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.
18/611,498	03/20/2024	Daniel Hunter	56710-0002001	9701

26191 7590 10/08/2024
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. (TC)
PO BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER	
LE, MICHAEL	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2163	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/08/2024	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):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Applicant-Initiated Interview Summary	**Application No.** 18/611,498	**Applicant(s)** Hunter et al.		
	Examiner MICHAEL LE	**Art Unit** 2163	**AIA (First Inventor to File) Status** Yes	**Page** 1 of 2

All Participants (applicant, applicants representative, PTO personnel)	**Title**	**Type**
MICHAEL LE	Examiner	Telephonic
ERIC SCHULMAN (43350)	Attorney of Record	
NATHAN DODGE	Technical Advisor	

Date of Interview: 02 October 2024

Issues Discussed:

Proposed Amendment(s)

Applicant's representative gave a brief overview of the invention with reference to Figs. 1B and 2 of the application.

Applicant's representative stated the intent of the proposed amendments were to incorporate the subject matter of claims 7 and 8 and contended that while Madisetti disclosed returning citations, it did not disclose specific sentences from the documents as claimed.

Examiner disagreed and explained he believed Madisetti disclosed returning citations to sentences. Specifically, Madisetti states "citations from the knowledge documents," which would preclude interpretation that a citation is merely to the document itself. Moreover, Examiner stated the claim currently does not require that an actual sentence from the document be returned and only requires that an "indication" be provided, which is disclosed by Madisetti by at least returning documents to the user.

Examiner suggested the claims be at least amended to clarify that a sentence is returned, but that additional features of how the sentence is returned would be better since Madisetti seems to disclose returning citations to "at least one sentence". For example, Examiner suggested amendments to features of how the sentence is returned and/or displayed, if such features are supported by the specification. Examiner did not have sufficient time to determine if those features are in the specification.

Applicant's representative stated he would take Examiner's suggestions into consideration and speak with the client before filing a response. No particular agreement was reached with regards to claim language or the rejection of record.

Examiner also noted the proposed amendments and the suggestion would likely not be sufficient to overcome the 101 rejection in view of the AI examples recently published by the PTO. In particular, claims 2 and 3 of example 45 seemed most relevant to the current invention. Examiner suggested reviewing that example as a guide to incorporate more amendments to overcome the 101 rejection.

No particular agreement was reached with regards to the 101 rejection either.

Other

Attached is the agenda provided by Applicant's representative.

Applicant-Initiated Interview Summary	**Application No.** 18/611,498	**Applicant(s)** Hunter et al.		
	Examiner MICHAEL LE	**Art Unit** 2163	**AIA (First Inventor to File) Status** Yes	**Page** **2 of 2**

☑ Attachment

/MICHAEL LE/ Examiner, Art Unit 2163	/TONY MAHMOUDI/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2163

Applicant is reminded that a complete written statement as to the substance of the interview must be made of record in the application file. It is the applicants responsibility to provide the written statement, unless the interview was initiated by the Examiner and the Examiner has indicated that a written summary will be provided. See MPEP 713.04
Please further see:
MPEP 713.04
Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews, paragraph (b)
37 CFR § 1.2 Business to be transacted in writing

Applicant recordation instructions: The formal written reply to the last Office action must include the substance of the interview. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, applicant is given a non-extendable period of the longer of one month or thirty days from this interview date, or the mailing date of this interview summary form, whichever is later, to file a statement of the substance of the interview.

Examiner recordation instructions: Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recordation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.