UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
90/006,831	10/30/2003	5838906		9718

30080   7590   02/26/2004

LAW OFFICE OF CHARLES E. KRUEGER
P.O. BOX 5607
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94596-1607

EXAMINER
CALDWELL, A.

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	9

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

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

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

a☒ Responsive to the communication(s) filed on _January 5 & 30, 2004_ .　　b☐ This action is made FINAL.

c☒ A statement under 37 CFR 1.530 has not been received from the patent owner.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire _two_ month(s) from the mailing date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will result in termination of the proceeding and issuance of an *ex parte* reexamination certificate in accordance with this action. 37 CFR 1.550(d). **EXTENSIONS OF TIME ARE GOVERNED BY 37 CFR 1.550(c).**
If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.

Part I　THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. ☒ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.　　3. ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-474.

2. ☐ Information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449.　　4. ☐ _____ .

Part II　SUMMARY OF ACTION

1a. ☒ Claims _1-10_ are subject to reexamination.

1b. ☐ Claims _____ are not subject to reexamination.

2. ☐ Claims _____ have been canceled in the present reexamination proceeding.

3. ☐ Claims _____ are patentable and/or confirmed.

4. ☒ Claims _1-10_ are rejected.

5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.

6. ☒ The drawings, filed on _30 October 2003_ are acceptable.

7. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ has been (7a)☐ approved (7b)☐ disapproved.

8. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of the priority claim under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None　　of the certified copies have

　　1☐ been received.

　　2☐ not been received.

　　3☐ been filed in Application No. _____ .

　　4☐ been filed in reexamination Control No. _____ .

　　5☐ been received by the International Bureau in PCT application No. _____ .

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

9. ☐ Since the proceeding appears to be in condition for issuance of an *ex parte* reexamination certificate 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.

10. ☐ Other: _____

1   *Information Disclosure Statement*

2   The Earlier Viola Source Code (dated May 12, 1993) and the Later Viola Source

3   Code (dated May 27, 1993) that was provided on a CD accompanying the information

4   disclosure statement filed on January 5, 2004 (paper no. 6) has not been considered.

5   Claims in an ex parte reexamination proceeding are examined on the basis of

6   patents or printed publications. 37 CFR 1.552(a). The Applicants have neither admitted

7   that the Viola source code is prior art nor provided any evidence that the Viola source

8   code is a publication. The Applicants have merely pointed to a ruling of a U.S. District

9   Court that raises questions as to whether the Viola source code was publicly available.

10   Accordingly, the information has been placed in the application file but has not been

11   considered as to the merits.

12

13   *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

14   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

15   obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

16   (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
17   forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
18   the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
19   invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
20   Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
21

22   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

23   the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

24   the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

25   were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

26

1 **The Prior Art as Applied to Claims 1-3 and 6-8:**

2

3 Berners-Lee, T., et al., Hypertext Markup Language (HTML),
4 Internet Draft, IETF, pages 1-40, (June 1993).

5

6 Raggett, D., HTML+ (Hypertext Markup Language), (July 23, 1993).
7 Hereinafter referred to as "Raggett L"

8

9 Raggett, D., Posting of Dave Raggett, dsr@hplb.hpl.hp.com
10 towww-talk@nxocOl.cern.ch (W-WW-TALK public mailing list),
11 (Posted June 14, 1993). Hereinafter referred to as "Raggett II."

12

13

14 Claims 1-3 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

15 over the admitted prior art in the `906 patent and the newly cited teachings of

16 Berners-Lee, Raggett I, and Raggett II.

17

18 Regarding claim 1 of the `906 patent, the admitted prior art teaches a portion of
19 the claimed invention of claim 1 of the `906 patent, namely a method comprising:

20

21 "providing at least one client workstation" (**See USP `906: Figure 2, element**
22 **130; Col. 4, Lines 32-40 which indicate that "small computer" 130 can be a**
23 **client**) "and one network server" (**See USP `906: Figure 2, element 132**)
24 "coupled to a network environment" (**See USP `906: Figure 2, element 100**
25 **Internet**), "wherein the network environment is a distributed hypermedia
26 environment" (**See USP `906: Col. 5 lines 24-25**);

27

28 "executing, at the client workstation, a browser application" (**See USP `906: Col.**
29 **3 lines 9-13**), "that parses a first distributed hypermedia document to identify text
30 formats included in the distributed hypermedia document and for responding to
31 predetermined text formats to initiate processing specified by the text formats"
32 (**See USP `906: Col. 1, lines 1-Col. 3, line 51, with particular emphasis on**
33 **Col. 2, line 63-Col. 3, line 25 showing a browser executing on client that**
34 **parses and then displays a hypermedia document; where the user clicks on**
35 **a link/image icon causing the browser to invoke a viewer application**
36 **displaying the image in a separate window**); and

37

38 "utilizing the browser to display, on the client workstation, at least a portion of a
39 first hypermedia document received over the network from the server, wherein
40 the portion of the first hypermedia document is displayed within a first

1   browser-controlled window on the client workstation." **(See USP `906: Figure 1,**
2   **element 10 as hypermedia document displayed on client; Col. 2 lines**
3   **28-36).**
4
5   While the admitted prior art describes a method in which a hypermedia page
6   **(See USP `906: Figure 1, element 10)** is displayed in a browser **(See USP `906: Col.**
7   **1, lines 1-Col. 3, line 51, particularly Col. 2, line 63-Col. 3, line 25),** the admitted prior
8   art does not teach, as in claim 1 of the `906 patent, the particular steps used by the
9   browser in order to process and display the hypermedia page. To summarize, the
10   admitted prior art does not teach a method wherein the browser application parses a
11   first distributed hypermedia document to identify text formats included in the distributed
12   hypermedia document and for responding to predetermined text formats to initiate
13   processing specified by the text formats.
14
15   Nevertheless, Berners-Lee teaches that HTML browsers parse HTML. **(See**
16   **Berners-Lee at p. 2 as printed - paragraph starting; "Implentations of ...")** The
17   parsing is used to identify characters interpreted as markup elements, such as the
18   various tags **(see Berners-Lee at page 5)** in the structured text example, and to
19   associate text with various tags. These tags correspond to the claimed "text formats."
20   Berners-Lee also teaches that the browser processes the HTML by rendering it into a
21   displayable form. **(See Berners-Lee at p. 3, definition of rendering).** Berners-Lee
22   also discusses how specific markup elements are to be rendered. **(See for example,**
23   **Berners-Lee at p. 14, typical rendering of address tag; p.15 typical rendering of**
24   **block quote).** Berners-Lee therefore teaches a method in which a browser application
25   parses a first distributed hypermedia document to identify text formats included in the
26   distributed hypermedia document and for responding to predetermined text formats to
27   initiate processing specified by the text formats.
28
29   It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to combine (1) the teachings of
30   Berners-Lee regarding the processing of HTML documents performed by a browser,
31   with (2) the HTML browser of the admitted prior art in light of the statement made by the
32   admitted prior art that its hypermedia system is designed to handle hypermedia
33   documents according the HTML markup standard. **(See USP `906: Col. 5, lines**
34   **28-31).**
35
36   Regarding the processing of the claimed "'text formats," patentee acknowledges
37   that the prior art teaches a method wherein a browser invokes an external viewer
38   program to process various file formats not handled directly by the browser. **(See USP**
39   **`906: Col. 3, lines 13-20).** Specifically, the prior art describes an example wherein the
40   file format not handled by the browser is an image file in ".TIF" or ".GIF" format and the
41   browser invokes an image viewer program to display the full image in a separate
42   window. **(See USP `906: Col. 3 lines 13-20).** While the prior art teaches that certain
43   tags may cause the browser to invoke external applications to process particular file
44   formats, these applications do not display their data in the browser window. Therefore,

1   the admitted prior art does not teach the portion of the method of claim 1 of the `906
2   patent wherein:
3
4   "Said first distributed hypermedia document includes an embed text format,
5   located at a first location in said first distributed hypermedia document, that
6   specifies the location of at least a portion of an object external to the first
7   distributed hypermedia document;
8
9   Said object has type information associated with it utilized by said browser to
10   identify and locate an executable application external to the first distributed
11   hypermedia document, and
12
13   Said embed text format is parsed by said browser to automatically invoke said
14   executable application to execute on said client workstation in order to display
15   said object and enable interactive processing of said object within a display area
16   created at said first location within the portion of said first distributed hypermedia
17   document being displayed in said first browser-controlled window."
18
19   However, Raggett I teaches various extensions to the HTML specification including
20 an EMBED tag that provides a simple form of object level embedding. **(See Raggett I:**
21 **p. 6 "Embedded data in an external format" and p. 26 embedded.)** For example,
22 Ragget I teaches an HTML document including an EMBED tag that identifies embedded
23 data in a foreign format. **(See Raggett 1: p. 6 <embed ...> and <embed> tags.)** This
24 embedded data is an object that cannot be directly processed by the browser. The
25 foreign format data, or object, is embedded in the HTML document by placing it
26 between the <embed ...> and </embed> tags. **(See Raggett 1: p. 6 "2 pi int sin**
27 **(omega t)dt" as an example of embedded foreign data.)** Raggett I describes the
28 example of an embedded equation, where the browser calls a program for rendering an
29 equation by providing ascii character information to an external program and receives a
30 pixmap image of the equation from the external program that is then displayed in the
31 browser window. **(See Raggett 1: p. 6, particularly the last ten lines.)** Raggett I
32 therefore teaches "a first distributed hypermedia document that includes an embed text:
33 format, located at a first location in said first distributed hypermedia document," that is
34 used to identify embedded foreign data. Raggett I also teaches that the embed tags
35 include a type attribute specifying a registered MIME content type that is used by the
36 browser to identify the appropriate external filter to use to render the embedded foreign
37 data. **(See Raggett 1: p. 6 type="application/eqn".)** Raggett I thus teaches a method
38 wherein "the object has type information associated with it utilized by said browser to
39 identify and locate: an executable application external to the first distributed hypermedia
40 document and wherein said embed text format is parsed by said browser to
41 automatically invoke said executable application to execute on said client workstation in
42 order to display said object." Although Raggett I describes an example where the
43 browser calls a program for rendering an equation in ASCII character format into a
44 pixmap image of the equation, Raggett I does also recognize that more sophisticated

1   browsers can link to external editors for creating or revising embedded data. These
2   external editors that create or revise the embedded data would work in the same way as
3   the simple example of providing equation support. **(See Raggett 1: p. 6.)** However, the
4   ability to create and revise the embedded data allows the user to interactively process
5   the data within the browser window. Raggett I therefore teaches a method which
6   "enables interactive processing of said object within a display area created at said first
7   location within the portion of said first distributed hypermedia document being displayed
8   in said first browser-controlled window."
9
10   It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to combine (1) Raggett I's teachings
11   regarding extensions to the HTML standard (i.e., the proposed HTML+ Specification)
12   allowing the embedding of data in foreign formats within web pages with (2) the method
13   as taught by patentee's admitted prior art. This combination would have been obvious
14   based on Raggett I's acknowledgment that this particular extension to HTML is
15   advantageous and it represents a "substantial improvement." **(See Raggett 1: p. 1 2nd**
16   **paragraph of abstract).**
17
18   The combination of patentee's admitted prior art in view of Berners-Lee and Raggett
19   I does not explicitly teach a system wherein "the embed text format specifies the
20   location of at least a portion of an object external to the first distributed hypermedia
21   document." Raggett I describes a method in which the object itself is embedded in the
22   HTML document. **(See Raggett I: p. 6 embedded data in an external format - see**
23   **example on the last two lines of the page where the object, the text representation**
24   **of the equation, is within the embed tags).**
25
26   Raggett II, though, teaches putting the foreign data in a separate file and then
27   referencing that file by a URL in the HTML+ embed tag. **(See Raggett II: last line.)** It is
28   thus argued that Raggett II describes a system wherein "the embed text format specifies
29   the location of at least a portion of an object external to the first distributed hypermedia
30   document."
31
32   It would have been readily apparent to a skilled artisan to modify the method
33   discussed above, combining the teachings of the admitted prior art in view of
34   Berners-Lee and Raggett I, by further substituting a URL which references a separate
35   file containing foreign data for the embedded foreign data within the hypermedia
36   document of the combination. Such a further modification would have been apparent
37   based on Raggett II's explicit suggestion to make such a substitution. **(See Raggett II:**
38   **last line.)**
39
40   Regarding claim 2 of the `906 patent, Raggett II teaches a method wherein "said
41   executable application is a controllable application" and the method further comprises
42   the step of "interactively controlling said controllable application on said client
43   workstation via interprocess communications between said browser and said
44   controllable application." (It is noted that Raggett II functions could be implemented as

1 separate programs driven via pipes and stdin/stdout or as dynamically linked library
2 modules.)
3
4   Regarding claim 3 of the `906 patent, the combination of patentee's admitted prior
5 art in view of Berners-Lee, Raggett I, and Raggett II teaches the invention substantially
6 as claimed. (See the rejection of claim 2, above.) However, the combination of the
7 patentee's prior art in view of Berners-Lee, Raggett I, and Raggett II does not explicitly
8 teach the additional limitation of claim 3. Nevertheless, Raggett I does teach that
9 sophisticated browsers can link to external editors for creating or revising embedded
10 data. **(See Raggett I: p. 6.)** The fact that the creating and revising is performed by an
11 external editor would suggest to a skilled artisan that the creating and revising is an
12 interactive process controlled by the browser user. The use of an editor to create or
13 revise an object suggests a continued interaction between the browser and the external
14 editor during the editing process. A skilled artisan would therefore reasonably infer that
15 the combination of the admitted prior art in view of Berners-Lee, Raggett I, and Raggett
16 II teaches a method wherein "communications to interactively control said controllable
17 application continue to be exchanged between the controllable application" (i.e., the
18 external editor) and the browser even after the controllable application program has
19 been launched.
20
21   Regarding claims 6-8 of the `906 patent, such claims are computer program product
22 claims which correspond to method claims 1-3, respectively. Since they do not teach or
23 define above the information in the corresponding method claims, the discussion and
24 application, supra, of the admitted prior art in combination with the newly cited
25 references of BernersLee, Raggett I, and Raggett II to method claims 1-3 is applied to
26 claims 6-8, respectively.
27

28 **The Prior Art as Applied to Claims 4-5 and 9-10:**
29
30   Reichard, K., et al., X11R6: the Rumored Changes (Release 6 of
31   the X Window System), Unix Review, vol. 11, no. 5, p. 101(5), pp.
32   1-4 as printed, May 1993.
33
34   Cox, B., Object Oriented Programming: An Evolutionary Approach,
35   Addison-Wesley, pp. 1-12, 1987.
36
37
38   Claims 4-5 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

39   over the combination of the admitted prior art in the `906 patent in view of Berners-Lee,

1   Raggett I, and Raggett II, as applied to claims 3 and 8 above, and further in view of

2   Reichard and Cox.

3
4   Regarding claim 4, the combination of the admitted prior art in view of
5   Berners-Lee, Raggett I, and Raggett II teaches the invention substantially as claimed.
6   (See the rejection of claim 3, above.) The combination also describes a method in
7   which the browser is implemented to run on an X Windows platform (**See USP `906:**
8   **Col. 8 lines 10-16**).   The combination teaches that the controllable applications (i.e.,
9   external editors) for creating and revising embedded data executes on the same
10   machine as the browser (**See USP '906: Col. 3 lines 15-16; Col. 6 lines 34-39.**) Since
11   the examples of external editors all produce output directed to the computer's graphical
12   user interface (**See Raggett I: p. 6 listing the rendering of mathematical equations**
13   **and simple drawings using TeX and eqn as examples**), it would have been obvious
14   to a skilled artisan that the combination's controllable application would be implemented
15   to run on an X Windows platform as well.
16
17   However, the combination of the admitted prior art in view of Berners-Lee,
18   Raggett I, and Raggett II does not explicitly teach the additional limitations of claim 4.
19
20   Nevertheless, Reichard teaches an extension to the X Windows system, the
21   Fresco toolkit, that allows the linking and embedding of object components, where the
22   objects can be distributed between processes on a single machine or across a network
23   on many machines. (**See Reichard: p. 2 first two paragraphs in Objects**
24   **Everywhere section.**)
25
26   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
27   invention was made to implement the browser and controllable application (i.e, external
28   editor) of the combination of the admitted prior art in view of Berners-Lee, Raggett I, and
29   Raggett II's using Reichard's distributed object toolkit because of Cox's teaching that
30   applying object oriented techniques to software makes the software more tolerant to
31   change (**See Cox: p. 8 last three lines.**)
32
33   Once the browser and the controllable application both support distributed
34   objects, it would have been obvious to move the controllable application (i.e., external
35   editor) to a remote machine across the network based on Reichard's explicit
36   suggestion. (**See Reichard: p. 2 first paragraph in Objects Everywhere section.**)
37   The combination of the admitted prior art in view of Berners-Lee, Raggett I, Raggett II,
38   Reichard, and Cox therefore teaches a method wherein additional instructions for
39   controlling said controllable application reside on a network server (i.e., a remote
40   machine across the network).
41

1   As to the remaining steps introduced in the claim, these steps all flow logically
2   from the movement of the controllable application from the client workstation to a
3   network server. The step of issuing, from the client workstation, one or more
4   commands to the network server flows logically from the fact that user editing
5   commands entered at the browser computer must be transmitted from the client
6   workstation to the controllable application executing on the remote machine. The step
7   of executing, on the network server, one or more instructions in response to the
8   commands is taught by the controllable application (i.e, the external editor) executing on
9   the remote machine. The step of sending information from said network server to said
10   client workstation in response to said executed instructions is taught by the controllable
11   application returning a result of the editing process to the client workstation. The step of
12   processing said information at the client workstation to interactively control said
13   controllable application is taught by the client workstation rendering the result of the edit
14   in the browser window, thus allowing the user to see the results of the editing operation
15   so the user can decide what editing operation to perform next.
16
17   Regarding claim 5, the combination of the admitted prior art in view of
18   Berners-Lee, Raggett I, Raggett II, Reichard, and Cox teaches that the results returned
19   by the controllable application residing on the network server are displayed in the
20   browser window. The instructions performing this function are additional instructions for
21   controlling said controllable application reside on said client workstation.
22
23   Regarding claims 9-10 of the '906 patent, such claims are computer program
24   product claims which correspond to method claims 4-5, respectively. Since they do not
25   teach or define above the information in the corresponding method claims, the
26   discussion and application, supra, of the admitted prior art in combination with the newly
27   cited references of Berners-Lee, Raggett I, Raggett II, Reichard, and Cox to method
28   claims 4-5 is applied to claims 9-10, respectively.
29
30

31   ### *Conclusion*

32   The patent owner is reminded of the continuing responsibility under 37 CFR

33   1.565(a), to apprise the Office of any litigation activity, or other prior or concurrent

34   proceeding, involving Patent No. 5,838,906 throughout the course of this reexamination

35   proceeding. See MPEP §§ 2207, 2282 and 2286.

36   In order to ensure full consideration of any amendments, affidavits or

37   declarations, or other documents as evidence of patentability, such documents **must** be

1   submitted in response to this Office action. Submissions after the next Office action,

2   which is intended to be a final action, will be governed by the requirements of 37

3   CFR 1.116, which will be strictly enforced.

4   A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **two**

5   **months** from the mailing date of this action.

6   **Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) do not apply in reexamination**

7   **proceedings**. The provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 apply only to "an applicant" and not to

8   parties in a reexamination proceeding. Further, in 35 U.S.C. 305 and in 37 CFR

9   1.550(a), it is required that reexamination proceedings "will be conducted with special

10   dispatch within the Office."

11   **Extensions of time in reexamination proceedings are provided for in 37**

12   **CFR 1.550(c).** A request for extension of time must be filed on or before the day on

13   which a response to this action is due. The mere filing of a request will not effect any

14   extension of time. An extension of time will be granted only for sufficient cause, and for

15   a reasonable time specified.

16   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
17   examiner should be directed to Andrew Caldwell, whose telephone number is (703)
18   306-3036. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.
19   EST.
20
21   If attempts to reach the examiner by phone fail, the examiner's supervisor,
22   Glenton Burgess, can be reached at (703) 305-4792. Additionally, the fax numbers for
23   Group 2100 are as follows:
24
25   Fax Responses: (703) 872-9306
26

1
2   Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should
3   be directed to the Group receptionist at (703) 305-9600.
4
5
6   *Andrew Caldwell*
7
8
9
10   Andrew Caldwell
11   703-306-3036
12   February 25, 2004

13
14
15
16
17
18

	Notice of References Cited	Application/Control No. 90/006,831	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination 5838906
		Examiner Andrew Caldwell	Art Unit 2151	Page 1 of 3

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
	A	US-5,812,862	09-1998	Smith et al.	715/515
	B	US-5,425,141	06-1995	Gedye, David	345/797
	C	US-5,537,526	07-1996	Anderson et al.	715/515
	D	US-			
	E	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	Adie, C., Network Access to Multimedia Information, 2nd ed., RARE Project OBR(93)015, RARE, pp. 1-53, February 4, 1994.
	V	Reichard, K., et al., X11R6: the Rumored Changes (Release 6 of the X Window System), Unix Review, vol. 11, no. 5, p. 101(5 pp. 1-4 as printed, May 1993.
	W	Cox, B., Object Oriented Programming: An Evolutionary Approach, Addison-Wesley, pp. 1-12, 1987.
	X	Solaris OpenWindows: Introduction to the ToolTalk Service - A White Paper, Sun Microsystems, Inc., pp. 1-16, 1991.

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTO-892 (Rev. 01-2001)   Notice of References Cited   Part of Paper No. 9

Notice of References Cited	Application/Control No. 90/006,831	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination 5838906	
	Examiner Andrew Caldwell	Art Unit 2151	Page 2 of 3

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
	A	US-			
	B	US-			
	C	US-			
	D	US-			
	E	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
B	U	Tool Inter-Operability: A Hands On Demonstration - A Simple Demonstration of How the ToolTalk Service Works, Sun Microsystems, Inc., pp. 1-24, 1992.
B	V	Designing and Writing a ToolTalk Procedural Protocol - A White Paper, Sun Microsystems, Inc., pp. 1-24, 1992.
B	W	Fresco Frequently Asked Questions, www.i.h.kyoto-u.ac.jp/~shom/doc.org/fresco/FAQ.html, pp. 1-4, April 13, 1995.
B	X	The Andrew View, Carnegie Mellon Univ., www-2.cs.cmu.edu/People/AUIS/ftp/NEWSLETTERS/ASCII/93Jun.ascii, vol. 2, no. pp. 1-12 as printed, June 1993.

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTO-892 (Rev. 01-2001)   **Notice of References Cited**   Part of Paper No. 9

		Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination
Notice of References Cited		90/006,831	5838906
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Andrew Caldwell	2151	Page 3 of 3

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
	A	US-			
	B	US-			
	C	US-			
	D	US-			
	E	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	The X Window System And Broadway, www.broadwayinfo.com/bwwhitesbroadwayhct.htm, Hummingbird Communications Ltd pp. 1-11, 1997.
	V	Neuendorffer, T., ADEW: A Multimedia Interface Builder for Andrew, Proceedings Multi-Media Communications, Applications, and Technology Workshop, pp. 1-19, July 1991.
	W	Palay, A., Andrew Toolkit: An Overview, Tech Rept., Carnegie-Mellon University Information Technology Center, pp. 1-15, 198
	X	Dettmer, R., X-Windows - the great integrator, IEE Review, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 219-222, June 1990.

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.