Overview

Rejections made in Office action. Check all that apply.

- ☐ None
- ☐ 35 U.S.C. 102
- ☐ 35 U.S.C. 103
- ☐ 35 U.S.C. 112(a) — Written Description
- ☐ 35 U.S.C. 112(a) — Enablement
- ☐ 35 U.S.C. 112(b) — Vague and Indefinite Claim Language
- ☐ 35 U.S.C. 112(a)/(b) — 112(f) Related
- ☐ 35 U.S.C. 101 (Utility/Eligibility)
- ☐ Double Patenting (Statutory)
- ☐ Double Patenting (Nonstatutory obviousness-type)
- ☐ Other

Were there any omitted rejections? Check all that apply.

- ☐ None
- ☐ 35 U.S.C. 102
- ☐ 35 U.S.C. 103
- ☐ 35 U.S.C. 112(a) — Written Description
- ☐ 35 U.S.C. 112(a) — Enablement
- ☐ 35 U.S.C. 112(b) — Vague and Indefinite Claim Language
- ☐ 35 U.S.C. 112(a)/(b) — 112(f) Related
- ☐ 35 U.S.C. 101 (Utility/Eligibility)
- ☐ Double Patenting (Statutory)
- ☐ Double Patenting (Nonstatutory obviousness-type)
- ☐ Other

Search

Was a classification search recorded by the examiner?   ○ Yes   ○ No
Was an inventor name search recorded by the examiner?   ○ Yes   ○ No
Was the examiner's text search logic recorded by the examiner?   ○ Yes   ○ No

Did the reviewer conduct a search?   ○ Yes   ○ No

Was prior art for the omitted rejection found using/in:

☐ Internet Search
☐ IDS
☐ PALM Inventor Name
☐ 892
☐ Classification Search
☐ Text search
☐ Other _____
☐ N/A

Comments: "Roboto"   ∨ │ **B** *I* U̲ │ Tˆ Tˇ │ ≡ ≡ ≡ │ ९

2

102 Rejection Omitted

Give a brief description of the proposed 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection(s) that should have been made:

"Roboto" | **B** *I* U | T T | ≡ ≡ ≡ | ⌗

Was there a 102 rejection made and subsequently withdrawn that should have been maintained?

○ Yes   ○ No   ○ N/A

Prior art for the omitted rejection was:

☐ Of record
☐ Not of record

Type of prior art for the omitted rejection was:

☐ US Patent
☐ PG Pub
☐ Foreign Patent or Published Application
☐ NPL
☐ Other [   ]

Prior art for the omitted rejection was found using/in:

☐ EAST
☐ WEST
☐ Internet Search
☐ ISR
☐ IDS
☐ PALM Inventor Name
☐ Other [   ]

This omitted rejection:

○ Needs Attention   ○ is a Significant Deficiency

Comments:

"Roboto" | **B** *I* U | T T | ≡

103 Rejection Omitted

Give a brief description of the proposed 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection(s) that should have been made:

"Roboto" ▾ | B I U | T˄ T˅ | ≡ ≛ ≡ | ⅋ | ⁝≡

Was there a 103 rejection made and subsequently withdrawn that should have been maintained?

○ Yes   ○ No   ○ N/A

Prior art for the omitted rejection was:

☐ Of record
☐ Not of record

Type of prior art for the omitted rejection was:

☐ US Patent
☐ PG Pub
☐ Foreign Patent or Published Application
☐ NPL
☐ Other [   ]

Prior art for the omitted rejection was found using/in:

☐ EAST
☐ WEST
☐ Internet Search
☐ ISR
☐ IDS
☐ PALM Inventor Name
☐ Other [   ]

This omitted rejection: ○ Needs Attention   ○ is a Significant Deficiency

Comments:

"Roboto" ▾ | B I U | T˄ T˅ | ≡ ≛

112(a) Rejection Omitted

Was there a 112(a) rejection made and subsequently withdrawn that should have been maintained?

○ Yes　　　　　○ No　　　　　○ N/A

Omitted 35 U.S.C. 112(a) Enablement Rejection(s):
Give a brief description of the proposed rejection(s) that should have been made:

"Roboto" ▾ | B I U | T˄ T˅ | ≡ ≡ ≡ |

The omitted 35 U.S.C. 112(a) Enablement rejection:

○ Needs Attention　　○ is a Significant Deficiency

Omitted 35 U.S.C. 112(a) Written Description Rejection(s):
Give a brief description of the proposed rejection(s) that should have been made:

"Roboto" ▾ | B I U | T˄ T˅ | ≡ ≡ ≡ |

The omitted 35 U.S.C. 112(a) Written Description rejection:

○ Needs Attention　　○ is a Significant Deficiency

Is the omitted 35 U.S.C. 112(a) rejection based on the addition of new matter?

○ Yes　　　　　○ No

Comments:

"Roboto" ▾ | B I U | T˄ T˅ | ≡ ≡ ≡ |

5

112(b) Rejection Omitted

Was there a 112(b) rejection made and subsequently withdrawn that should have been maintained?

○ Yes   ○ No   ○ N/A

Omitted 35 U.S.C. 112(b) Indefiniteness Rejection(s)
Give a brief description of the proposed rejection(s) that should have been made:

"Roboto" ⌄ | B *I* U | T˄ T˅ | ≡ ≡ ≡ | ⸜ | ☰

Reasons for indefiniteness rejection(s) (check all that apply):

☐ Relative Terminology - Terms of degree in the claim(s)
☐ Relative Terminology - Subjective terms in the claim(s) (*e.g.*, about, substantially, etc.)
☐ Numerical ranges and amounts limitations in the claim(s)
☐ Exemplary language in the claim(s) (*e.g.*, "for example," "such as," etc.)
☐ Lack of antecedent basis
☐ Alternative limitations (*e.g.*, a Markush group)
☐ Misdescriptive language
☐ Other _____

This omitted rejection:

○ Needs Attention   ○ is a Significant Deficiency

Comments:

"Roboto" ⌄ | B *I* U | T˄ T˅ | ≡ ≡ ≡ | ⸜ | ☰

6

112(a)/(b), 112(f)-Related Rejection Omitted

Was there a 112(a)/(b), 112(f)-related rejection made and subsequently withdrawn that should have been maintained?   ○ Yes   ○ No   ○ N/A

Give a brief description of the proposed rejection(s) that should have been made:

"Roboto" ▾ | B *I* U | T˄ T˅ | ≡ ≡ ≡ | % | ≣ ≣

Reasons for 35 U.S.C. 112(a)/(b) under 35 U.S.C. 112(f) should have been made (check all that apply):

☐ There should be a 35 U.S.C. 112(b) rejection on the basis that 35 U.S.C. 112(f) is invoked and there is no disclosure of corresponding structure, material, or acts for performing the claimed function

☐ There should be a 35 U.S.C. 112(b) rejection addressing the absence of a corresponding algorithm for computer-implemented means-plus-function limitations

☐ There should be a 35 U.S.C. 112(b) rejection on the basis that 35 U.S.C. 112(f) is invoked and there is insufficient disclosure of corresponding structure, material, or acts for performing the claimed function

☐ There should be a 35 U.S.C. 112(b) rejection addressing the inadequacy of a corresponding algorithm for computer-implemented means-plus-function limitations

☐ There should be a 35 U.S.C. 112(b) rejection on the basis that 35 U.S.C. 112(f) is invoked and the supporting disclosure fails to clearly link or associate the disclosed structure, material, or acts to the claimed function

☐ There should be a 35 U.S.C. 112(b) rejection on the basis that it is unclear whether a claim limitation invokes 35 U.S.C. 112(f)

☐ There should be a 35 U.S.C. 112(a) rejection on the basis that the claim is a single means claim

☐ There should be a 112(a) rejection related to 112(b) on the basis that there is no disclosure of corresponding structure, material, or acts for performing the function recited in a claim limitation invoking 112(f)

This omitted rejection: ○ Needs Attention   ○ is a Significant Deficiency

Comments:

"Roboto" ▾ | B *I* U | T˄ T˅ | ≡ ≡ ≡ | % | ≣ ≣

101 Rejection Omitted

Was there a 101 rejection made and subsequently withdrawn that should have been maintained?

   ○ Yes   ○ No   ○ N/A

Omitted 35 U.S.C. 101 (Eligibility) Rejection
Give a brief description of the proposed rejection(s) that should have been made:

"Roboto" ▼ | **B** *I* U | T T | ≡ ≡ ≡ | ✆ |

Basis for 35 U.S.C. 101 (Eligibility) Rejection (check all that apply):

Claim(s) that do not fall within a statutory category, *e.g.*:

☐ Transitory signal

☐ Ineligible Computer Readable Medium

☐ Software *per se*

☐ Human Organism

☐ Other (*e.g.*, "information" or "data *per se*") [_____]

Claim(s) directed to Law of Nature, Natural Phenomenon, Product of Nature, or Abstract Idea (Judicially Recognized Exceptions):

☐ Law of Nature (*e.g.*, naturally occurring correlations)

☐ Natural Phenomenon (*e.g.*, wind)

☐ Product of Nature (*e.g.*, isolated DNA)

☐ Abstract Idea (*e.g.*, fundamental economic practices, certain methods of organizing human activities, idea itself (standing alone), and mathematical relationships/formulas)

Comments:

"Roboto" ▼ | **B** *I* U | T T | ≡ ≡ ≡ | ✆ | ≔ ≔

Omitted 35 U.S.C. 101 (Utility) Rejection
Give a brief description of the proposed rejection(s) that should have been made:

"Roboto" ▼ | **B** *I* U | T T | ≡ ≡ ≡ | ✆ |

This omitted rejection: ○ Needs Attention   ○ is a Significant Deficiency

Comments:

"Roboto" ▼ | **B** *I* U | T T | ≡ ≡ ≡ | ✆ |

Double Patenting Rejection Omitted

Was there a Double Patenting rejection made and subsequently withdrawn that should have been maintained? ○ Yes ○ No ○ N/A

Omitted Double Patenting — Nonstatutory Obviousness-type Rejection (s):

☐ Obviousness-type Rejection
☐ Provisional Obviousness-type Rejection

Give a brief description of the proposed rejection(s) that should have been made:

"Roboto" ▾ | B *I* U̲ | Tᴬ Tᵥ | ≡ ≡ ≡ | %

Related application/patent used in the omitted rejection(s) was:

☐ Of record
☐ Not of record

The omitted Nonstatutory Obviousness-type Rejection: ○ Needs Attention ○ is a Significant Deficiency

Comments:

"Roboto" ▾ | B *I* U̲ | Tᴬ Tᵥ | ≡ ≡ ≡ | %

Omitted Double Patenting — Statutory Rejection(s):

☐ Statutory
☐ Provisional Statutory

Give a brief description of the proposed rejection(s) that should have been made:

"Roboto" ▾ | B *I* U̲ | Tᴬ Tᵥ | ≡ ≡ ≡ | %

Related application/patent used in the omitted rejection(s) was:

☐ Of record
☐ Not of record

The omitted Statutory Rejection: ○ Needs Attention ○ is a Significant Deficiency

Comments:

"Roboto" ▾ | B *I* U̲ | Tᴬ Tᵥ | ≡ ≡ ≡ | %

9

Other Rejection Omitted

Give a brief description of any other rejection(s) that should have been made:

"Roboto" ⌄ | **B** *I* U | T˄ T˅ | ≡ ≡ ≡ | %

This omitted rejection: ○ Needs Attention   ○ is a Significant Deficiency

102 Rejection Made

Correctness

	Yes	In-Part	No	N/A
Claimed feature(s) are found in the prior art relied upon	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	⊙ N/A
Claim limitation(s) are properly matched to the prior art relied upon	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	⊙ N/A
Effective date of the reference applied as prior art is sufficient	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	⊙ N/A
Reliance on inherency is properly applied	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	⊙ N/A
The 102 determination was incorrect but the reference would serve as a 103	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	⊙ N/A
Each claim rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 has been properly addressed (*i.e.*, "shotgun" rejection avoided)	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	⊙ N/A
Did not use incorrect form paragraph(s)	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	⊙ N/A
OVERALL	○ OK	○ Needs Attention	○ Significant Deficiency	

Correctness Comments: "Roboto" ⌄ | B *I* U | T˄ T˅ | ≡ ≐ ≡ | ⸽

11

Clarity

	Yes	In-Part	No	N/A
Were annotation(s) provided that reasonably pin-point where each claim limitation is met by the reference?	⊙ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	
Were explanations provided to further clarify the basis of the rejection(s)?	⊙ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Were the explanations sufficient to allow applicant to readily understand rejection(s)?	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	
Were statements of inherency clearly explained?	⊙ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
OVERALL	○ OK	○ Needs Attention	○ Significant Deficiency	

Clarity Comments: "Roboto" ⌄ | B *I* U | T˄ T˅ | ≡ ≐ ≡ | ⸽

103 Rejection Made

Correctness

Claimed feature(s) are found in the combination of prior art	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Claim limitation(s) are properly matched to the prior art relied upon	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Effective date of the references applied as prior art is sufficient	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Rejection identifies how primary reference is being modified by secondary	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Proper rationale to combine prior art references provided (*e.g.*, motivation to combine)	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
There is a reasonable expectation of success in combining the prior art references	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
References are combinable	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Could the prior art applied have been used to make a 102?	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Examiner's reliance on inherency is properly applied	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Examiner's reliance on Official Notice is properly applied	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Each claim rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 has been properly addressed (*i.e.*, "shotgun" rejection avoided)	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Correct form paragraph(s) used	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
OVERALL ○ OK		○ Needs Attention	○ Significant Deficiency	

12

Correctness Comments:

"Roboto" ⌄ | **B** *I* U̲ | T˙ T˙ | ≡ ≡ ≡ | ☍

103 Rejection Made - *continued*

Clarity

	Yes	In-Part	No	N/A
Were annotation(s) provided that reasonably pin-point where each claim limitation is met by the reference(s)?	● Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	
Were explanations provided to further clarify the basis of the rejection(s)?	● Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Were the explanations sufficient to allow applicant to readily understand rejection(s)?	● Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	
Were statements of inherency clearly explained?	● Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Were statements of Official Notice clearly explained?	● Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Was a full *Graham v. John Deere Co.* analysis performed?	○ Yes	○ In-Part	● No	
Were the differences between the claim limitation(s) and teaching(s) of the prior art references relied upon clearly stated?	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	
Was the proposed modification or combination of prior art references clearly explained?	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	
Was the rationale to combine/reasons for obviousness clearly explained?	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	
OVERALL	○ OK	○ Needs Attention	○ Significant Deficiency	

Clarity Comments:

"Roboto" ▾ | **B** *I* U | T T | ☰ ☰ ☰ | ✎

112(a) Written Description Rejection Made

Correctness

Claim limitations rejected as new matter do not have support in the specification	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Specification fails to describe claimed invention in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can conclude the inventor was in possession of the claimed invention	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Correct form paragraph(s) used	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
OVERALL	○ OK	○ Needs Attention	○ Significant Deficiency	

Correctness Comments:

"Roboto" ⌄ | **B** *I* U | T^ T˅ | ≡ ≡ ≡ | ⸕ | ☰

Clarity

Does the office action clearly state that the rejection is based on the lack of written description?	⦿ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Was subject matter purported to be unsupported matter clearly identified and discussed?	⦿ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
OVERALL	○ OK	○ Needs Attention	○ Significant Deficiency	

14

Clarity Comments:

"Roboto" ⌄ | **B** *I* U | T^ T˅ | ≡ ≡ ≡ | ⸕ | ☰

112(a) Enablement Rejection Made

Correctness

The specification fails to describe the claimed subject matter in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
The rejection made a proper *prima facie* case, including *Wands* factors discussion	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
The enablement or scope of enablement rejection does not contradict an art rejection or what the references teach as state of the art	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Correct form paragraph(s) used	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
OVERALL	○ OK	○ Needs Attention	○ Significant Deficiency	

Correctness Comments:

"Roboto" | B *I* U | T` T˅ | ☰ ☰ ☰ | % | ☰

Clarity

Is lack of enablement sufficiently explained?	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No
Were relevant *In re Wands* factors clearly identified and explained?	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No
Did the Office action indicate whether it is a total lack of enablement or scope of enablement rejection?	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No
OVERALL	○ OK	○ Needs Attention	○ Significant Deficiency

Clarity Comments:

"Roboto" | B *I* U | T` T˅ | ☰ ☰ ☰ | % | ☰

15

112(b) Rejection Made

Correctness

All claims properly treated	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Breadth versus indefiniteness was correctly interpreted	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Relative Terminology — Terms of degree in the claim(s) that are vague and indefinite were correctly identified/rejected	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Relative Terminology — Subjective terms in the claim(s) that are vague and indefinite were properly identified/rejected (*e.g.*, about, substantially, etc.)	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Numerical ranges and amounts limitations in the claim(s) that are vague and indefinite were properly identified/rejected (*e.g.*, range set forth in dependent claims are not within the scope of the independent claim)	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Exemplary language in the claim(s) was properly identified/rejected as being vague and indefinite (*e.g.*, "for example," "such as," etc.)	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Lack of Antecedent Basis was properly identified/rejected	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Alternative limitations (*e.g.*, Markush group) that are vague and indefinite were properly identified/rejected	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Correct form paragraph(s) used	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
OVERALL	○ OK	○ Needs Attention	○ Significant Deficiency	

Correctness Comments:

"Roboto" ▾ | **B** *I* U̲ | T^ T˅ | ≡ ≡ ≡ | ✎

Clarity

Did the Examiner clearly state which limitation(s) does not meet 112(b)?	⦿ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	
Did the Examiner clearly provide rationale as to why the claim(s) does not meet 112(b)?	⦿ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
OVERALL	○ OK	○ Needs Attention	○ Significant Deficiency	

Clarity Comments:

"Roboto" ▾ | **B** *I* U̲ | T^ T˅ | ≡ ≡ ≡ | ✎

112 (a)/(b), 112(f)-Related Rejection Made

Correctness

Every 35 U.S.C. 112(b) rejection on the basis that there is **no disclosure** of corresponding structure, material, or acts for performing the function recited in a claim limitation invoking 35 U.S.C. 112(f) is proper	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Every 35 U.S.C. 112(b) rejection on the basis that there is **insufficient disclosure** of corresponding structure, material, or acts for performing the function recited in a claim limitation invoking 35 U.S.C. 112(f) is proper	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Every 35 U.S.C. 112(b) rejection on the basis that the supporting disclosure fails to clearly link or associate the disclosed structure, material, or acts to the claimed function recited in a claim limitation invoking 35 U.S.C. 112(f) is proper	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Every 35 U.S.C. 112(b) rejection addressing the absence or inadequacy of a corresponding algorithm for computer-implemented means-plus-function limitations invoking 35 U.S.C. 112(f) is proper	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Every 35 U.S.C. 112(b) rejection on the basis that it is unclear as to whether or not 35 U.S.C. 112(f) is invoked is proper	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Every 35 U.S.C. 112(a) rejection on the basis that the claim is a single means claim is proper	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Every 112(a) rejection related to 112(b) on the basis that there is no disclosure of corresponding structure, material, or acts for performing the function recited in a claim limitation invoking 112 (f) is proper	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Correct form paragraph(s) used	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
OVERALL	○ OK	○ Needs Attention	○ Significant Deficiency	

Correctness Comments:

"Roboto" ⌄ | B I U | T T | ≡ ≡ ≡ |

Clarity

Has the Examiner clearly stated 35 U.S.C. 112(f) presumptions on the record?	⦿ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Has the Examiner clearly explained on the record how 35 U.S.C. 112(f) presumptions are overcome, when applicable?	⦿ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
OVERALL	○ OK	○ Needs Attention	○ Significant Deficiency	

Clarity Comments:

"Roboto" ⌄ | B I U | T T | ≡ ≡ ≡ |

101 Rejection Made

Basis for 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection (check all that apply):

☐ Lack of Utility

Claim(s) that do not fall within a statutory category, *e.g.*:

☐ Transitory signal

☐ Ineligible Computer Readable Medium

☐ Software *per se*

☐ Human Organism

☐ Other (*e.g.*, "information" or "data *per se*") [   ]

Claim(s) directed to Law of Nature, Natural Phenomenon, Product of Nature, or Abstract Idea (Judicially Recognized Exceptions):

☐ Law of Nature (*e.g.*, naturally occurring correlations)

☐ Natural Phenomenon (*e.g.*, wind)

☐ Product of Nature (*e.g.*, isolated DNA)

☐ Abstract Idea (*e.g.*, fundamental economic practices, certain methods of organizing human activities, idea itself (standing alone), and mathematical relationships/formulas)

Correctness

Identifies issue(s) introducing 101 rejection	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Rejection proper for all claims identified	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Followed current guidance	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Scope of claims properly interpreted	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Correct form paragraph(s) used	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
OVERALL	○ OK	○ Needs Attention	○ Significant Deficiency	

Correctness Comments:

"Roboto" ▾ | **B** *I* U̲ | T˄ T˅ | ≡ ≡ ≡ | ✎

101 Rejection Made - *continued*

Clarity

	Yes	In-Part	No	
Is the rejection based on a judicial exception?	⦿ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	
Was the judicial exception identified?	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	
Does the rejection identify specific claim(s) and its limitation(s) that recite(s) the judicial exception?	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	
Is there an explanation as to why it is a judicial exception?	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	
Is there an explanation as to why any additional elements, if present, are not significantly more?	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
If judicial exception was a product of nature, is there an explanation as to why it does not include markedly different characteristics?	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A

OVERALL ○ OK ○ Needs Attention ○ Significant Deficiency

Clarity Comments:

"Roboto" ⌄ | **B** *I* <u>U</u> | T˄ T˅ | ☰ ☰ ☰

19

Double Patenting (Statutory) Rejection Made

Correctness

Proper application of "same invention" standard	⦿ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No
Correct form paragraph(s) used	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No
OVERALL	○ OK	○ Needs Attention	○ Significant Deficiency

Correctness Comments:

"Roboto" ▾ | **B** *I* U | T^ T˅ | ≡ ≡ ≡ |

Clarity

All rejected claims properly identified and matched?	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Is the interpretation that the claims are of the "same scope" clearly explained?	⦿ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	
OVERALL	○ OK	○ Needs Attention	○ Significant Deficiency	

Clarity Comments:

"Roboto" ▾ | **B** *I* U | T^ T˅ | ≡ ≡ ≡ |

20

Double Patenting (Non-Statutory) Rejection Made

Correctness

Analyzed under the correct standard (*i.e.*, examined application claim is either anticipated by or obvious in view of the claims of the related application/patent)	◉ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Specification of related application/patent is appropriately depended on without bringing in unclaimed features	◉ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Secondary reference combined when necessary	◉ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Correct form paragraph(s) used	◉ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	
Correct use of non-statutory non-obviousness (*Schneller*) form paragraph	◉ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
OVERALL	○ OK	○ Needs Attention	○ Significant Deficiency	

Correctness Comments:

"Roboto" ⌄ | **B** *I* U̲ | T^ T͟ | ≡ ≣ ≡ |

Clarity

Is the statement of obviousness clearly explained?	◉ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	
Was a complete *Graham v. John Deere Co.* analysis performed, if claims are obvious variants?	◉ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Was a genus/species analysis clearly explained?	◉ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
OVERALL	○ OK	○ Needs Attention	○ Significant Deficiency	

Clarity Comments:

"Roboto" ⌄ | **B** *I* U̲ | T^ T͟ | ≡ ≣ ≡ |

Reply to Applicant

Were all grounds of rejection clearly presented in the Office action and was the examiner's position fully developed?	⊙ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Were all of applicant's arguments addressed in the Office action (whether examiner's position was correct or not) including arguments with respect to art still relied upon?	⊙ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
If applicant's response should have been found persuasive to overcome the rejection(s), did the examiner drop all of the corresponding rejection(s) in the Office action?	⊙ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Was the case as a whole allowable based on the record?	⊙ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Were the affidavits/declarations evaluated sufficiently?	⊙ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A

Comments:

"Roboto"   ▾ | **B** *I* U̲ | T˄ T˅ | ≡ �≡ ≡ | ⚲

22

Final Rejection

Was the final rejection premature? ◉ Yes   ○ No

Indicate the reasons:

☐ New art applied to claims that were not amended

☐ New art applied to amended claims however to address limitation(s) present in previous version of claims and substantially in the same context

☐ New rejection(s), not necessitated by amendment, which were made in response to applicant overcoming a prior art rejection with a 37 CFR 1.131(a) affidavit or declaration

☐ New rejection(s), not necessitated by amendment, which were made in response to applicant overcoming a prior art rejection with a statement averring common ownership

☐ The Office action is a first action final; however, an Advisory Action was mailed including an indication that proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection would not be entered because they raise new issues that would further require consideration and/or search

☐ New rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 101, or double patenting which are not necessitated by amendment

Other observations concerning the final rejection (check any that apply irrespective of whether or not the Final Rejection is premature):

☐ Final Rejection contains no claim rejections, only objections or informalities that would be appropriately resolved by *Ex parte Quayle* action or telephone interview and appropriate amendment

☐ All rejections contained within Final Rejection are improper for reasons set forth in another section of this form

☐ None of the above

Comments:

"Roboto" | **B** *I* U̲ | T˄ T˅ | ≡ ≡ ≡ | % | ⊟ ⊟

Other Quality-Related Items

Allowable Subject Matter

Did the examiner write a Reasons for Allowance?	⦿ Yes		○ No	○ N/A
Did the Reasons for Allowance add substance to the record?	⦿ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	

Comments:

"Roboto" ▾ | B *I* U | T T | ≡ ≡ ≡ | ✎

Restrictions/Election of Species

Did the examiner make a requirement for restriction/election of species?	⦿ Yes		○ No	
Was the requirement for restriction/election of species proper?	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	
Was sufficient rationale set forth in making the requirement for restriction/election of species?	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	
Was rejoinder properly practiced?	○ Yes		○ No	○ N/A
If the requirement for restriction/election of species was traversed by applicant, did the examiner reply to the reasons or arguments advanced by applicant in the traverse?	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A

Comments:

"Roboto" ▾ | B *I* U | T T | ≡ ≡ ≡ | ✎

Interview Summary Form

Was there an interview relevant to the reviewed action?	⦿ Yes		○ No	
Was the interview documented on the record?	⦿ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Is the record of the interview clear and complete?	⦿ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
Was the interview initiated by the examiner?	⦿ Yes		○ No	○ Unknown
Was the interview substantive in nature?	⦿ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A

Comments:

"Roboto" ▾ | B *I* U | T T | ≡ ≡ ≡ | ✎

24

Other Quality-Related Items - *continued*

Other Issues

Did the Office action contain clear and correct suggestions to overcome outstanding rejections?	⊙ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	○ N/A
DNA or Protein Sequence claims: Did the examiner properly handle sequence compliance issues?	○ Yes	○ In-Part	○ No	⊙ N/A

Comments:

"Roboto" ⌄ | **B** *I* U | T T | ☰ ☰ ☰ | ⚭

Overall Review Comments:

"Roboto" ⌄ | **B** *I* U | T T | ☰ ☰ ☰ | ⚭