1

| 1<br>2                     | IN T  | IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE |  |                                    |  |  |
|----------------------------|---|--|--|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 3                          | Telephone Interview Summary   |  |  |                                    |  |  |
| 5                          | Application Serial No. 09/947,801   |  |  |                                    |  |  |
| 6                          | Filed: 09/06/2001   |  |  | <b>HECEIVED</b>                    |  |  |
| 7                          | For: DISTRIBUTED COMPUTING SYSTEM   |  |  | CENTRAL FAX CENTER                 |  |  |
| 8                          | Examiner: Chirag R  | R. Patel   | Art Unit: 2141   | <b>AU</b> G 1 2 2005               |  |  |
| 9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13  | In re Application of  | 3570 Plea<br>San Jose                            | olin<br>asant Echo Dr.<br>, CA 95148-1916<br>08-238-4564 | 5148-1916                          |  |  |
| 14<br>15                   | Telephone Interview Date: 8/5/2005  |  |  |                                    |  |  |
| 16<br>17<br>18             | Participants: Examiner Chirag R. Patel, pro se Applicant Jed Margolin   |  |  |                                    |  |  |
| 19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | Mail Stop AF Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450   |  |  |                                    |  |  |
| 23<br>24<br>25             | Sir,  |  |  |                                    |  |  |
| 26<br>27<br>28             | The following Interview Summary is submitted as required by Rule 713.04 <b>Substance of Interview Must Be Made of Record [R-2] - 700 Examination of Applications</b> paragraph (b)  |  |  |                                    |  |  |
| 29<br>30                   |   |  | Background   |                                    |  |  |
| 31<br>32                   | Application 09/947,801 Distributed Computing System filed September 6, 2001.  |  |  |                                    |  |  |
| 33<br>34<br>35             | The application was docketed to five Examiners. The last one (Examiner Chirag R. Patel) issu the First Office Action on January 26, 2005.  The Examiner rejected all the claims solely under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ellis (US 6,167,428). It was clear that the Examiner did not understand my invention and had misinterpreted Ellis. |  |  |                                    |  |  |
| 36<br>37<br>38<br>39<br>40 |   |  |  |                                    |  |  |
| 41<br>42                   | I filed a response o  | n April 21,                                      | 2005 where I respectfully                                | pointed out the Examiner's errors. |  |  |
| 43<br>44                   | The Second Office Action was issued June 15, 2005.  |  |  |                                    |  |  |
| 45<br>46                   | The Examiner mistakenly insisted (again) that Ellis's <b>Network Server 2</b> is a <b>Home Network Server</b> as defined in my application and rejected all the claims again.   |  |  |                                    |  |  |