

Attorney's Docket No.: 15685P123

Patent

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of:
Dogan, et al.

Application No. 09/967,208

Filed: 09/28/2001

Examiner: Nguyen, Dung X.

Art Unit: 2631

Customer No.: 08791

Confirmation No.: 6059

Mail Stop: Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE AND AMENDMENT TO OFFICE ACTION

Sir:

In response to the Office action of November 15, 2006, please amend the above-identified application as follows:

Amendments to the Specification begin on page 2 of this paper and a new Abstract is attached as Exhibit A hereto.

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims, which begins on page 3 of this paper.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 9 of this paper.

Amendments to the Specification

The abstract is replaced by the new abstract attached hereto as Exhibit A.

Amendments to the Claims:

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions and listings of claims in the application:

Listing of the Claims:

CLAIMS

1. (Previously Presented) A method comprising:
 - selecting a set of one or more original ordered sequences the set of ordered sequences having at least one desired property;
 - creating a set of extended sequences, each based on an original ordered sequence of the set of ordered sequences by beginning with an element of the original ordered sequence of the set of ordered sequences, cyclically appending elements of the original ordered sequence of the set of ordered sequences in order to obtain a desired extended sequence length comprising at least one subsequence, and
 - modifying each extended sequence using a corresponding modifying sequence, such that a training sequence can be generated from any one of the modified extended sequences by beginning with a first element of a subsequence of the any one modified extended sequence and taking each element of the subsequence in order to obtain the training sequence, the modifying sequence being selected so that the obtained training sequence when modulated by a selected modulation format has the at least one desired property of the corresponding original ordered sequence.
2. (Cancelled).

3. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the one desired property comprises a function of the autocorrelation of any original ordered sequence of the set of original ordered sequences being below a threshold value.

4. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the original ordered sequences have a cross-correlation property further comprising generating further training sequences from the any one modified extended sequence by beginning with other elements of the any one modified extended sequence and wherein the modifying sequence is selected so that the training sequence and the further training sequences when modulated by the selected modulation format have the cross-correlation property.

5. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the one desired property comprises a function of the cross-correlation of any original sequence in the set of original sequences with any other original sequence in the set of original training sequences being below a threshold value.

6. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the original sequence comprises a sequence of complex numbers corresponding to phase shifts employed by the modulation format used to transmit the training sequence.

7. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the modifying sequence comprises a sequence of complex numbers, and forming the modified extended sequence comprises multiplying each element of the extended sequence by a corresponding element of the modifying sequence.

8. (Original) The method of claim 7, wherein the modulation format is a π/M – MPSK modulation format.

9. **(Currently Amended)** The method of claim 8, wherein the modifying sequence comprises pairs of equal complex numbers, such that each complex number pair is equal to the previous complex number pair multiplied by ~~$\exp(j2\pi/M)$~~ **$\exp(2\pi/M)$** .

10. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the modulation format is a $\pi/2$ – 2PSK modulation format.

11. (Original) The method of claim 10, wherein the original sequence comprises a sequence of binary symbols.

12. (Original) The method of claim 11, wherein the modifying sequence performs a binary complement operation on every other pair of elements of the extended sequence.

13. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein selecting a set of original ordered sequences comprises selecting a family of Gold sequences.

14. – 17. (Cancelled)

18. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the at least one subsequence has a length at least as great as the original sequence.

19. (Previously Presented) An apparatus comprising:

a data store having stored therein a plurality of ordered sequences for use in generating a training sequence; and

a processor to generate the training sequence by taking and modifying a number of elements of one of the plurality of ordered sequences, wherein a function of an autocorrelation of the training sequence is below a threshold value.

20. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 19, further comprising the processor to generate another training sequence by taking a number of elements of another of the plurality of ordered sequences, wherein the cross correlation of the another training sequence with the training sequence is below a threshold value.

21. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 19, wherein the length of the plurality of ordered sequences is the length of the training sequence plus the index of the element of one of the plurality of training sequences which is the initial element of the training sequence.

22. **(Currently Amended)** A computer readable medium ~~having~~ **encoded with computer executable** instructions which, when executed by a processing system, cause the system to:

select a set of one or more original ordered sequences the set of ordered sequences having at least one desired property;

modify each original ordered sequence of the set of ordered sequences using a corresponding modifying sequence to obtain a set of training sequences, such that the obtained training sequences when modulated by a selected modulation format have the at least one desired property of the corresponding original ordered sequence.

23. (Previously Presented) The computer readable medium of claim 22, wherein the one desired property comprises a function of the autocorrelation of any original ordered sequence of the set of original ordered sequences being below a threshold value.

24. (Previously Presented) The computer readable medium of claim 22, wherein the one desired property comprises a function of the cross-correlation of any two of the original ordered sequences being below a threshold value.

25. (Previously Presented) The computer readable medium of claim 22, wherein the modifying sequence comprises a sequence of complex numbers, and forming the training sequence comprises multiplying each element of the original sequence by a corresponding element of the modifying sequence.

REMARKS

Claims 9 and 22 are amended. No other claims are amended, canceled, or added. Thus, claims 1, 3-13, and 18-25 are pending. Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is requested in light of the amendments and the following remarks.

Summary of Interview with the Examiner

On January 23, 2007, Applicants' patent attorney Jose R. Mata sent a fax to Examiner Leila Malek requesting an interview to discuss the Shattil reference (U.S. Patent Publication 2004/041548) ("Shattil") which is relied upon for Section 102(e) rejections in the Office Action of November 15, 2006. The fax stated as follows:

I would like to request an interview to discuss the Shattil (U.S. Patent Publication 2004/041548) which is relied upon in the recent office action of November 15, 2006. Shattil has a filing date of December 8, 2003, which is after our filing date of September 28, 2001.

Shattil states it is a continuation in part of application no. 09/906,257, now U.S. Patent 6,686,789 (filed July 16, 2001). Shattil also relies on provisional no 60/219,482, which apparently was filed July 19, 2000.

However, with respect to at least paragraphs [0067], [0014] and [0082-0083] and Fig. 12, of Shattil which are cited against the independent claims, I have not found any support for that subject matter in either the parent U.S. Patent 6,686,789 or the provisional 60/219,482.

I would like an interview to discuss where the Office believes such support might exist in either the parent reference or the provisional on which Shattil relies for its priority date. Our response is due February 15, 2007.

Jose Mata conferred by telephone with Examiner Leila Malek on January 23, 2007.

Examiner Malek stated that even if the Shattil reference is not supported by the parent application or the provisional application, Applicants would still need to file a response pointing out the lack of support.

At that time, Examiner Malek had not yet received the above fax. It was agreed that Examiner Malek would review the fax and confer further regarding whether the specific paragraphs of Shattil discussed in the fax are supported by the parent patent and the provisional application.

Jose Mata conferred by telephone with Examiner Malek again on February 7, 2007. There was agreement that there was no support for paragraphs [0067], [0014] and [0082-0083] and Fig. 12 of Shattil in either the parent U.S. Patent 6,686,789 or provisional application no. 60/219,482. Applicant would file a response noting the lack of support.

Examiner Malek stated that claims 19 and 20 appear too broad and recommended narrowing these claims. A new search would be needed if these claims retained their current breadth. No agreement was reached on narrowing these claims.

Objection to the Abstract

The Office Action of November 15, 2006 (“Office Action”) objects to the Abstract as exceeding the 150-word limit. (Office Action, p. 2). Applicant amends the Abstract to bring it within the limit. The replacement Abstract is attached as Exhibit A hereto. Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the Abstract be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

The Office objects to language in claim 9 as being inconsistent with the specification. (Office Action, p.2). Specifically, the Office contends that claim 9 recites an extended sequence such that “each complex number pair is equal to the previous complex number pair multiplied by $\exp(j2\pi/M)$.” In contrast, page 19, line 1 of the specification states that the previous complex number pair is multiplied by “ $\exp(2\pi/M)$.”

Applicant amends claim 9 to be consistent with the above portion of the specification and therefore respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1, 3-13 and 18

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-13 and 18 under Section 101 as “directed to non-statutory subject matter, because as a whole it does not accomplish a practical application.” (Office Action, p. 3). The Office Action further asserts that, “Applicant in claim 1 does not cite any use for the generated training signal. Therefore the claim lacks practical application.” *Id.*

Applicants assert that the above claims do recite subject matter that has a practical application. Independent claim 1 recites generating a training sequence: “such that a training sequence can be generated” Training sequences have a well-known utility in the communications industry. This utility is discussed in the specification:

For synchronization and calibration purposes, each burst includes a training sequence. The training sequence contains a known symbol set transmitted for quality control purposes. Since the data or symbol sequence is known, the characteristics of the received signal can be accurately measured and interpreted. Training sequences can be used for computing spatial and temporal filter weights at a base station in order to reduce intersymbol interference and co-channel interference, and increase the signal to noise ratio.

(Specification, p. 2, ¶ [0002]).

Thus, the generated training sequences of claim 1 have a practical application. Therefore, claim 1 recites subject matter with a useful, concrete and tangible result. Claim 1 thus recites statutory subject matter. *Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility* (“Interim Guidelines”), p. 1, citing

State Street Band & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc., 149 F.3d 1368, 1373-74 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

The practical application of the recited training signals does not need to be recited in the claim itself. The description of the practical application may be in the detailed description of the specification. The MPEP states that, “USPTO personnel should review **the application** to identify any asserted use.” MPEP § 2106(II)(A)(Emphasis added). The “application” that must be reviewed “to identify any asserted use” clearly includes the specification.

The MPEP further states that, “USPTO personnel should review the totality of the evidence (e.g., **the specification**, the claims, relevant prior art) before reaching a conclusion with regard to whether the claimed subject invention sets forth patent eligible subject matter.” MPEP § 2106(IV)(D)(Emphasis added). “The Examiner bears the initial burden . . . of presenting a *prima facie* case of unpatentability.” *Id.*, quoting *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Here, no *prima facie* case of unpatentability has been presented.

Instead, claim 1 recites generating training signals, which are well-known to have a practical application. Claim 1 therefore recites statutory subject matter. Dependent claims 3-13 and 18 are deemed to recite this same statutory subject matter. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Section 101 rejections of claims 1, 3-13, and 18 be withdrawn.

Claims 22-25

The Office Action rejects claims 22-25 under Section 101 as purportedly not accomplishing a practical application. (Office Action, p. 3). However, independent claim 22 recites obtaining a set of training sequences. For the reasons discussed above

regarding claims 1, 3-13, and 18, Applicants assert that claims 22-25 recite statutory subject matter.

The rejection of claim 22 is supported by an argument against the word “having” in the claim preamble, “a computer-readable medium having instructions.” (Office Action, p. 3). The word “having” is considered ambiguous. *Id.* The Office suggests the use of “a computer readable medium encoded with computer executable instructions” instead. Independent claim 22 is so amended. Thus, Applicants believe that the Section 101 rejections of claims 22-25 are obviated and respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e)

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 6-8, 10-12, 18, 22, and 25 under Section 102(e) as anticipated by Shattil – which is discussed above under the heading “Summary of Interview with the Examiner.” As discussed above, Shattil has a filing date of December 8, 2003, which is after the September 28, 2001 filing date of the current application. Further, as discussed above, the Office concedes that at least paragraphs [0014], [0067], [0082-0083], and Fig. 12 of Shattil are not supported by either the parent U.S. Patent 6,686,789 or provisional application no. 60/219,482. Thus, at least these paragraphs and Fig. 12 of Shattil may not be used to support rejection of the current application under Section 102(e). In making this argument, Applicants do not admit that any of the above paragraphs or Fig. 12 teaches or suggests any subject matter recited by the claims of the current application.

Reviewing the rejections of the independent claims, Applicants note that paragraphs [0014], [0067], and [0082-0083] of Shattil are cited to reject various limitations of independent claim 1. For example, [0067] is the only portion of Shattil that

is cited as describing, “that a training sequence may be generated from any one of the modified extended sequences by beginning with the first element of a subsequence of the any one modified extended sequence and taking each element of the sequence in order to obtain the training sequence.” (Office Action, p. 4, ¶ 5). Thus, Shattil cannot teach at least the above limitation of claim 1. Shattil therefore does not anticipate independent claim 1.

The Office Action cites paragraphs [0014], [0067], and paragraphs [0082-0083] to reject various limitations of independent claim 22. (Office Action, p. 6). For example, Shattil paragraphs [0014] and [0082-0083] are the only paragraphs cited as describing, “modify each original ordered sequence of the set of ordered sequences using a corresponding modifying sequence (shaping of the prefix and postfix has been interpreted as modifying the sequence).” *Id.* Further, paragraph [0067] is the only authority cited as describing, “to obtain a set of training sequences.” *Id.* Thus, Shattil cannot teach at least the above limitations of claim 22. Shattil therefore does not anticipate independent claim 22.

Dependent claims 6-8, 10-12, 18, and 25 each depend from one of independent claims 1 and 22. These dependent claims are deemed to recite the subject matter of their respective independent claim. Therefore, dependent claims 6-8, 10-12, 18, and 25 are also not anticipated by Shattil. *See*, MPEP § 2143.03.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 3, 4, 5, 13, 19, 20, 21, and 23-24 under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shattil in view of Engstrom et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,909,436) (“Engstrom”). Applicants assert that for at least the reasons stated below, the above claims are not rendered obvious by the combination of Shattil and Engstrom.

As discussed above, Fig. 12 of Shattil may not be used to reject claims of the current application. Turning first to the rejection of independent claim 19, the Office cites only Fig. 12, blocks 1210 and 1212 of Shattil as describing a claimed “processor to generate the training sequence by taking and modifying a number of elements of one of the plurality of ordered sequences.” (Office Action, p. 8). However, as discussed above, Fig. 12 of Shattil cannot be relied upon as teaching any limitations of the current application.

Also, Engstrom is not cited as teaching or suggesting the above limitation. Instead, Engstrom is cited as describing “that a function of an autocorrelation of the training sequence is below a threshold value.” (Office Action, p. 9).

Thus, the combination of Shattil and Engstrom cannot teach or suggest at least the above limitation of claim 19. Therefore, claim 19 is not rendered obvious by the combination of Shattil and Engstrom.

Dependent claims 3, 4, 5, 13, 20, 21, and 23-24 depend from one of independent claims 1, 19, and 22. As discussed above, claim 19 is not rendered obvious by the combination of Shattil and Engstrom. Further, Shattil cannot teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 1 and 22. Nor is Engstrom cited as describing any of the limitations of claims 1 and 22. Therefore, claims 1 and 22 are not rendered obvious by the combination of Shattil and Engstrom. Dependent claims 3, 4, 5, 13, 20, 21, and 23-24 are thus also not rendered obvious by the combination of Shattil and Engstrom. MPEP § 2143.03.

-16-
CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance and request reconsideration. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Jose Mata at (503) 439-8778.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: February 14, 2007

/Jose R. Mata/

Jose R. Mata
Reg. No. 56,978

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 947-8200

ABSTRACT OF THE INVENTION

~~The present invention efficiently stores~~ Some embodiments store a
training sequence in a communications system[[,]]. ~~where the~~ The stored
training sequence exhibits certain desirable characteristics when used by a peak
to average power constrained modulation format. In one embodiment,~~the~~
~~invention includes selecting a set of one or more original ordered sequences is~~
selected to have such that the set of ordered sequences has at least one desired
property[[,]]. ~~creating a~~ A set of extended sequences, each based on an original
~~ordered sequence is created from the original sequences by beginning with an~~
element of an original sequence[[,]]and cyclically appending elements of the
original sequence in order to obtain a desired extended sequence length[[,]]. ~~and~~
~~modifying each~~ Each extended sequence is modified using a corresponding
modifying sequence, such that a training sequence can be generated from any
one of the modified extended sequences. ~~by beginning with any one element of~~
~~any one modified extended sequence and taking each element of the any one~~
~~sequence in order to obtain the training sequence, the~~ Each modifying sequence
~~being~~ is selected so that the obtained generated training sequence when
modulated by a selected modulation format has the at least one desired property
of the corresponding original ordered sequence.

Clean copy:

Some embodiments store a training sequence in a communications system. The stored training sequence exhibits certain desirable characteristics when used by a peak to average power constrained modulation format. In one embodiment, a set of original ordered sequences is selected to have at least one desired property. A set of extended sequences is created from the original sequences by beginning with an element of an original sequence and cyclically appending elements of the original sequence in order to obtain a desired extended sequence length. Each extended sequence is modified using a corresponding modifying sequence, such that a training sequence can be generated from any one of the modified extended sequences. Each modifying sequence is selected so that the generated training sequence when modulated by a selected modulation format has the at least one desired property of the corresponding original ordered sequence.

Electronic Acknowledgement Receipt

EFS ID:	1515386
Application Number:	09967208
International Application Number:	
Confirmation Number:	6059
Title of Invention:	Method and apparatus for efficient storage of training sequences for peak to average power constrained modulation formats
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	Mithat C. Dogan
Customer Number:	45222
Filer:	Jose R. Mata./Gayle Bekish
Filer Authorized By:	Jose R. Mata.
Attorney Docket Number:	015685.P123
Receipt Date:	14-FEB-2007
Filing Date:	28-SEP-2001
Time Stamp:	13:49:28
Application Type:	Utility

Payment information:

Submitted with Payment	no
------------------------	----

File Listing:

Document Number	Document Description	File Name	File Size(Bytes)	Multi Part /.zip	Pages (if appl.)
1	Amendment - After Non-Final Rejection	P123_RESPONSE_021407.pdf	223491	no	18

Warnings:

--

Information:**Total Files Size (in bytes):**

223491

This Acknowledgement Receipt evidences receipt on the noted date by the USPTO of the indicated documents, characterized by the applicant, and including page counts, where applicable. It serves as evidence of receipt similar to a Post Card, as described in MPEP 503.

New Applications Under 35 U.S.C. 111

If a new application is being filed and the application includes the necessary components for a filing date (see 37 CFR 1.53(b)-(d) and MPEP 506), a Filing Receipt (37 CFR 1.54) will be issued in due course and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the filing date of the application.

National Stage of an International Application under 35 U.S.C. 371

If a timely submission to enter the national stage of an international application is compliant with the conditions of 35 U.S.C. 371 and other applicable requirements a Form PCT/DO/EO/903 indicating acceptance of the application as a national stage submission under 35 U.S.C. 371 will be issued in addition to the Filing Receipt, in due course.

New International Application Filed with the USPTO as a Receiving Office

If a new international application is being filed and the international application includes the necessary components for an international filing date (see PCT Article 11 and MPEP 1810), a Notification of the International Application Number and of the International Filing Date (Form PCT/RO/105) will be issued in due course, subject to prescriptions concerning national security, and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the international filing date of the application.

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PATENT APPLICATION FEE DETERMINATION RECORD Substitute for Form PTO-875	Application or Docket Number 09/967,208	Filing Date 09/28/2001	<input type="checkbox"/> To be Mailed
---	---	----------------------------------	---------------------------------------

APPLICATION AS FILED – PART I			OTHER THAN SMALL ENTITY				
	(Column 1)	(Column 2)	SMALL ENTITY <input type="checkbox"/>	OR			
FOR	NUMBER FILED	NUMBER EXTRA	RATE (\$)	FEE (\$)	OR	RATE (\$)	FEE (\$)
<input type="checkbox"/> BASIC FEE <small>(37 CFR 1.16(a), (b), or (c))</small>	N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A	
<input type="checkbox"/> SEARCH FEE <small>(37 CFR 1.16(k), (l), or (m))</small>	N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A	
<input type="checkbox"/> EXAMINATION FEE <small>(37 CFR 1.16(o), (p), or (q))</small>	N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A	
TOTAL CLAIMS <small>(37 CFR 1.16(i))</small>	minus 20 =	*	X \$ =		OR	X \$ =	
INDEPENDENT CLAIMS <small>(37 CFR 1.16(h))</small>	minus 3 =	*	X \$ =			X \$ =	
<input type="checkbox"/> APPLICATION SIZE FEE <small>(37 CFR 1.16(s))</small>	If the specification and drawings exceed 100 sheets of paper, the application size fee due is \$250 (\$125 for small entity) for each additional 50 sheets or fraction thereof. See 35 U.S.C. 41(a)(1)(G) and 37 CFR 1.16(s).						
<input type="checkbox"/> MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM PRESENT <small>(37 CFR 1.16(j))</small>							
			TOTAL			TOTAL	

* If the difference in column 1 is less than zero, enter "0" in column 2.

APPLICATION AS AMENDED – PART II					OTHER THAN SMALL ENTITY				
	(Column 1)	(Column 2)	(Column 3)		SMALL ENTITY	OR			
AMENDMENT	02/14/2007	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA	RATE (\$)	ADDITIONAL FEE (\$)	OR	RATE (\$)	ADDITIONAL FEE (\$)
	Total (37 CFR 1.16(i))	* 20	Minus ** 20	= 0	X \$ =		OR	X \$50=	0
	Independent (37 CFR 1.16(h))	* 3	Minus ***3	= 0	X \$ =		OR	X \$200=	0
	<input type="checkbox"/> Application Size Fee (37 CFR 1.16(s))								
	<input type="checkbox"/> FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM (37 CFR 1.16(j))						OR		
					TOTAL ADD'L FEE		OR	TOTAL ADD'L FEE	0

	(Column 1)	(Column 2)	(Column 3)		SMALL ENTITY	OR			
AMENDMENT		CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA	RATE (\$)	ADDITIONAL FEE (\$)	OR	RATE (\$)	ADDITIONAL FEE (\$)
	Total (37 CFR 1.16(i))	*	Minus **	=	X \$ =		OR	X \$ =	
	Independent (37 CFR 1.16(h))	*	Minus ***	=	X \$ =		OR	X \$ =	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Application Size Fee (37 CFR 1.16(s))								
	<input type="checkbox"/> FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM (37 CFR 1.16(j))						OR		
					TOTAL ADD'L FEE		OR	TOTAL ADD'L FEE	

* If the entry in column 1 is less than the entry in column 2, write "0" in column 3.
 ** If the "Highest Number Previously Paid For" IN THIS SPACE is less than 20, enter "20".
 *** If the "Highest Number Previously Paid For" IN THIS SPACE is less than 3, enter "3".

Legal Instrument Examiner:
CORALIA -. BETANCOURT

The "Highest Number Previously Paid For" (Total or Independent) is the highest number found in the appropriate box in column 1.

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.16. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. **SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.