (Step 1), (II) they are not directed to an abstract idea (Step 2A), and (III) they amount to "significantly more" than a judicial exception (Step 2B).*"

The examiner agreed with applicant's analysis for claims 1-20 in step 1 (Remarks, page 9-10, **I. The Claims are Directed to Statutory Categories (Step 1**).)

In the analysis for Step 2A (**II. The Claims are Not Directed to an Abstract Idea (Step 2A).**), applicant alleged (**Remarks, page 10**) "*The Office has failed to establish a prima facie case of subject matter ineligibility because the Office relies on the Office's own overly-broad characterization of the claims. The Second Updated Guidance unambiguously states that, in formulating a § 101 rejection, the "broadest* ***reasonable*** *interpretation" of the claimed invention must be established prior to evaluating the eligibility of each claim as a whole using the two-step analysis detailed in the Interim Guidance. Second Updated Guidance (emphasis in the Remarks).*"

In response, the examiner notes that as explained in the previous office action (Non final rejection, Pages 2-4), the limitations defined by independent claims could be interpreted as a person is using an online translator (e.g., Google translation website). This person performs some text editing by first removing no-need translation parts (such as person's name) before submitting to the online translator. This person later put back

the removed text back after receiving translation results. Applicant just alleged that the claims were given unreasonably broad interpretation without specific pointing which limitations were given unreasonably broad interpretation.

Applicant further argued (Remarks, pages 12-14, ***B. Claims 1-20 are not directed to an abstract idea.***). Applicant stated that the pending application recites "a specific means or method that improves the relevant technology". Applicant further argued "*As discussed in Applicant's Specification, "the mechanism described ... provides a meaningful technical benefit by allowing human and machine translators to focus only on the translation of the content item ... without regard to any localization-specific syntax contained therein. This can provide better human translations, enable machine translations that were previously not possible, and reduce processor and memory utilization in some configurations." Specification, [0068]*" .

In response, the examiner notes that claim limitations just broadly defines " based at least in part on the content item, to generate one or more pre-rendered content items that do not have the localization-specific syntax; provide the one or more pre-rendered content items that do not have the localization-specific syntax to a translation management system (TMS) for translation;" The claim just broadly recites "that has do not have the localization-specific syntax" with giving any details how pre-rendered content item is generated. The limitations corresponds to an abstract idea of a person editing to be translated text by removing no-need translation items (e.g., person's name) before submitting to an online translation service.

Applicant further argued (Remarks, pages 15-17, **The Claims Amount to "Significantly More" than the Judicial Exception (Step 2B).)** that "*Applicant respectfully submits that, even if the pending claims are considered to be directed to an abstract idea--a contention with which Applicant strongly disagrees, claims 1-20 contain elements that individually, and/or when considered in combination with other elements of the claims, amount to "significantly more" than the alleged abstract ideas at least because the additional limitations provide meaningful limits on the alleged abstract idea*". "*That is, the claims do not preempt all technical solutions that result in an implementation of either the alleged abstract idea of "'collecting and comparing known information' or 'collecting, displaying and manipulating data*."

The examiner analyzed claim limitations according to Step 2B in interim Guidance. As explained above for each limitations recited in claim 1, none of the limitations meet the requirement of "Significantly more" consideration. For examine, the added "based at least in part on the one or more translated pre-rendered content items that do not have the localization-specific syntax, regenerate the localization specific syntax" can be interpreted as when a user receives translation results, this person reinserted person's name that was removed before submitting for translation. When viewing all limitations recited in claim 1 as a whole, the claim 1 is directed to an abstract idea of organizing human activity (e.g., a person editing text by removing no-need translation items before submitting to an online translation service).

Independent claims 7 and 15 include features similar to claim 1. Dependent claims do not include limitations that when considered together with limitations recited in independent claims meet the requirement of "significantly more" consideration.

From the above analysis, the arguments to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 is not persuasive. The rejection to claims under §101 has been maintained.

6. Regarding rejection to claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(a)(1), applicant argued that Labarge discloses removing formatting information, tables, drawings etc. Applicant argued that claimed "localization-specific syntax" is **not limited to formatting information.** The claim recitation "pre-rendered content items" does **not merely correspond to documents without formatting information** (Remarks, page 18).

It appears applicant acknowledge that Labarge reference meets one instance of the broadly recited term "localization-specific syntax", but does not cover the whole scope of the broadly recited term. However, there is no requirement that a reference must meet the whole scope of a broad term. If the cited reference teaches **one embodiment of the broadly recited limitations**. This reference meets the requirement of claim limitations.

Labarge discloses that before submitting a document to a translation server, no-need translation items (drawings, images, equations) are temporality removed. After

receiving translation results, these removed items are reinserted into the translated document to keep formatting same as the original document.

Although Labarge meets the requirement of claim limitations, the examiner reviewed the previously cited references (but not relied upon) and decided to further cited Satake et al. (US PG Pub. 2006/0200339, previously cited in PTO-892 form, but not relied upon for rejection) to address the new limitations. Satake discloses before sending a document to a translation server, first substituting confidential information with a place holder (Fig. 5, replacing a company name with “ABC Incorporation Company” as a place holder). After obtaining translation results, replacing the place holder with the original company name or person name (Sataka, [0027-0028], [0040-0042]).

The examiner rejected independent claims and some dependent claims as obvious over Labarge in view of Satake.

Regarding the second rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(a)(1) to independent claims over Bourbonnais et al. (US Pat. 6,446,036). Applicant argued (Remarks, pages 22-25) that Bourbonnais does not disclose all limitations recited in amended independent claims. Bourbonnais reference is no longer used in the following rejections. The argument is moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a judicial exception (**an abstract idea**) without significantly more. Claims 1-20 corresponds to a concept that the courts have identified as an abstract idea as "**Collecting, storage and recognition of date**". In addition, the claimed scope covers a situation that a person is using an online translation service ("certain human activities"). Claim 1 (an apparatus), claim 7 (a method) or claim 15 (computer readable medium) include: (1) receiving a document to be translated; (2) preprocessing the inputted text (claimed "a content term") by removing no-need-translation entities (claimed "do not have the localization specific syntax"); (3) translating the preprocessed document; (4) storing translated document together with no-need translation items. The limitations "provide..." and "receive..." also cover a human translator using some translation tools (e.g., online Google translator). For example, limitations in claim 1 can be interpreted as:

receive a content item having a localization-specific syntax (**A person receive a document for translation, the documents contains some mathematical equations ("a localization-specific syntax") which is no need to be translated**);

based at least in part on the content item, to generate one or more pre-rendered content items that do not have the localization-specific syntax (**The person reviews the**

document and temporally removes no-need translation portions using a editing software on his computer);

provide one or more pre-rendered content items that do not have the localization-specific syntax to a translation management system (TMS) for translation (**The user submits the document without Math equations to an online translation service such as Google translation**);

receive from the TMS, at the rendering engine, one or more translated pre-rendered content items that do not have the localization-specific syntax (**The user receives translation results that do not include no-need translation portions (e.g. Math equations)**);

based at least in part on the one or more translated pre-rendered content items that do not have the localization-specific syntax, regenerate the localization specific syntax (**the user re-edit the translated document by inserting the previously removed math equations**);

generate a translated content item having the localization-specific syntax (t**he user uses the document editor to put back the mathematical equations, which are no-need translation entities**); and

provide the translated content item having the localization-specific syntax to a content management system (CMS) (**The translator stores the final results to his folder on a computer**).

In light of specification ([**0063-0068**]) no-need-translation elements (claimed as "a localization-specific syntax") such as a **variable-element placeholder** is removed before sending the text to a human translator or a machine translation system, so that a human translator / a machine translation system could focus only on the real content item.

Although claim 1 includes "one or more processors", "storage media" or "translation management system" or "a content management system", these elements are generic computer elements that are well-understood, routine, and conventional activities previously known to the industry. These computer components are recited at a high level of generality and add no more to the claimed invention than the components that perform basic mathematical calculation functions routinely provided by a general purpose computer. The additional elements do not show any inventive concept and do not meaningfully limit the performance of the calculation. Independent claims 7 and 15 include similar limitations as claim 1. Dependent claims 2-6, 8-14 and 16-20 further recite some limitations to describe properties of data (localization-specific syntax). These additional limitations, when combining with limitations recited in the corresponding independent claims, **fail to** add elements that are significantly more than the judicial exception.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 112(b):

> (b) CONCLUSION.—The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the inventor or a joint inventor regards as the invention.
>
> The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 112 (pre-AIA), second paragraph:
> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112(b) or 35 U.S.C. 112 (pre-AIA), second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the inventor or a joint inventor, or for pre-AIA the applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant amended independent claims 1, 7 and 15 by reciting:

"based at least in part on the one or more translated pre-rendered content items that do not have the localization-specific syntax, **regenerate the localization specific syntax**;

generate a translated content item **having the localization-specific syntax**;"

It is unclear if claimed "the localization-specific syntax" refers to previously mentioned "having **a localization-specific syntax"** or "regenerate **the localization specific syntax**". In other words, it is unclear if the regenerated the localization-specific syntax is the same as that removed from the translation text or different from the removed localization-specific syntax (i.e., variable placeholder).

There two possible interpretations. One interpretation is that the claimed “a localization-specific syntax” (i.e., variable place holder as described in specification, [0060]) is stored somewhere before removing the place holder and the restored by retrieving from a storage. Another interpretation is that these claimed “a localization-specific syntax” were deleted and later recreated (“regenerated”). By reading the specification ([0065]), it appears the proposed method is that a variable place holder (claimed “a localization-specific syntax”) is replaced with a value (e.g., “0” to represent no error; “1” to represent singular error, “2” to represent plural errors) and then restore the variable place holder later after translation.

Since claim limitations are unclear and ambiguous, the examiner assumes the claimed "regenerate the localization-specific syntax" just means restoring the removed variable place holder.

Labarge et al. (US PG Pub. 2002/0188435) discloses translating a richly formatted document by first removing table, equations, and images from the document before submitting the document to an online translation. Then the table, equations and images are stored ([0058], [0068]). Labarge meets the newly added limitation:

based at least in part on the one or more translated pre-rendered content items that do not have the localization-specific syntax, regenerate the localization specific syntax; (**[0068], combining the translated document with previously stored images, tables**)

generate a translated content item having the localization-specific syntax;

(**[0068], the translated document contains table, drawings, equations, images and/or other no-need translation items**).

Although Labarge meets all limitations recited in amended claims, to advance prosecution, the examiner performed an update search. The examiner noticed that Satake et al. (US PG Pub. 2006/0200339, previously cited but not relied upon) also meets all limitations of independent claims. Since claims have an ambiguous issue as explained above, the examiner combines Labarge and Satake to reject amended claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. Claims 1, 5-7, 11-15, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (a)(1) as being anticipated by Labarge (US PG Pub. 2002/0188435, hereinafter referred to as Labarge) in view of Satake et al. (US PG Pub. 2006/0200339, hereinafter referred to as Satake).

Labarge discloses a method/system of translating richly-formatted documents into different languages (**Abstract, fig. 3, [0008]**). Before sending a document to a translation server, formatting information or no-need translation portions in the richly-formatted document are removed (**[0055], specific coding tags that are not necessary for translation are removed**). The translated documents are combined with saved formatting information to generate a translated richly-formatting documents

(**[0081], combing the translated document with graphs, charts to form a translated a richly formatted document**).

In light of the specification, the examiner gives a few terms used in the claim limitations a reasonable interpretations. The examiner interprets claimed "localization-specific syntax" as **formatting information** as described in the Labarge reference. The examiner interprets “pre-rendered content items" as documents without formatting information (after removing formatting information, graphs, charts).

Regarding claims 1, 7 and 15, Labarge discloses an apparatus, a method and computer readable medium (**Abstract, Fig. 1, fig. 2, a word processing application running on a computer**), comprising:

one or more processors (**fig. 2, computer implemented word processing and translation system**); and

one or more non-transitory computer-readable storage media having instructions stored thereupon which are executable by the one or more processors and which, when executed, (**fig. 2, computer implemented word processing and translation system**) cause the apparatus to:

receive, at a rendering engine, a content item having a localization-specific syntax (**[0019], receiving a richly formatted document including formatting**

information, images, drawings, pictures and other data that are not necessarily being translated);

based at least in part on the content item, generate one or more pre-rendered content items that do not have the localization-specific syntax (**[0058], saving formatting information and other no need translated items in a temporary file, creating a text file that do not include images or other no-need translation items; Note, the text file without other no-need translations data corresponding to the claimed "pre-rendered content items"**);

provide one or more pre-rendered content items that do not have the localization-specific syntax to a translation management system (TMS) for translation (**[0059], submitting the filtered document to a translation server**);

receive from the TMS, at the rendering engine, one or more translated pre-rendered content items that do not have the localization-specific syntax (**[0068], receiving translated text from a translation server; Note, the translated text without formatting, images, drawings that were saved before**);

based at least in part on the one or more translated pre-rendered content items that do not have the localization-specific syntax, regenerate the localization specific syntax (**[0020], return translate results without previous stored images, drawings; retrieved previously stored images, drawings and create formatting same as before**);

generate a translated content item having the localization-specific syntax (**[0008][0020][0068], the translated text is combined with saved images, drawings to form a richly formatted translated document**); and

provide the translated content item having the localization-specific syntax to a content management system (CMS) (**[0068][0081], display a translated text together with saved images/drawings in a user's word processor application**).

Labarge discloses before submitting to a translation server, images, drawings or other no-need translation items are removed. After receiving translation results, the removed items are put back to the translation results to form a same format as original text. Although Labarge meets all limitation requirements, to advance prosecution, the examiner further cites Satake to show the claimed features are known in the prior art. Satake discloses before submit a document for translation, first removing some confidential information from the text and replaced with a place holder. After receiving translation results, these place holders are replaced with correct values (**Satake, Fig. 5, fig. 6, [0038-0041], first replacing company name, person name or sale value with a place holder, such as "ABC incorporation company". After translation, replace place holder with correct name or sale values**).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was filed to combine Labarge's teaching with Satake's teaching to substitute confidential information with a place holder and then restoring the confidential

information after translation. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a modification to keep confidential information without leaking out during a translation process (Satake, [0009]).

Regarding claims 5, 11, 19 Labarge in view of Satake further discloses he translated pre-rendered content items that do not have the localization-specific syntax are generated by human translators (**[0068], human translation**).

Regarding claims 6, 12, 20 Labarge in view of Satake further discloses wherein the translated pre-rendered content items that do not have the localization-specific syntax are generated by machine translation (**[0007], submitting to a translation server using API**).

Regarding claim 13, Labarge in view of Satake further discloses herein the content item containing localization-specific syntax is received at a rendering engine and wherein and translation management system (TMS) translates the pre-rendered content items that do not have the localization-specific syntax to generate the one or more translated pre- rendered content items that do not have the localization-specific syntax (**[0007-0008][0012], saving images, graphs or drawings into a temporary file and obtaining pre-filtered HTML text; Examiner note, "a rendering engine" is a software module for preprocessing text by removing no-need translated portions from the text**).

Regarding claim 14, Labarge in view of Satake further discloses wherein the rendering engine is further configured to perform content validation on the content item and to generate a corrected content item if errors are found in the content item (**Fig. 3, #315, spelling check for text**).

11. Claims 2-4, 8-10 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Labarge in view of Satake and further in view of Lakritz (US PG pub. 2003/0140316).

Regarding claims 2, 8 and 16, Labarge in view of Satake discloses when translating a richly formatted document, first saving the images, charts in a temporary file and removing these no-need translation items from the documents ([0007-0008]). Labarge does not explicitly disclose variable-element placeholder.

Labarge discloses translating a website and removing variable placeholder ([0062-0063], [0446-0447], *A template contains placeholders for country and language-specific information that has been removed from a document. This information is dynamically inserted from a TermDB*)

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was filed to modify Labarge's teaching with Lakritz's teaching to remove a

placeholder that is no-need to be translated. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a modification to improve translation accuracy.

Regarding claims 3, 9 and 17, Labarge in view of Satake and further in view of Lakritz further discloses wherein generating the one or more pre-rendered content items comprises replacing the localization-specific syntax with one or more generated content items based at least in part on at least one of a source language, a target language, or the localization-specific syntax (**Satake, Fig. 5 and Fig. 6, [0038-0041], first replacing a company name with "ABC company" before submitting for translation; after translation, replace translated a place holder "ABC company" to a correct company name**).

Regarding claims 4, 10 and 18, Labarge in view of Lakritz further discloses the localization-specific syntax is expressed using International Component for Unicode (ICU) MessageFormat syntax (**[0045], support all language encoding including Unicode**).

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JIALONG HE whose telephone number is (571) 270-5359. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00AM-4:30PM, ALT. Fridays, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pierre Desir can be reached on (571) 272-7799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JIALONG HE/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2659

Notice of References Cited	Application/Control No. 15/278,735	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination SEILLIER ET AL.	
	Examiner JIALONG HE	Art Unit 2659	Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	CPC Classification	US Classification
*	A	US-5,960,080 A	09-1999	Fahlman; Scott E.	G06F21/6209	380/252
*	B	US-2009/0002569 A1	01-2009	Matsukura; Ryuichi	H04N7/17318	348/721
*	C	US-2014/0163951 A1	06-2014	Nikoulina; Vassilina	G06F17/278	704/4
	D	US-				
	E	US-				
	F	US-				
	G	US-				
	H	US-				
	I	US-				
	J	US-				
	K	US-				
	L	US-				
	M	US-				

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	CPC Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.