



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.
11/864,275	09/28/2007	Douglas J. McKibbon	259766/P001545-ALS	3221
73811	7590	02/13/2013	EXAMINER	
Leydig, Voit & Mayer, Ltd. Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900 180 North Stetson Avenue Chicago, IL 60601-6731			GILKEY, CARRIE STRODER	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3689	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/13/2013	ELECTRONIC

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.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Chgpatent@leydig.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 11/864,275	Applicant(s) MCKIBBON ET AL.	
	Examiner CARRIE STRODER GILKEY	Art Unit 3689	

-- 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 08 November 2011.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.
- 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) 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

- 5) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 7) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 9) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

* If any claims have been determined allowable, you may be eligible to benefit from the **Patent Prosecution Highway** program at a participating intellectual property office for the corresponding application. For more information, please see http://www.uspto.gov/patents/init_events/pph/index.jsp or send an inquiry to PPHfeedback@uspto.gov.

Application Papers

- 10) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) 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).

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)
- 2) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 3) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 4) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

In view of the appeal brief filed on 08 November 2011,
PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED.

A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113.(if this Office action is final); or,

2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/Janice A. Mooneyham/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3689

Art Unit: 3689

Claim Status

1. This is in response to the applicant's communication filed on 08 November 2011, wherein:

Claims 1-20 are currently pending.

2. Please note that a new Examiner has been assigned to this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 112(b):

(B) CONCLUSION.—The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the inventor or a joint inventor regards as the invention.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 112 (pre-AIA), second paragraph:

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.

2. **Claims 6-8, 10, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.**

112(b) or 35 U.S.C. 112 (pre-AIA), second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the inventor or a joint inventor, or for pre-AIA the applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 3689

Claims 6-8, 10, and 18-20 include several abbreviations which are not defined in the claims. Therefore, the subject matter of the invention is not definite. Included in these abbreviations which are not defined are: *CDMA2000, GSM, WiFi, WiMAX, GPS, and NAD.*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Based upon consideration of all of the relevant factors with respect to the claims as a whole, claims 1-12 are held to claim an abstract idea, and are therefore rejected as ineligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. The rationale for this finding is explained below:

Based on Supreme Court precedent and recent Federal Circuit decisions, the Office's guidance to an examiner is that one clue to patent eligibility under 35 USC 101 is whether or not the process is (1) be tied to a particular machine or apparatus or

Art Unit: 3689

(2) transforms underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876).

The claim should recite the particular machine or apparatus to which it is tied, for example by identifying the machine or apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively reciting the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

There are two corollaries to the machine-or-transformation test. First, a mere field-of-use limitation is generally insufficient to render an otherwise ineligible method claim patent-eligible. This means the machine or transformation must impose meaningful limits on the method claim's scope to pass the test. Second, insignificant extra-solution activity will not transform an unpatentable principle into a patentable process. This means reciting a specific machine or a particular transformation of a specific article in an insignificant step, such as data gathering or outputting, is not sufficient to pass the test.

Art Unit: 3689

Here, applicant's method steps fail the first prong of the new test because there is no tie to any kind of machine for any of the claimed steps. Claim 1, steps a and b refer to storing data in a database (which is not necessarily a computer) and receiving data at a server, but both steps are data gathering and therefore, insufficient to pass the test. Steps c and d do not require the use of a computer. Step e refers to "completing configuration" by the server. However, completing configuration could just refer to sending authorization data to the module. This is insufficient to pass the test. Claim 9 is similar in that only steps which refer to sending data involve a machine. Examiner notes that "whereby the telematics service provider completes configuration" is not a positively recited step.

Further, applicant's method steps fail the second prong of the test because the claimed steps do not result in an article being transformed from one state to another. There is no transformation occurring in the claims for a physical object or substance or data that represents physical objects or substances.

Art Unit: 3689

Additionally, other factors and considerations in addition to the machine/transformation test also point to a finding that the claims are directed to a mere abstract idea. The claims also seem to be a mere statement of a general concept of configuring a module. The claims if allowed would appear to effectively grant a monopoly on the concept of configuring a module as claimed. The claims seem to be directed to a general business concept of configuring a module, which seems to be just a general business concept. When viewing these factors and the claims as whole, it is concluded that the claims are directed to a mere abstract idea and are not patent eligible under 35 USC 101.

The dependent claims, when analyzed as a whole are held to be patent ineligible under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the additional recited limitations fail to establish that the claims are not directed to an abstract idea, for the same reasoning as set forth with respect to the independent claims. The dependent claims do not act to remedy the problem with the independent claims by reciting (explicitly or implied) the use of any particular machine and/or any significant transformation.

Art Unit: 3689

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. 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 negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. 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.

3. **Claims 1-4, 6-16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis et al. (US 20020194476), in view of Zambo et al. (US 20060202799).**

Art Unit: 3689

Referring to claim 1:

Lewis discloses a method for automatically configuring a replacement module in a telematics unit, the method comprising:

(a) receiving repair identity information from repair facility personnel at a telematics service provider server, a replacement module having been installed into the unit by the repair facility personnel, and storing at least a portion of the repair identity information in a suspension file in one or more databases ([0124] *If a part is to be replaced, the replacement part is installed first. The repair facility's computer makes the controller read descriptor data both for itself, and for all parts in the vehicle (step 501). The repair facility's computer then formulates the update request and transmits it to a central server under the control of the vehicle manufacturer or its agent (steps 502 and 503) where the agent of the vehicle manufacturer is interpreted as a "telematics service provider" and the descriptor data is interpreted as repair identity information, and further, "telematics service provider" is simply describing the server and receives little patentable weight);*

Art Unit: 3689

(b) receiving a data feed at a server from the unit, the data feed including the vehicle identification number ([0115][0124])
In order to facilitate updating smart chip part data, the data is typically read from the vehicle at an authorized repair facility, using a computer and special data coupling which connects to the on-board vehicle controller[0124] and Preferably, smart chip 805 includes in its attribute data a list of part identifiers for each part having an attached smart chip. Smart chip 805 also includes the vehicle identification number as part of its attribute data[0115]);

(e) completing configuration of the replacement module across a network by the server ([0124]) *The manufacturer then generates new descriptors for the controller and for each part in the vehicle (or only for selected replacement parts) as described above with reference to steps 505-508 in FIG. 5. The descriptors are then transmitted back to the repair facility (step 526), downloaded from the repair facility's computer into the on-board controller, and ultimately stored in the controller's smart chip 805 and the smart chip(s) of the affected parts (step 527) [0124]).*

Art Unit: 3689

Lewis discloses a system for authenticating objects, including car parts. Lewis does not disclose where the unit is a telematics unit; (c) comparing the vehicle identification number from the data feed to a plurality of vehicle identification numbers in one or more suspension files in the one or more databases; and (d) detecting a match between the vehicle identification number from the data feed and a vehicle identification number in a suspension file in the one or more databases; and where the network is a wireless network.

However, Zambo teaches a similar system for enabling vehicle functions provided by various vehicle parts [0008]. Zambo teaches

where the unit is a telematics unit ([0017] *...a telematics unit 120...*);

(c) comparing the vehicle identification number from the data feed to a plurality of vehicle identification numbers in one or more suspension files in the one or more databases ([0048][0052] *The telematics unit 120 is configured to request the vehicle identification number from the electronic modules 135, 136 and 137 when the MVCU 110 is powered-up by an ignition cycle. During*

Art Unit: 3689

power up, the telematics unit 120 applies an algorithm to retrieve the VIN stored in the master control module 135, and stores the retrieved VIN in memory 128[0048] where the electronic modules store the VIN in a database and the VIN is retrieved from the master control module 135 in a data feed and If the vehicle identification number in the electronic modules 135, 136 and 137 matches the vehicle identification number in the telematics unit 120[0052] where determining whether there is a match requires a comparison);

(d) detecting a match between the vehicle identification number from the data feed and a vehicle identification number in a suspension file in the one or more databases ([0048][0052] *The telematics unit 120 is configured to request the vehicle identification number from the electronic modules 135, 136 and 137 when the MVCU 110 is powered-up by an ignition cycle. During power up, the telematics unit 120 applies an algorithm to retrieve the VIN stored in the master control module 135, and stores the retrieved VIN in memory 128[0048] where the electronic modules store the VIN in a database and the VIN is retrieved from the master control module 135 in a data feed and If the vehicle identification number in the electronic modules*

Art Unit: 3689

135, 136 and 137 matches the vehicle identification number in the telematics unit 120[0052]); and

where the network is a wireless network ([0020] MVCU 110, via telematics unit 120, sends and receives radio transmissions from wireless carrier system 140).

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA) at the time of invention to modify the system disclosed in Lewis to incorporate using a telematics unit and matching the VIN numbers as taught by Zambo because this would provide a manner for preventing stolen parts from being used as replacement parts [0004], thus aiding the client by ensuring consumers will buy the replacement parts from the dealer, rather than making use of stolen parts.

Referring to claim 2:

Lewis discloses wherein the repair identity information comprises vehicle information, including a vehicle identification number ([0115] *Preferably, smart chip 805 includes in its attribute data a list of part identifiers for each part having an attached smart chip. Smart chip 805 also includes the vehicle identification number as part of its*

Art Unit: 3689

attribute data. Additionally, each smart chip 810-812 contains as part of its attribute data a global part identifier, which could be the part identifier of controller 801, or a vehicle identification number).

Lewis, as modified by Zambo, discloses telematics unit information (Zambo [0048][0049] *...matches the vehicle identification number in the master control module 135... where the master control module is the telematics module, as in [0048]*)).

Lewis discloses a system for authenticating objects, including car parts, using repair identity information (Lewis [0115][0124]). Lewis does not disclose wherein the repair identity information comprises subscriber information.

However, the Examiner asserts that "subscriber" is a label for the information and adds little, if anything, to the claimed acts or steps and thus does not serve to distinguish over the prior art. Any differences related merely to the meaning and information conveyed through labels (i.e., the type of the item) which does not explicitly alter or impact the steps of the

Art Unit: 3689

method does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use repair identity information as disclosed in the Lewis and Zambo references because the type of information being supplied does not functionally alter or relate to the steps of the method and merely labeling the information differently from that in the prior art does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Referring to claim 3:

Lewis discloses wherein storing at least a portion of the repair identity information in a suspension file in one or more databases comprises storing the vehicle information in the one or more databases ([0124] *If a part is to be replaced, the replacement part is installed first. The repair facility's computer makes the controller read descriptor data both for itself, and for all parts in the vehicle (step 501). The repair facility's computer then formulates the update request and transmits it to a central server under the control of the vehicle manufacturer or its agent (steps 502 and 503) where the*

Art Unit: 3689

location from which the information is read by the controller is interpreted as a database storing the information).

Referring to claim 4:

Lewis discloses installing replacement parts and exchanging information concerning repairs through a server [0124]. Lewis, as modified by Zambo, does not explicitly disclose wherein receiving subscriber, telematics unit, and vehicle information further comprises receiving at a telematics service provider server through a user interface an order of the replacement module from the repair facility personnel. However, given that Lewis discloses installing replacement parts [0124] and communicating with remote service facilities via a server [0122]-[0124], it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to receive an order for the replacement module at a server from the repair facility, as this would ensure that the part is available for install.

Referring to claim 6:

Lewis discloses wherein the wireless network is selected from the group consisting of wireless wide area networks, wireless metropolitan area networks, wireless local area networks,

Art Unit: 3689

CDMA2000, Evolution Data Optimized (EVDO), High Speed Downlink Packet Access (HSDPA), GSM, WiFi, and WiMAX networks

([0077][0154] *The digital device communicates with the remote server using any appropriate data communications medium. Since there is no requirement that the communications medium be secure, the Internet or the telephone network are appropriate communications media, although other media could be used*[0077] where the internet is a wide area network and ...including wireless communications links[0154] where using a wireless connection to the internet is interpreted as a wireless wide area network).

Referring to claim 7:

Lewis, as modified by Zambo, discloses wherein the replacement module comprises a GPS module (Zambo [0021] *Telematics unit 120 includes a processor 122 connected to a wireless modem 124, a global positioning system (GPS) unit 126...*).

Referring to claim 8:

Lewis discloses wherein the replacement module comprises a NAD module ([0122] *...the vehicle is equipped with data transmission capabilities for communicating with remote service facilities...* where a NAD is interpreted as a network access device, as

Art Unit: 3689

discussed in applicant's specification, paragraph [0023] of the published application, and communicating with remote service facilities requires the use of a network access device).

Referring to claim 9:

Lewis discloses a method for automatically configuring a replacement module in a telematics unit comprising:

sending subscriber information to a telematics service provider via a first network ([0124][0151] *If a part is to be replaced, the replacement part is installed first. The repair facility's computer makes the controller read descriptor data both for itself, and for all parts in the vehicle (step 501). The repair facility's computer then formulates the update request and transmits it to a central server under the control of the vehicle manufacturer or its agent (steps 502 and 503) where the agent of the vehicle manufacturer is interpreted as a "telematics service provider" and A customer wishing to change his subscription options initiates a request by telephone, mail, internet, or the like. The subscriber need not know the identity public key or other data relating to his receiver. The customer simply gives his name and desired subscription options to initiate the request[0151]);*

Art Unit: 3689

installing the replacement module in the unit ([0124] *If a part is to be replaced, the replacement part is installed first*); and

activating the unit, whereby the telematics service provider completes configuration of the replacement module ([0124] *The manufacturer then generates new descriptors for the controller and for each part in the vehicle (or only for selected replacement parts) as described above with reference to steps 505-508 in FIG. 5. The descriptors are then transmitted back to the repair facility (step 526), downloaded from the repair facility's computer into the on-board controller, and ultimately stored in the controller's smart chip 805 and the smart chip(s) of the affected parts (step 527) [0124]*).

Lewis discloses a system for authenticating objects, including car parts. Lewis does not disclose where the unit is a telematics unit; and where the configuration is via a second network comprising a wireless network.

However, Zambo teaches a similar system for enabling vehicle functions provided by various vehicle parts [0008]. Zambo teaches

Art Unit: 3689

where the unit is a telematics unit ([0017] ...a telematics unit 120...); and

where the configuration is via a second network comprising a wireless network ([0020] MVCU 110, via telematics unit 120, sends and receives radio transmissions from wireless carrier system 140).

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA) at the time of invention to modify the system disclosed in Lewis to incorporate a telematics unit, and a second, wireless network as taught by Zambo because this would provide a manner for preventing stolen parts from being used as replacement parts [0004], thus aiding the client by ensuring consumers will buy the replacement parts from the dealer, rather than making use of stolen parts.

Referring to claim 10:

Lewis discloses wherein the replacement module comprises a NAD module ([0122] ...the vehicle is equipped with data transmission capabilities for communicating with remote service facilities... where a NAD is interpreted as a network access device, as

Art Unit: 3689

discussed in applicant's specification, paragraph [0023] of the published application, and communicating with remote service facilities requires the use of a network access device).

Lewis, as modified by Zambo, discloses wherein the replacement module comprises a GPS module (Zambo [0021] *Telematics unit 120 includes a processor 122 connected to a wireless modem 124, a global positioning system (GPS) unit 126...*).

Referring to claim 11:

Lewis discloses wherein the subscriber information comprises a vehicle identification number, relative to the vehicle ([0115] *Preferably, smart chip 805 includes in its attribute data a list of part identifiers for each part having an attached smart chip. Smart chip 805 also includes the vehicle identification number as part of its attribute data. Additionally, each smart chip 810-812 contains as part of its attribute data a global part identifier, which could be the part identifier of controller 801, or a vehicle identification number*).

Referring to claim 12:

Lewis discloses installing replacement parts and exchanging information concerning repairs through a server [0124]. Lewis,

Art Unit: 3689

as modified by Zambo, does not explicitly disclose requesting the replacement module via a user interface of the telematics service provider (as above, the telematics service provider is interpreted as Lewis' vehicle manufacturer's agent in [0124]) website. However, given that Lewis discloses installing replacement parts [0124], communicating with remote service facilities via a server [0122]-[0124], and communicating with service providers via the internet to change subscription options [0151], it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to receive an order for the replacement module at a website from the repair facility, as this would ensure that the part is available for install.

Referring to claims 13-16 and 18-20:

Claims 13-16 and 18-20 are rejected on the same basis as claims 1-4 and 6-8, respectively.

4. Claims 5 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis et al. (US 20020194476), in view of Zambo et al. (US 20060202799), in further view of Wittman et al. (US 20060211446).

Art Unit: 3689

Referring to claim 5:

Lewis, as modified by Zambo, discloses a system for authenticating objects, including car parts, which can include a telematics module. Lewis, as modified by Zambo, does not disclose mapping the replacement module to a subscriber account.

However, Wittman teaches a similar system for enabling telematics services on a vehicle. Wittman teaches mapping the replacement module to a subscriber account ([0056][0065] *Using the plug-in data card 160 with the telematics unit 135, the user of the vehicle 125 may subscribe to a telematics service[0056] and The vehicle OEM 120 may control the gateway unit 130 to wirelessly couple the vehicle 125 to the vehicle service provider 137 that provides the wireless service to a user[0065]* where, by coupling the vehicle, including its replacement module, to the provider, and the provider's recognition of a subscriber, the replacement module in the telematics unit is mapped to the subscriber account).

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA) at the time of invention to modify the system disclosed in Lewis and Zambo to incorporate mapping the module to a subscriber account as taught by Wittman because this would

Art Unit: 3689

provide a manner for enabling the vehicle OEM 120 to access and/or monitor and/or send or receive data associated with the vehicle 125 for the wireless services offered or subscribed to either by the user or a wireless service provider, a vehicle dealer, or an automobile producer (Wittman [0050]), thus aiding the client by providing desired services.

Referring to claim 17:

Claim 17 is rejected on the same basis as claim 5.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot because the arguments do not apply to any of the references being used in the current rejection.

1. Rejection of claims 1-12 as being directed to non-patentable subject matter

Applicant argues that the method is not merely directed to an abstract idea, in that it has the concrete result of configuring a replacement module. Examiner respectfully disagrees. As is explained above, the claims also seem to be a mere statement of a general concept of configuring a module. The claims if

Art Unit: 3689

allowed would appear to effectively grant a monopoly on the concept of configuring a module as claimed. The claims seem to be directed to a general business concept of configuring a module, which seems to be just a general business concept. When viewing these factors and the claims as whole, it is concluded that the claims are directed to a mere abstract idea and are not patent eligible under 35 USC 101. As is further explained above, the machine or transformation test is also not passed by the methods claims because there is no tie to any kind of machine for any of the claimed steps.

2. Rejections of claims 6 and 18 as indefinite

The Examiner has withdrawn the previous rejection and issued a new rejection, which is explained above.

3. Rejections of claims 1-20 as obvious over Wittman

A new rejection has been issued which uses different prior art. Applicant's arguments do not apply to the current rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CARRIE STRODER GILKEY whose telephone number is (571)270-7119. The

Art Unit: 3689

examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8:00 a.m.
- 5:00 p.m. ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jan Mooneyham can be reached on (571)272-6805. 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.

**/CARRIE STRODER GILKEY/
Examiner, Art Unit 3689**