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.
12/033,431	02/19/2008	Claudia R. Morris	CHOR-029	6322

24353 7590 12/06/2011

BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP
1900 UNIVERSITY AVENUE
SUITE 200
EAST PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER
MACAULEY, SHERIDAN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1653	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/06/2011	PAPER

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.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	12/033,431	MORRIS, CLAUDIA R.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	SHERIDAN MACAULEY	1653

-- 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* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, 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 *19 July 2011*.

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

3)☐ 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

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *18-25* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-17 and 26-31* is/are rejected.

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

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

Application Papers

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

10)☐ 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).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

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).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

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)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

A response and amendment were received and entered on July 19, 2011. All evidence and arguments have been fully considered. Claim 2 has been canceled. New claim 32 has been added. Claims 1 and 3-32 are pending. Claims 18-25 are withdrawn due to a previous requirement for restriction/election. Claims 1, 3-17 and 26-32 are examined on the merits in this Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> 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.

Claims 1, 3-17 and 26-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are rendered indefinite by the recitation of "the DHA is EPA is present in an amount of..." in the twelfth line of the claim. It is unclear whether applicant intends to recite that the DHA is present as EPA, that EPA and DHA are present in the amount recited, or that EPA alone is present in the amount recited. Thus, the metes and bounds of the claims would be unclear to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. Rejections under 35 USC 102 are withdrawn due to amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1, 3-13, 15-17 and 26-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ernest (US 2005/0070498; reference cited in IDS) in view of Dreon et al. (US 2004/0048919) and Chilton et al. (US 2006/0052446). Claim 1 recites a dietary

formulation comprising: a) eicosapentaenoic acid (EPA); b) docosohexaenoic acid (DHA); c) alpha-tocopherol; and d) gamma-tocopherol; e) beta-tocopherol, delta-tocopherol, alpha-tocotrienol, beta-tocotrienol, gamma-tocotrienol, and delta-tocotrienol; and f) glutamine, wherein the ratio of EPA to DHA is in a range of from about 1.5:1 to about 5:1, wherein the alpha tocopherol is present in an amount of from 500 mg to about 3000 mg per unit dose, wherein the gamma-tocopherol is present in an amount of from about 200 mg to about 1000 mg per unit dose, wherein the EPA is present in an amount of from about 500 mg to about 3000 mg per unit dose, wherein the DHA is EPA is present in an amount of from about 100 mg to about 400 mg per unit dose, and wherein the glutamine is present in an amount of from about 500 mg to about 750 mg per unit dose. Claim 3 recites the formulation, further comprising alpha-lipoic acid in an amount of from about 50 mg to about 600 mg per unit dose. Claim 4 recites the formulation, further comprising carnitine in an amount of from about 200 mg to about 3000 mg per unit dose. Claims 5 and 6 recite the formulation, further comprising an omega-6 fatty acid, wherein the omega-6 fatty acid is .gamma.-linolenic acid. Claims 7 and 8 recite the formulation, further comprising an omega-9 fatty acid, wherein the omega-9 fatty acid is oleic acid. Claim 9 recites the formulation, further comprising vitamin C in an amount of from about 200 mg to about 500 mg. Claim 10 recites the formulation, further comprising vitamin K. Claim 11 recites the formulation, further comprising phosphocholine. Claim 12 recites the formulation, further comprising zinc. Claim 13 recites the formulation, further comprising one or more additional components selected from coenzyme Q, selenium, vitamin A, vitamin B1, riboflavin, vitamin B6,

vitamin B2, vitamin D, arginine, calcium, magnesium, vitamin B7, vitamin B9, vitamin B5, tetrahydrobiopterin, and vitamin B3. Claim 15 recites the formulation, further comprising a leukotriene inhibitor. Claim 16 recites the formulation, wherein the formulation is in a dosage form selected from a tablet, a capsule, a powder, a gel, and a liquid. Claim 17 recites the formulation, further comprising one or more food-grade components. Claim 26 recites the formulation, further comprising an antioxidant. Claim 27 recites the formulation, further comprising an anti-inflammatory agent. Claims 28 and 29 recite the formulation, further comprising an amino acid, wherein the formulation comprises arginine, glutamine or both. Claim 30 recites the formulation, further comprising and anti-fungal agent. Claim 31 recites that the beta-tocopherol, delta-tocopherol, alpha-tocotrienol, beta-tocotrienol, gamma-tocotrienol and delta- tocotrienol are each present in an amount of from about 5 mg to about 2000 mg per unit dose. Claim 32 recites that a unit dose of the formulation is effective to treat an autism spectrum disorder and/or apraxia.

6. Ernest teaches a dietary composition comprising EPA, DHA, alpha-tocopherol and gamma-tocopherol (abstract, p. 1, par. 10, p. 2, par. 18). The reference teaches that the composition should be formulated so that the ratio of EPA to other fatty acids is at least 2:1 and particularly teaches the use of menhaden oil as the source of fatty acids, which has a EPA:DHA ratio of about 4:1 (i.e., 14.5% EPA: 3.6% DHA; p. 2, par. 18, p. 3, par. 31). Ernest teaches that the compositions may comprise 0.5 to 7 g of the fatty acids (p. 2, par. 17; note that 14.5% of 7 g is about 1000 mg EPA and 3.6% of 7 g is about 250 mg DHA). Ernest teaches that the compositions may comprise glutamine

and arginine and that the glutamine may be present at an amount of 1.5 g per a 240 kcal dose (p. 1, par. 8). The reference teaches that the compositions may further comprise alpha-lipoic acid in an amount of 125 mg per dose (p. 5, par. 93), carnitine in an amount of 280 mg per dose (p. 4, par. 61), gamma-lineolic acid (p. 1, par. 10), oleic acid (p. 3, par. 29), vitamin C in an amount of 240 mg per dose (p. 4, par. 50), vitamin K (p. 4, par. 64), phosphocholine (as lecithin; p. 4, par. 76), zinc (p. 4, par. 52), vitamin A (an antioxidant, p. 3, par. 48), an anti-inflammatory (such as fish oil; p. 3, par. 31), and alpha-, beta-, gamma- and delta-tocopherols and tocotrienols (p. 4, par. 49). The reference teaches that the composition may be administered orally and therefore would comprise a food-grade component (p. 6, claims 17-18). Ernest does not teach that the compositions comprise the specific amounts of tocopherols and tocotrienols recited in the claims, or that the composition comprises a leukotriene inhibitor or an antifungal agent. The reference does not specifically that the compositions are formulated as a tablet, capsule, powder, gel or liquid.

7. Dreon teaches compositions for the treatment of inflammatory symptoms, wherein the compositions comprise fatty acids such as DHA and EPA and alpha-, beta-, gamma- and delta-tocopherols and tocotrienols (abstract, pp. 2-3, par. 19-20, p. 6, par. 60-71). The reference teaches the use of alpha-, beta-, gamma- and delta-tocopherols and tocotrienols at amounts of from about 50 mg to about 2000 mg per unit dose (p. 6, par. 70-71, p. 14, par. 158). Dreon teaches that the compositions comprise tocopherol formulations comprising less than 50% alpha-tocopherol and at least 60% gamma-tocopherol and also teaches compositions comprising, for example, 1500 mg of

tocopherol per unit dose (p. 6, par. 70, p. 14, par. 158); thus, the reference teaches compositions that may comprise, for example, about 900 mg of gamma-tocopherol and about 750 mg of alpha-tocopherol. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the amounts of tocopherols taught by Dreon in the compositions of Ernest because Dreon teaches that the elevated amounts of tocopherols are beneficial because they have CRP-lowering activity, which indicates a reduction in inflammation (p. 1, par. 2, pp. 7-8, par. 82); since the Ernest reference is directed to the treatment of disorders, including inflammatory disorders, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the amounts of tocopherols could have been increased to the levels recited in Dreon in the compositions of Ernest. One of ordinary skill in the art could have prepared a composition with these components with a reasonable expectation of success because the components taught by the references were known to be capable of use in a variety of formulations.

8. Chilton teaches dietary compositions comprising fatty acids, such as EPA, DHA and gamma-lineolic acid (GLA; abstract, p. 25, par. 230). The reference teaches that GLA acts as a leukotriene inhibitor (p. 28, claims 5 and 6). Thus, since Ernest teaches that GLA is an important component of the composition taught therein (p. 2, par. 16-17), the composition of Ernest would inherently comprise a leukotriene inhibitor.

9. Further, Chilton teaches that the compositions are administered in a palatable liquid or powder form (abstract). Since Ernest teaches that the dietary compositions taught therein should be administered orally and that they should be prepared as a component of a patient's diet (p. 2, par. 13-14), one of ordinary skill in the art would

have been motivated to prepare the compositions of Ernest in the palatable forms disclosed by Chilton. Chilton also teaches that the compositions are formulated to comprise antifungals (p. 10, par. 95, p. 11, par. 108); one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine an antifungal with the composition taught by Ernest because Chilton that antifungals were known to be common and desirable preservative components for the addition to pharmaceutical preparations. Further, although the reference does not teach the exact concentration glutamine recited in the claims, Ernest teaches that the composition is given in a dosage that is suitable for the dietary needs of the patient; thus, the specific amount that is given in a dose may be varied and a dose that meets the claimed conditions could have been arrived upon in the course of routine experimentation. Also, since the prior art teaches all of the elements of the claimed invention, the composition of the prior art would be effective for the intended use recited in the claims. One of ordinary skill in the art would have a reasonable expectation of success in combining the teachings of the prior art to arrive at the claimed invention because the references each disclose similar dietary compositions that are compatible with a wide range of components. It would therefore have been obvious to combine the teachings of the prior art to arrive at the claimed invention.

10. Claims 1, 3-14, 17, 26-29, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ernest (US 2005/0070498; reference cited in IDS) in view of Dreon et al. (US 2004/0048919) and Girsh (US 2005/0260181 A1).

Claim 1 recites a dietary formulation comprising: a) eicosapentaenoic acid (EPA); b) docosohexaenoic acid (DHA); c) alpha-tocopherol; and d) gamma-tocopherol; e) beta-tocopherol, delta-tocopherol, alpha-tocotrienol, beta-tocotrienol, gamma-tocotrienol, and delta-tocotrienol; and f) glutamine, wherein the ratio of EPA to DHA is in a range of from about 1.5:1 to about 5:1, wherein the alpha tocopherol is present in an amount of from 500 mg to about 3000 mg per unit dose, wherein the gamma-tocopherol is present in an amount of from about 200 mg to about 1000 mg per unit dose, wherein the EPA is present in an amount of from about 500 mg to about 3000 mg per unit dose, wherein the DHA is EPA is present in an amount of from about 100 mg to about 400 mg per unit dose, and wherein the glutamine is present in an amount of from about 500 mg to about 750 mg per unit dose. Claim 3 recites the formulation, further comprising alpha-lipoic acid in an amount of from about 50 mg to about 600 mg per unit dose. Claim 4 recites the formulation, further comprising carnitine in an amount of from about 200 mg to about 3000 mg per unit dose. Claims 5 and 6 recite the formulation, further comprising an omega-6 fatty acid, wherein the omega-6 fatty acid is .gamma.-linolenic acid. Claims 7 and 8 recite the formulation, further comprising an omega-9 fatty acid, wherein the omega-9 fatty acid is oleic acid. Claim 9 recites the formulation, further comprising vitamin C in an amount of from about 200 mg to about 500 mg. Claim 10 recites the formulation, further comprising vitamin K. Claim 11 recites the formulation, further comprising phosphocholine. Claim 12 recites the formulation, further comprising zinc. Claim 13 recites the formulation, further comprising one or more additional components selected from coenzyme Q, selenium, vitamin A, vitamin B1, riboflavin, vitamin B6,

vitamin B2, vitamin D, arginine, calcium, magnesium, vitamin B7, vitamin B9, vitamin B5, tetrahydrobiopterin, and vitamin B3. Claim 14 recites the formulation, further comprising a pancreatic enzyme. Claim 17 recites the formulation, further comprising one or more food-grade components. Claim 26 recites the formulation, further comprising an antioxidant. Claim 27 recites the formulation, further comprising an anti-inflammatory agent. Claims 28 and 29 recite the formulation, further comprising an amino acid, wherein the formulation comprises arginine, glutamine or both. Claim 31 recites that the beta-tocopherol, delta-tocopherol, alpha-tocotrienol, beta-tocotrienol, gamma-tocotrienol and delta- tocotrienol are each present in an amount of from about 5 mg to about 2000 mg per unit dose. Claim 32 recites that a unit dose of the formulation is effective to treat an autism spectrum disorder and/or apraxia.

11. Ernest teaches a dietary composition comprising EPA, DHA, alpha-tocopherol and gamma-tocopherol (abstract, p. 1, par. 10, p. 2, par. 18). The reference teaches that the composition should be formulated so that the ratio of EPA to other fatty acids is at least 2:1 and particularly teaches the use of menhaden oil as the source of fatty acids, which has a EPA:DHA ratio of about 4:1 (i.e., 14.5% EPA: 3.6% DHA; p. 2, par. 18, p. 3, par. 31). Ernest teaches that the compositions may comprise 0.5 to 7 g of the fatty acids (p. 2, par. 17; note that 14.5% of 7 g is about 1000 mg EPA and 3.6% of 7 g is about 250 mg DHA). Ernest teaches that the compositions may comprise glutamine and arginine and that the glutamine may be present at an amount of 1.5 g per a 240 kcal dose (p. 1, par. 8). The reference teaches that the compositions may further comprise alpha-lipoic acid in an amount of 125 mg per dose (p. 5, par. 93), carnitine in

an amount of 280 mg per dose (p. 4, par. 61), gamma-lineolic acid (p. 1, par. 10), oleic acid (p. 3, par. 29), vitamin C in an amount of 240 mg per dose (p. 4, par. 50), vitamin K (p. 4, par. 64), phosphocholine (as lecithin; p. 4, par. 76), zinc (p. 4, par. 52), vitamin A (an antioxidant, p. 3, par. 48), an anti-inflammatory (such as fish oil; p. 3, par. 31), and alpha-, beta-, gamma- and delta-tocopherols and tocotrienols (p. 4, par. 49). The reference teaches that the composition may be administered orally and therefore would comprise a food-grade component (p. 6, claims 17-18). Ernest does not teach that the compositions comprise the specific amounts of tocopherols and tocotrienols recited in the claims, or that the composition comprises a leukotriene inhibitor or an antifungal agent. The reference does not specifically that the compositions are formulated as a tablet, capsule, powder, gel or liquid.

12. Dreon teaches compositions for the treatment of inflammatory symptoms, wherein the compositions comprise fatty acids such as DHA and EPA and alpha-, beta-, gamma- and delta-tocopherols and tocotrienols (abstract, pp. 2-3, par. 19-20, p. 6, par. 60-71). The reference teaches the use of alpha-, beta-, gamma- and delta-tocopherols and tocotrienols at amounts of from about 50 mg to about 2000 mg per unit dose (p. 6, par. 70-71, p. 14, par. 158). Dreon teaches that the compositions comprise tocopherol formulations comprising less than 50% alpha-tocopherol and at least 60% gamma-tocopherol and also teaches compositions comprising, for example, 1500 mg of tocopherol per unit dose (p. 6, par. 70, p. 14, par. 158); thus, the reference teaches compositions that may comprise, for example, about 900 mg of gamma-tocopherol and about 750 mg of alpha-tocopherol. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to use the amounts of tocopherols taught by Dreon in the compositions of Ernest because Dreon teaches that the elevated amounts of tocopherols are beneficial because they have CRP-lowering activity, which indicates a reduction in inflammation (p. 1, par. 2, pp. 7-8, par. 82); since the Ernest reference is directed to the treatment of disorders, including inflammatory disorders, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the amounts of tocopherols could have been increased to the levels recited in Dreon in the compositions of Ernest. One of ordinary skill in the art could have prepared a composition with these components with a reasonable expectation of success because the components taught by the references were known to be capable of use in a variety of formulations. However, the references do not specifically teach that the compositions comprise a pancreatic enzyme.

13. Girsh teaches therapeutic compositions for the treatment of Crohn's disease, comprising omega-3 fatty acids, such as EPA, and pancreatic enzymes (abstract, p. 10, par. 103-104, p. 12, par. 123-125). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated at the time of the invention to include a pancreatic enzyme in the composition of Ernest because Girsh teaches that the combination of the components taught therein are beneficial for the treatment of Crohn's disease, which is an inflammatory disorder (p. 12, par. 127), and Ernest teaches that the compositions may be formulated as a treatment for inflammatory disorders such Crohn's disease (p. 1, par. 12). One would therefore conclude that the pancreatic enzymes of Girsh would be beneficial to add to the compositions of Ernest and would have been able to formulate a composition comprising the two components a reasonable expectation of success. Further, although

the reference does not teach the exact concentration glutamine recited in the claims, Ernest teaches that the composition is given in a dosage that is suitable for the dietary needs of the patient; thus, the specific amount that is given in a dose may be varied and a dose that meets the claimed conditions could have been arrived upon in the course of routine experimentation. Also, since the prior art teaches all of the elements of the claimed invention, the composition of the prior art would be effective for the intended use recited in the claims. It would therefore have been obvious to combine the teachings of the prior art to arrive at the claimed invention.

14. Thus, the claimed invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious over the combined teachings of the prior art.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed July 19, 2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the claimed invention is not rendered obvious by the cited prior art because the prior art does not teach certain features of the claimed invention. This is not found to be persuasive, however, because the features to which applicant refers are rendered obvious by the prior art. Specifically, although applicant argues that the prior art does not teach formulations comprising the claimed amounts of tocopherols, EPA and DHA or glutamine, these features are found in the references. As discussed in the rejections above, it would have been obvious to use the amounts of tocopherols recited in the claims because these amounts are taught by the Dreon

reference. Further, the amounts of EPA and DHA recited in the claims are taught by Ernest. It would have been obvious to combine these references to arrive at the claimed invention for the reasons set forth above. The Ernest reference further teaches that the compositions may comprise about 1.5 grams of glutamine per 240 kcal dose and that the dosages may be adapted to any caloric concentration desired (p. 2, par. 14); thus, the reference teaches that the formulation may be given in a smaller dosage, such as one that would meet the claim limitations. Therefore, the features of the invention to which applicant refers are rendered obvious by the combined teachings of the prior art.

16. Applicant also argues that the cited prior art does not render the claimed invention obvious because it does not teach compositions for treating autism spectrum disorder or apraxia. It is noted, however, that since the prior art teaches all of the elements of the claimed composition, the composition of the prior art would be effective for the intended use recited in the claims. Thus, applicant's argument has not been found to persuasive.

17. Therefore, applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but they have not been found to be persuasive.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) 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.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHERIDAN MACAULEY whose telephone number is (571)270-3056. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs, 7:30AM-5:00PM EST, alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sue Liu can be reached on (571) 272-5539. 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.

SRM
/Ruth A. Davis/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1651