



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.
90/009,591	10/02/2009	5,784,584	0081-011D4X3	8118

40972 7590 02/17/2011
HENNEMAN & ASSOCIATES, PLC
70 N. MAIN ST.
THREE RIVERS, MI 49093

EXAMINER

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 02/17/2011

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

DO NOT USE IN PALM PRINTER

(THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS)

Fish & Richardson P.C.
P.O. Box 1022
Minneapolis, MN 55440-1022

MAILED

FEB 17 2011

CENTRAL REEXAMINATION UNIT

EX PARTE REEXAMINATION COMMUNICATION TRANSMITTAL FORM

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NO. 90/009,591 + 90/011,169

PATENT NO. 5,784,584.

ART UNIT 3992.

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above identified *ex parte* reexamination proceeding (37 CFR 1.550(f)).

Where this copy is supplied after the reply by requester, 37 CFR 1.535, or the time for filing a reply has passed, no submission on behalf of the *ex parte* reexamination requester will be acknowledged or considered (37 CFR 1.550(g)).

Ex Parte Reexamination Interview Summary	Control No. <i>90/011,169</i> 90/009,591	Patent Under Reexamination 5,784,584	
	Examiner Sam Rimell	Art Unit 3992	

All participants (USPTO personnel, patent owner, patent owner's representative):

- (1) Sam Rimell (3) Jessica Harrison
(2) Larry Henneman (4) JEFF CARLSON

Date of Interview: 08 February 2011

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal (copy given to: 1) patent owner 2) patent owner's representative)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.
Any other agreement(s) are set forth below under "Description of the general nature of what was agreed to..."

Claim(s) discussed: 29.

Identification of prior art discussed: McDowell (primary reference) and Sachs (US Pat. 4,933,835).

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:
Discussed instruction buffer feature of McDowell, and whether or not such feature could be construed as an instruction register, given its disclosed functionality. Although no specific conclusion was reached on this point, examiners agreed to reconsider this point, and reconsider the full disclosure of McDowell in view of this argument. Examiners also considered argument that this same issue was considered in the prior reexamination proceeding (90/008,225). Examiners agreed to review this point if it were found that the reference to McDowell remains applicable.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims patentable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims patentable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE PATENT OWNER'S STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP § 2281). IF A RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION HAS ALREADY BEEN FILED, THEN PATENT OWNER IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO PROVIDE THE MANDATORY STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (37 CFR 1.560(b)). THE REQUIREMENT FOR PATENT OWNER'S STATEMENT CAN NOT BE WAIVED. EXTENSIONS OF TIME ARE GOVERNED BY 37 CFR 1.550(c).

/Sam Rimell/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3992		
---	--	--

cc: Requester (if third party requester)