



# 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. |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| 12/272,204   | 11/17/2008  | Subrahmanyam S. Musti | END920080189US1        | 5851             |
| 46583  | 7590        | 09/26/2019            | EXAMINER               |                  |
| Roberts Mlotkowski Safran Cole & Calderon, P.C.<br>Intellectual Property Department<br>P.O. Box 10064<br>MCLEAN, VA 22102-8064 |             |                       | OSMAN BILAL AHME, AFAF |                  |
|  |             |                       | ART UNIT               | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |             |                       | 3682                   |                  |
|  |             |                       | NOTIFICATION DATE      | DELIVERY MODE    |
|  |             |                       | 09/26/2019             | 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):

docketing@rpsc2.com  
lgallaugh@rpsc2.com  
secretaries@rpsc2.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

*Ex parte* SUBRAHMANYAM S. MUSTI, SRI RAMANATHAN,  
MATTHEW A. TERRY and MATTHEW B. TREVATHAN

---

Appeal 2018-006772  
Application 12/272,204  
Technology Center 3600

---

Before KARA L. SZPONDOWSKI, SCOTT B. HOWARD, and  
STEVEN M. AMUNDSON, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

SZPONDOWSKI, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellant<sup>1</sup> appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Examiner's Final Rejection of claims 1, 4, 5, 7–10, 12–17, and 20–28, which constitute all of the claims pending in this application. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We REVERSE.

---

<sup>1</sup> We use the word “Appellant” to refer to “applicant” as defined in 37 C.F.R. § 1.42. Appellant identifies the real party in interest as International Business Machines. Appeal Br. 2.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant's invention is directed to "a system, topologies and method of leveraging session initiation protocol (SIP) to integrate RFID tag information into presence documents." Spec. ¶ 1. Claim 1, reproduced below, is representative of the claimed subject matter:

1. A method for tracking a location of people or items having Radio-Frequency Identification (RFID) tags, implemented in a computing environment, comprising:

receiving RFID signals, including radio-frequency identification (RFID) information pertaining to the people or items having the RFID tags, from a RFID gateway coupled to receive the RFID signals from RFID scanners configured to scan the RFID tags, wherein the RFID information includes a tag identification and "to", "subject", and "payload" information that are embedded in the RFID;

looking up profile information associated with the RFID information, in a storage system, based on the tag identification, wherein the profile information includes content and/or information regarding an event pertaining to the people or items having the RFID tags;

determining, by the processor, how to process the content and/or the event associated with the RFID information based on the profile information associated with the RFID information;

converting, by the processor, the RFID information and the profile information into a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) message comprising the RFID information and the profile information after determining how to process the content and/or event associated with the RFID information;

publishing the SIP message to a presence server;

receiving one or more subscriber profile updates of one or more subscribers which are subscribed to receive the SIP message from the presence server, from the storage system;

obtaining location information pertaining to the people or items having the RFID tags from a location platform and

placing the location information into a presence document with the RFID information to create a rich content presence document; and

sending the SIP message, with the rich content presence document, by the presence server to watchers that are subscribed to receive the SIP message.

## REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7–10, 12–17, and 20–28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to patent-ineligible subject matter. Final Act. 6.

Claims 1, 15, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written-description requirement. Final Act. 8.

Claims 1, 4, 7–9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20, 22–24, and 26–28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trossen (US 2003/0048195 A1, published Mar. 13, 2003), Poikselka et al. (US 2005/0065801 A1, published Mar. 24, 2005) (“Poikselka”), and Kim et al. (US 7,843,857 B2, issued November 30, 2010) (“Kim”). Final Act. 9, 15.<sup>2</sup>

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trossen, Poikselka, Kim, and Quon et al. (US 2007/0293212 A1, published Dec. 20, 2007) (“Quon”). Final Act. 14.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The Examiner’s statement of rejection includes non-pending claims 6 and 29–31. Final Act. 9. The statement of rejection does not include claim 22, but the rejection for claim 22 is in the body of the rejection. Final Act. 15. We treat this as a harmless typographical error.

<sup>3</sup> The Examiner’s statement of rejection does not include Kim, but should because claim 5 depends on claim 1, which is rejected over Trossen, Poikselka, and Kim. We treat this as a harmless typographical error.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trossen, Poikselka, Kim, and Yamamoto (US 2010/0057571 A1, published Mar. 4, 2010). Final Act. 18.<sup>4</sup>

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trossen, Poikselka, Kim, and Haakana (US 7,822,659 B2, issued Oct. 26, 2010). Final Act. 19.<sup>5</sup>

Claims 10, 17, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trossen, Poikselka, Kim, and RFC 3261-SIP, 2002. Final Act. 19.<sup>6</sup>

## ANALYSIS

### *35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection*

An invention is patent eligible if it claims a “new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter.” 35 U.S.C. § 101. However, the Supreme Court has long interpreted 35 U.S.C. § 101 to include implicit exceptions: “[l]aws of nature, natural phenomena, and abstract

---

<sup>4</sup> The Examiner’s statement of rejection does not include Kim, but should because claim 14 depends on claim 1, which is rejected over Trossen, Poikselka, and Kim. We treat this as a harmless typographical error.

<sup>5</sup> The Examiner’s statement of rejection does not include Kim, but should because claim 21 depends on claim 15, which is rejected over Trossen, Poikselka, and Kim. We treat this as a harmless typographical error.

<sup>6</sup> The Examiner’s statement of rejection does not include Kim, but should because claims 10, 17, and 25 depend on claims 1, 15, and 24, respectively, which are rejected over Trossen, Poikselka, and Kim. We treat this as a harmless typographical error.

ideas” are not patentable. *E.g.*, *Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank Int’l*, 573 U.S. 208, 216 (2014).

In determining whether a claim falls within an excluded category, we are guided by the Supreme Court’s two-step framework, described in *Mayo* and *Alice*. *Id.* at 217–18 (citing *Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.*, 566 U.S. 66, 75–77 (2012)). In accordance with that framework, we first determine what concept the claim is “directed to.” *See Alice*, 573 U.S. at 219 (“On their face, the claims before us are drawn to the concept of intermediated settlement, *i.e.*, the use of a third party to mitigate settlement risk.”); *see also Bilski v. Kappos*, 561 U.S. 593, 611 (2010) (“Claims 1 and 4 in petitioners’ application explain the basic concept of hedging, or protecting against risk.”).

Concepts determined to be abstract ideas, and, thus, patent ineligible, include certain methods of organizing human activity, such as fundamental economic practices (*Alice*, 573 U.S. at 219–20; *Bilski*, 561 U.S. at 611); mathematical formulas (*Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 594–95 (1978)); and mental processes (*Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 69 (1972)).

If the claim is “directed to” an abstract idea, we turn to the second step of the *Alice* and *Mayo* framework, where “we must examine the elements of the claim to determine whether it contains an ‘inventive concept’ sufficient to ‘transform’ the claimed abstract idea into a patent-eligible application.” *Alice*, 573 U.S. at 221 (internal citation omitted). “A claim that recites an abstract idea must include ‘additional features’ to ensure ‘that the [claim] is more than a drafting effort designed to monopolize the [abstract idea].’” *Id.* (quoting *Mayo*, 566 U.S. at 77).

“[M]erely requir[ing] generic computer implementation[] fail[s] to transform that abstract idea into a patent-eligible invention.” *Id.*

The PTO recently published revised guidance on the application of § 101. USPTO’s January 7, 2019 Memorandum, *2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance*, 84 Fed. Reg. 50 (Jan. 7, 2019) (“Memorandum”). Under that guidance, we first look to whether the claim recites:

(1) any judicial exceptions, including certain groupings of abstract ideas (i.e., mathematical concepts, certain methods of organizing human activity such as a fundamental economic practice, or mental processes); and

(2) additional elements that integrate the judicial exception into a practical application (*see* MANUAL OF PATENT EXAMINING PROCEDURE (MPEP) § 2106.05(a)–(c), (e)–(h) (9th ed. rev. 08.2017 Jan. 2018)).

Only if a claim (1) recites a judicial exception and (2) does not integrate that exception into a practical application, do we then look to whether the claim:

(3) adds a specific limitation beyond the judicial exception that is not “well-understood, routine, conventional” in the field (*see* MPEP § 2106.05(d)); or

(4) simply appends well-understood, routine, conventional activities previously known to the industry, specified at a high level of generality, to the judicial exception.

*See* Memorandum, 84 Fed. Reg. at 52–57.

Applying the guidance set forth in the Memorandum, we determine the Examiner erred in concluding that the claims do not recite patent-eligible subject matter. Even assuming the claims recite a judicial exception under Step 2A, Prong 1 of the Memorandum, we conclude the claims recite

additional elements that integrate the judicial exception into a practical application under Step 2A, Prong 2 of the Memorandum.

In determining whether the claims are “directed to” the identified abstract idea—here, the claims recite looking up profile information that is associated with RFID information and determining how to process content or event data based on the looked up profile information (comparing collected information against stored information, and using rules to identify options), and receiving subscriber profile updates and obtaining location information (collecting information), which are mental process steps that can be practically performed by a human, either mentally or with the aid of paper and pencil—we consider whether the claims recite additional elements that integrate the judicial exception into a practical application.<sup>7</sup> *See* Memorandum, 84 Fed. Reg. at 54–55.

Appellant argues that the claimed invention “improves the technical field of tracking the location of people or items by improving the ease and accuracy of tracking the location of people or items.” Appeal Br. 12; *see* Appeal Br. 9; Reply Br. 6–7. Appellant further argues that the claims are “based in computer and radio frequency technology.” Appeal Br. 9–10. Specifically, Appellant argues that the claimed conversion of the RFID information and the profile information into a Session Initiation Protocol

---

<sup>7</sup> We acknowledge that some of the considerations at Step 2A, Prong Two, properly may be evaluated under Step 2 of *Alice* (Step 2B of the Office guidance). For purposes of maintaining consistent treatment within the Office, we evaluate them under Step 1 of *Alice* (Step 2A of the Office guidance). *See* Memorandum, 84 Fed. Reg. at 55 nn.25 & 27–32.

(SIP) message “requires computer technology, and could not be performed ‘by hand’ or mentally.” Appeal Br. 9.

We are persuaded by Appellant’s arguments. The claims address the problem of integrating “existing systems . . . in order to fully capitalize on existing technologies,” such as “wireless technologies includ[ing] cellular telephones, the Internet, wireless Internet access (WiFi), [and] GPS and RFID technologies.” Spec. ¶¶ 2, 3. The claimed invention endeavors to “increase the ability and efficiency to transfer content, track inventories, provide content to user, etc.” Spec. ¶ 6. Independent claims 1, 15, and 24 recite a particular solution to this problem in a specific way to achieve the desired outcome (e.g., using RFID tags to identify RFID information for people and items, converting RFID information and profile information into a SIP message after determining how to process content and/or an event associated with the RFID information, publishing the SIP message to a presence server, building a rich content presence document with location information and RFID information to send with the SIP message), rather than merely claiming the result (e.g., sending an SIP message with a rich content presence document to subscribed watchers).

In our view, the combination of limitations in the claims, when viewed as a whole, integrates the abstract idea into a practical application under the guidelines in the Memorandum, specifically in that it reflects a technology improvement to integrate existing technologies in order to increase the synergistic effects of different technologies. *See* claim 1; Memorandum, 84 Fed. Reg. at 55; *see also Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.*, 822 F.3d 1327, 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (“the ‘directed to’ inquiry applies a stage-one filter to claims, considered in light of the specification, based on

whether ‘their character as a whole is directed to excluded subject matter.’”); Spec. Title (“System and Method of Leveraging SIP to Integrate RFID Tag Information into Presence Documents”), ¶ 6 (“there is a need to increase the synergistic effects of different technologies” in order “to increase the ability and efficiency to transfer content, track inventories, provide content to user, etc.”), ¶ 2 (“much integration with existing systems still is needed in order to fully capitalize on existing technologies”), ¶ 18 (“RFID originated events (e.g., RFID tag information) are converted into SIP messages for incorporation into an IP Multimedia Subsystem infrastructure,” which “allows third parties, e.g., ‘watchers,’ to track the location of items, people, events, etc. using the existing presence infrastructure of the telecommunications ‘network’ in order to receive richer presence information”); *see also DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.*, 773 F.3d 1245, 1257 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (holding the claims satisfy *Alice* step two because “the claimed solution is necessarily rooted in computer technology in order to overcome a problem specifically arising in the realm of computer networks”).

We, therefore, agree the Examiner erred. Accordingly, we do not sustain the Examiner’s § 101 rejection of independent claims 1, 15, and 24, and for the same reasons, dependent claims 4, 5, 7–10, 12–14, 16, 17, 20–23, and 25–28.

*35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph, Rejection*

The Examiner finds that the claim language “determining . . . how to process the content and/or the event associated with the RFID information based on the profile information associated with the RFID information” and

“obtaining location information pertaining to the people or items having the RFID tags from a location platform and placing the location information into a presence document with the RFID information to create a rich content presence document” fails to comply with the written-description requirement. *See* Final Act. 8; Ans. 9. Specifically, the Examiner finds that “[n]either the specification nor the drawings disclose in detail the specific steps or algorithm needed to perform” the claimed steps. *Id.*

Appellant argues that the Specification supports “people or items with RFID tags” and “determining how to process the content and/or the event associated with the RFID information based on the profile information.” Appeal Br. 31 (citing Spec. ¶¶ 18, 20, 55, 58, Fig. 5); *see* Appeal Br. 32 (citing Spec. ¶ 58, Fig. 5). Appellant also argues that the Specification supports presence information to provide richer presence information to a watcher, and SIP notifications including rich presence documents. Reply Br. 14 (citing Spec. ¶¶ 36, 47).

We are persuaded by Appellant’s arguments. To satisfy the written-description requirement, a patent specification must describe the claimed invention in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can reasonably conclude that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. *See, e.g., Moba, B.V. v. Diamond Auto., Inc.*, 325 F.3d 1306, 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563 (Fed. Cir. 1991). “[T]he test requires an objective inquiry into the four corners of the specification from the perspective of a person of ordinary skill in the art,” where “the specification must describe an invention understandable to that skilled artisan and show that the inventor actually invented the invention claimed.” *Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 598 F.3d 1336, 1351 (Fed.

Cir. 2010) (en banc). The exact level of detail required depends upon “the nature and scope of the claims and on the complexity and predictability of the relevant technology.” *Id.* Factors for “evaluating the adequacy of the disclosure” may include “the existing knowledge in the particular field, the extent and content of the prior art, the maturity of the science or technology, [and] the predictability of the aspect at issue.” *Id.* (quoting *Capon v. Eshhar*, 418 F.3d 1349, 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2005)).

In describing Figure 5, the Specification states “the RFID SIP gateway receives the RFID information and . . . checks a profile in the HSS [Home Subscriber Server],” and the “profile lookup may be used to determine how to process the event.” Spec. ¶ 58. The Specification also explains the “presence server . . . can obtain information from a common user profile 80 such as an HSS” that “contains subscription-related information (user profiles), performs authentication and authorization of the user, and can provide information about the user’s physical location” and “can also obtain location based information of the user from a location platform (LBS).” Spec. ¶ 47. Once all of the pertinent information is received, a SIP notification can be provided, which “can include rich presence documents, which may include the RFID information in addition to location information of the event or item associated with the RFID.” Spec. ¶ 47.

We find the Specification’s description of checking a profile “to determine how to process the event,” and “obtaining location information” and “placing the location information into a presence document” sufficiently shows Appellant had possession of the disputed limitations.

Accordingly, we reverse the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection of claims 1, 15, and 24.

*35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections*

*Dispositive Issue:* Did the Examiner err in finding that the combination of Trossen, Poikselka, and Kim teaches or suggests “looking up profile information associated with the RFID information, in a storage system, based on the tag identification, wherein the profile information includes content and/or information regarding an event pertaining to the people or items having the RFID tags,” “receiving one or more subscriber profile updates of one or more subscribers which are subscribed to receive the SIP message from the presence server, from the storage system,” and “sending the SIP message, with the rich content presence document, by the presence server to watchers that are subscribed to receive the SIP message,” as recited in independent claim 1, and commensurately recited in independent claims 15 and 24?

The Examiner relies on Trossen to teach or suggest “looking up profile information associated with the RFID information, in a storage system, based on the tag identification, wherein the profile information includes content and/or information regarding an event pertaining to the people or items having the RFID tags.” Final Act. 9. The Examiner finds Trossen's passing status information of a user entering a region to a notify message teaches looking up profile information associated with the RFID information, that includes content and/or information regarding an event

pertaining to the people or items having the RFID tags. Final Act. 9–10 (citing Trossen ¶¶ 26, 31, 32); *see* Ans. 10 (citing Trossen ¶ 45).

The Examiner relies on Poikselka to teach or suggest “receiving one or more subscriber profile updates of one or more subscribers which are subscribed to receive the SIP message from the presence server, from the storage system” and “sending the SIP message by the presence server to watchers that are subscribed to receive the SIP message.” Final Act. 10. The Examiner finds Poikselka’s updating of subscriber profile information teaches receiving profile updates for users subscribed to receive the SIP message from the presence server and sending the SIP message by the presence server to the subscribed watchers. Final Act. 10–11 (citing Poikselka ¶¶ 20–21, 26, 36, 43–47, Abstr.); *see* Ans. 11.

The Examiner relies on Kim to teach or suggest the “rich content presence document.” Final Act. 11. The Examiner finds Kim’s SIP server performing SIP registration and obtaining context information and notifying a user of the context information through the SIP NOTIFY message teaches the claimed creating a rich content presence document. Final Act. 11 (citing Kim col. 6, ll. 60–67, col. 7, ll. 1–2); *see* Ans. 11.

The Examiner finds it would have been obvious to modify Trossen to include Poikselka’s ability to update subscriber profile information, and obvious to modify Trossen and Poikselka to include Kim’s ability to create a rich content presence document, because the claimed invention is a combination of old elements and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable. Final Act. 10–11.

Appellant argues the “combination of Trossen, Poikselka, and Kim does not teach or suggest” the disputed claim limitations. Appeal Br. 34; *see* Reply Br. 16. According to Appellant, the claim “recites a first feature of looking up the first type of profile information associated with the RFID information before converting the RFID information and the profile information into an SIP message” and “a second feature of receiving subscriber profile updates with regard to subscribers which are subscribed to receive the SIP message from the presence server, prior to sending the SIP message to watchers that are subscribed to receive the SIP message.” Appeal Br. 35; *see* Appeal Br. 34–35 (citing Spec. ¶¶ 39, 55). Appellant argues the two features require two separate types of profile information. Appeal Br. 35–36. Appellant argues Trossen does not teach or suggest the use of either type of profile information, and further argues the cited portions of Poikselka do not teach receiving profile updates of subscribers subscribed to receive the SIP message or determining how to process an event associated with RFID information based on received profile updates prior to converting the RFID information and profile information. Appeal Br. 36 (citing Poikselka ¶¶ 20–21, 26, 43–47); *see* Reply Br. 15.

We are persuaded by Appellant’s arguments. Claim 1 requires (1) looking up *profile information* that is *associated with RFID information* and that *includes content and/or information regarding an event* pertaining to the people or items having the RFID tags, (2) receiving *subscriber profile updates* for *subscribers to receive SIP messages* from the presence server, and (3) sending *the SIP message, from converting the RFID information and profile information, with a rich content presence document*, to subscribed watchers for the SIP message.

The cited sections of Trossen teach “tagging sensors that report to a central presence server, which may be a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) Presence Server (SPS),” as well as a subscribe message, which is sent from a requesting entity who wants to establish a subscription with the presence server. Trossen ¶¶ 26, 28, 31, 45. The SPS may then send information about the status of a tag to the requesting entity. Trossen ¶ 32. The status information may indicate a willingness and ability of a user to communicate with others, a present state of the user, or a transition. Trossen ¶ 32. In other words, Trossen teaches reporting tag sensor information to a presence server and that an entity may subscribe to the presence server to receive status information about the tag. However, we do not see, and the Examiner has not sufficiently explained, how Trossen teaches or suggests “looking up profile information associated with the RFID information in a storage system, based on the tag identification, wherein the profile information includes content and/or information regarding an event pertaining to the people or items having the RFID tags,” as claimed.

Poikselka is generally directed to changing the subscription information of a subscriber in a data network. Poikselka Abstr. The cited sections of Poikselka teach detecting an update to a subscriber profile in a subscriber database (e.g. a HSS), checking whether the capability is still supported, and initiating a registration procedure. Poikselka ¶¶ 20, 36, 43, Abstr. Although Poikselka teaches subscriber profile updates, we do not see, and the Examiner has not sufficiently explained, how Poikselka teaches or suggests “receiving one or more subscriber profile updates of one or more subscribers which are subscribed to receive the SIP message from the presence server, from the storage system” and “sending the SIP message, . . .

by the presence server to watchers that are subscribed to receive the SIP message,” as claimed.

Kim is generally directed to a “context-aware service providing system.” Kim Abstr. The cited section of Kim teaches “SIP server 300 performs the SIP registration, and obtains the context information from the SIP registration message . . . and notifies the context information of the user BOB to the first context-aware service provider 200a through the notification message SIP NOTIFY in step S470.” Kim col. 6, l. 60–col. 7, l. 2. Although Kim teaches sending an SIP NOTIFY message to the context-aware service provider of the user’s context information, we do not see, and the Examiner has not sufficiently explained, how Kim teaches creating a “rich content presence document,” as claimed.

Nor has the Examiner sufficiently explained how the combination of Trossen, Poikselka, and Kim teach or suggest the foregoing limitations. *See* Final Act. 9–11; Ans. 9–11.

Because we agree with at least one of the arguments advanced by Appellant, we need not reach the merits of Appellant’s other arguments. Accordingly, we do not sustain the Examiner’s § 103(a) rejection of independent claims 1, 15, and 24, and dependent claims 4, 7–9, 12, 13, 16, 20, 22, 23, and 26–28.

Moreover, because the Examiner has not shown that the additional references cure the foregoing deficiency regarding the rejection of the independent claim, we do not sustain the obviousness rejection of dependent claims 5, 10, 14, 17, 21, and 25.

DECISION

We reverse the Examiner’s rejection of claims 1, 4, 5, 7–10, 12–17, and 20–28 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

We reverse the Examiner’s rejection of claims 1, 15, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

We reverse the Examiner’s rejections of claims 1, 4, 5, 7–10, 12–17, and 20–28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

In summary:

| <b>Claims Rejected</b>                      | <b>Basis</b>                                | <b>Affirmed</b> | <b>Reversed</b>                             |
|---|---|-----------------|---|
| 1, 4, 5, 7–10, 12–17, 20–28                 | § 101                                       |                 | 1, 4, 5, 7–10, 12–17, 20–28                 |
| 1, 15, 24                                   | § 112, first paragraph                      |                 | 1, 15, 24                                   |
| 1, 4, 7–9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20, 22–24, 26–28 | § 103 Trossen, Poikselka, Kim               |                 | 1, 4, 7–9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20, 22–24, 26–28 |
| 5   | § 103 Trossen, Poikselka, Kim, Quon         |                 | 5   |
| 14  | § 103 Trossen, Poikselka, Kim, Yamamoto     |                 | 14  |
| 21  | § 103 Trossen, Poikselka, Kim, Haakana      |                 | 21  |
| 10, 17, 25                                  | § 103 Trossen, Poikselka, Kim, RFC 3261-SIP |                 | 10, 17, 25                                  |
| <b>Overall Outcome</b>                      |   |                 | 1, 4, 5, 7–10, 12–17, 20–28                 |

REVERSED