



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

AA

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.
09/947,801	09/06/2001	Jed Margolin		7358

23497 7590 10/12/2006
JED MARGOLIN
1981 EMPIRE ROAD
RENO, NV 89521-7430

EXAMINER

PATEL, CHIRAG R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 10/12/2006

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

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/947,801	MARGOLIN, JED	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chirag R. Patel	2141	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Chirag R. Patel. (3) _____.

(2) Jed Margolin. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 5 August 2005.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

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

Claim(s) discussed: Claims 1-5.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ellis (6,167,428).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation page.

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

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Upon review of the history of this application, it became apparent that an interview summary was inadvertently not prepared. A summary is provided below to make the record complete for the August 5th interview to the best of the examiner's recollection. A discussion of the prior art of Ellis (US 6,167,428) vs. interpretation of claim language 1-5 took place.

Applicant argued that his "home network server" and the definition of "subscribe" was different from Ellis.

Applicant argued the examiner improperly made the second office action final and introduced a new grounds of rejection. Applicant requested the examiner to withdraw the rejection. Examiner responded to all of the arguments and used the same prior art, Ellis (US 6,167,428), thus making a proper final rejection.

Applicant proposed changing the claims only if the examiner was willing to allow the application. Examiner explained that any amendment would require further search and consideration by the examiner. Examiner repeatedly asked applicant to send a formal response in writing. Applicant repeatedly refused as applicant did not wish to pay the extra fees of \$395.

Applicant was extremely insistent and wished to speak to someone with negotiation authority. Out of courtesy by the examiner, another interview was scheduled for August 9th with someone of negotiation authority.

No agreements were reached with respect to both the limitations of claims 1-5 and proposed claim amendments.


RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER