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.
18/807,150	08/16/2024	Zach Bolton		2354

128548 7590 04/17/2026

Accelerate IP
1133 Vinsetta Cir.
Winter Gardens, FL 34787

EXAMINER	
SPAR, ILANA L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3622	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/17/2026	PAPER

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.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 18/807,150	Applicant(s) Bolton, Zach	
	Examiner ILANA L SPAR	Art Unit 3622	AIA (First Inventor to File) Status Yes

-- 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 MONTHS 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 12/31/2025.

☐ A declaration(s)/affidavit(s) under **37 CFR 1.130(b)** was/were filed on _____.

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) 1-26 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) 1-26 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).

Certified copies:

a)☐ All b)☐ Some** c)☐ None of the:

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/08a and/or PTO/SB/08b) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

3) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Notice of Pre-AIA or AIA Status

The present application, filed on or after March 16, 2013, is being examined under the first inventor to file provisions of the AIA.

Response to Amendment

The following Office Action is responsive to the amendments and remarks received on December 31, 2025.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

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 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a judicial exception without significantly more.

At step 1, claim 1 is directed to a platform, i.e. an apparatus, which is a statutory category of invention.

At step 2A prong I, the claims recite an abstract idea. The following limitations recite the abstract idea of Certain Methods of Organizing Human Activity:

a client interface that is accessible by one or more managers selected by the client;

a set of creation tools provided through the platform that allow the client to create custom wallet app content;

one or more real world triggers that are each associated with and accessible by at least one of the one or more users;

a linker allowing the client to associate the one or more triggers with the custom wallet app content.

These steps are directed to marketing, sales activities, and business relationships (see specification paragraph 4, improved consumer experiences in retail environments).

At step 2A prong II, the additional elements are a mobile device and non-transitory computer-readable medium. These are generic computing components recited at a high level of generality, and amount to no more than the words "apply it" on a generic computing device. Therefore, the additional elements do not integrate the abstract idea into a practical application.

At step 2B, the additional elements are again analyzed, but are still generic computing components recited at a high level of generality, and amount to no more than the words "apply it" on a generic computing device. Therefore, the additional elements do not amount to significantly more than the abstract idea.

Dependent claims 2-26 are further rejected under the same analysis as above. While some additional elements are included in the dependent claims, they are each generic computing elements and therefore fail to integrate the abstract idea into a practical application or amount to significantly more than the abstract idea for the reasons discussed above and in the previous office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

In the event the determination of the status of the application as subject to AIA 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 (or as subject to pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103) is incorrect, any correction of the statutory basis (i.e., changing from AIA to pre-AIA) for the rejection will not be considered a new ground of rejection if the prior art relied upon, and the rationale supporting the rejection, would be the same under either status.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A patent for a claimed invention may not be obtained, notwithstanding that the claimed invention is not identically disclosed as set forth in section 102, if the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious before the effective filing date of the claimed invention to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the

claimed invention pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 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.

Claims 1, 4, 12-15, and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Van Os (US 2019/0370805) in view of Lim (US 2022/0318785).

With reference to claim 1, Van Os teaches a client-user interaction platform for allowing a client to interact with one or more storage unit users associated with the client through a mobile device having an operating system and an operating system wallet application, the platform comprising:

at least one non-transitory computer-readable medium storing instructions that, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to provide (see Figure 1A):

a client interface that is accessible by the client (see Figure 7A and paragraph 219, interface 706);

a set of creation tools provided through the platform that allow the client to create custom wallet app content (see Figures 7C-7N – the user can enter various information about the card);

one or more real world triggers that are each associated with and accessible by at least one of the one or more users (see Figure 7J and paragraph 230 – each card added to the app is a real world trigger);

a linker allowing the client to associate the one or more triggers with the custom wallet app content (see paragraph 217 – the secure credential becomes linked between the app and the card).

Van Os fails to teach that the client interface is accessible by one or more managers selected by the client.

Lim teaches that the client interface is accessible by one or more managers selected by the client (see paragraph 86 – "In another embodiment, such facilitated verification may involve the user's accessing a remote kiosk or smartphone app to virtually interact with an agent that facilitates the identity verification, or to interact with a self-guided verification user interface, such as a website or smartphone app." See also paragraph 7 – "In this disclosure, "user" and "client" are used interchangeably to refer to the MIC user as a user or client or agent or worker in the physical access context." Since the user may be a worker or agent, i.e. manager, the client interface is accessible to one or more managers.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art before the effective filing date to modify access permissions of the app as taught by Van Os to include access by managers as taught by Lim, to facilitate identity verification (see Lim, paragraph 85).

With reference to claim 4, Van Os and Lim teach all that is required with reference to claim 1, and Van Os further teaches wherein the set of creation tools comprises at least one of a wallet pass builder, a landing page builder, and an email template builder (see paragraph 272 – the wallet can build entries for transit passes, i.e. a wallet pass builder).

With reference to claim 12, Van Os and Lim teach all that is required with reference to claim 1, and Van Os further teaches wherein the client has a plurality of locations, and wherein the content is customized to at least one of the plurality of locations (see paragraph 83, 120 – GPS can identify user location and use it to provide information to the apps operating on the device).

With reference to claim 13, Van Os and Lim teach all that is required with reference to claim 4, and Van Os further teaches herein the wallet pass builder comprises at least one wallet pass template (see Figures 7C-7L – template for information being received from the card).

With reference to claim 14, Van Os and Lim teach all that is required with reference to claim 13, and Van Os further teaches wherein the at least one wallet pass template is selected from the group consisting of a generic pass, a storage pass, a loyalty pass, a coupon pass, a member pass, an event ticket pass, a store pass, and a transit pass (see Figure 7A – loyalty pass, transit pass).

With reference to claim 15, Van Os and Lim teach all that is required with reference to claim 4, and Van Os further teaches wherein the landing page builder comprises at least one landing page template (see Figure 11P – landing page for information about the stored card).

With reference to claim 19, Van Os and Lim teach all that is required with reference to claim 1, and Van Os further teaches at least one sensor, wherein information from the at least one sensor is incorporated into the custom wallet app content (see Figure 7J and paragraph 230 – the sensor can be a camera).

With reference to claim 20, Van Os and Lim teach all that is required with reference to claim 19, and Van Os further teaches wherein the at least one sensor is at least one of a motion sensor, a humidity sensor, a temperature sensor, and a water sensor (see paragraph 120 – a GPS sensor, i.e. a motion sensor, can be used in conjunction with the apps on the device).

With reference to claim 21, Van Os and Lim teach all that is required with reference to claim 1, and Van Os further teaches wherein the client is a storage facility, the one or more triggers are Near Field Communication tags and wherein the wallet app content allows gate access to a user (see paragraph 289 – NFC tags can be used to access secure access facilities. Whether the facility is a storage facility or used for some other purpose is merely intended use, and not given patentable weight).

With reference to claim 22, Van Os and Lim teach all that is required with reference to claim 1, and Lim further teaches a method of managing a plurality of storage units, each storage unit leased by a tenant (see paragraphs 169-170 – storage units leased by tenants for package rooms and equipment storage areas), the method comprising the acts of:

providing the platform of claim 1, wherein the client of the platform is an owner or operator of the plurality of storage units, and wherein one of the one or more real world triggers is a first trigger and wherein the first trigger is a Near Field Communication tag (see paragraph 57, 65 – property owner has the device that triggers via the NFC);

enrolling the tenant of each storage unit as a user of the platform and assigning the user a unique user identifier (see paragraphs 43 and 75 – initial enrollment);

linking the user identifier to at least one gate (see paragraph 171 – touchpoint has a dialog with user at the access point);

configuring the at least one gate to open when a mobile device of the user is placed in proximity to the Near Field Communication tag (see paragraphs 61 and 67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art before the effective filing date to combine the teachings of Lim, above, with Van Os, for the purpose of allowing users to access entry points via their preregistered and stored access cards, as taught by both Van Os and Lim.

Claims 2, 3, 5, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Van Os in view of Lim as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hirsch (WO 2012154347).

With reference to claim 2, Van Os and Lim teach all that is required with reference to claim 1, but fail to teach a tracker that logs user interactions with the one or more real world triggers or with the custom wallet app content.

Hirsch teaches a tracker that logs user interactions with the one or more real world triggers or with the custom wallet app content (see paragraph 125 – table used to keep track of various statistics for an app).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art before the effective filing date to incorporate the tracker of Hirsch into the apps of Van Os and Lim to obtain further data on the use of the app, which may be beneficial for device or app manufacturers to track, as is well known in the art.

With reference to claim 3, Van Os and Lim teach all that is required with reference to claim 1, but fail to teach herein the one or more real world triggers is at least one of a Bluetooth beacon, a QuickResponse Code, a 2-way short message service, a Near Field Communication tag, a geographical location, and a trackable link.

Hirsch teaches herein the one or more real world triggers is at least one of a Bluetooth beacon, a QuickResponse Code, a 2-way short message service, a Near Field Communication tag, a geographical location, and a trackable link (see paragraph 222 – QR code).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art before the effective filing date of the invention that a user may enter information into the app via a variety of methods, including both the photograph and OCR of Van Os and the QR code scan of Hirsch, which are obvious variants of one another and may be substituted to provide predictable results.

With reference to claim 5, Van Os, Lim, and Hirsch teach all that is required with reference to claim 2, and Hirsch further teaches wherein the custom wallet app content comprises one or more campaign items (see paragraph 146 – advertisements inserted into apps).

It would have further been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art before the effective filing date to provide targeted ads within the wallet app, as a means of targeting a captive audience with relevant content without the need to download further apps (see Hirsch, paragraph 16).

With reference to claim 16, Van Os and Lim teach all that is required with reference to claim 15, but fail to teach wherein the at least one landing page template is selected from the group consisting of redirection page, a registration page, a payment page, a social media link, an issue reporting page, a photo gallery, an audio link, a virtual card, a social media react page, a rate and review page, a feedback page, a video, an email us page, a text us page, a wifi login page, a business page, a maps page, an iFrame page, and a multiple links page.

Hirsch teaches wherein the at least one landing page template is selected from the group consisting of redirection page, a registration page, a payment page, a social media link, an issue reporting page, a photo gallery, an audio link, a virtual card, a social media react page, a rate and review page, a feedback page, a video, an email us page, a text us page, a wifi login page, a business page, a maps page, an iFrame page, and a multiple links page (see paragraphs 163, 190, 231).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art before the effective filing date to use any known template type, such as those taught by Hirsch, as a means of providing additional information to the user in a simple and easy to use format.

With reference to claim 17, Van Os and Lim teach all that is required with reference to claim 4, but fail to teach wherein the email template builder comprises at least one email template.

Hirsch teaches wherein the email template builder comprises at least one email template (see paragraph 164 – new email message in email app).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art before the effective filing date to combine the email template of Hirsch with the general template as taught by Van Os as a means to further customize the available content in the wallet app, while utilizing available features already included on the user's device (see paragraph 164).

With reference to claim 18, Van Os, Lim, and Hirsch teach all that is required with reference to claim 17, and Hirsch further teaches wherein the at least one email template is selected from the group consisting of at least one of a holiday email, a basic announcement email, a basic letter email, a birthday email, a newsletter email, a special offer email, and a sign up email (see paragraph 164 – new email message is equivalent to a basic letter email).

Combined under the same rationale as above.

Claims 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Van Os in view of Lim, further in view of Hirsch as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Sami (US 2024/0394502).

With reference to claim 6, Van Os, Lim, and Hirsch teach all that is required with reference to claim 5, but fail to teach wherein the one or more campaign items are at least one of an email, SMS, or push notification scheduled to a marketing strategy that adapts to user preferences, behaviors, and engagement patterns (see paragraph 87 for various marketing campaign items, and see paragraphs 60, 89 – user/customer preferences are used for targeting the marketing actions).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art before the effective filing date to incorporate the customized marketing strategy of Sami into the general marketing strategies of Lim and Hirsch, in order to deliver highly targeted and personalized advertisements using behavioral analysis and pattern recognition (Sami, paragraph 2), thus delivering improved results.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Van Os in view of Lim as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Jain (US 2019/0384617).

With reference to claim 7, Van Os and Lim teach all that is required with reference to claim 1, but fail to teach a wallet pass application programming interface mapper.

Jain teaches a wallet pass application programming interface mapper (see paragraph 24 – API modification candidate generator and mapping generator).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art before the effective filing date to modify the wallet app of Van Os with the API mapper of Jain, in order to identify endpoint patterns (see Jain, paragraph 24), thus improving results.

Claims 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Van Os and Lim as applied to claims 8 and 1 above, and further in view of Schmidt (US 2022/0051514).

With reference to claim 9, Van Os and Lim teach all that is required with reference to claim 8, but fail to teach wherein at least one of the one or more real world triggers is depicted on the custom geographic or location map.

Schmidt teaches wherein at least one of the one or more real world triggers is depicted on the custom geographic or location map (see paragraph 104 and Figure 10 – map with QR codes (triggers) on it).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art before the effective filing date to modify the wallet app of Van Os with the map feature of Schmidt, to support the contactless procurement and provision of diverse kinds of valuable services to park guests and visitors (see Schmidt, paragraph 104).

With reference to claim 11, Van Os and Lim teach all that is required with reference to claim 1, but fail to teach a dashboard summarizing the client's content, real world triggers, and users of the client.

Schmidt teaches a dashboard summarizing the client's content, real world triggers, and users of the client (see paragraph 263 and Figure 15A – the table summarizes a variety of features pertaining to the storage locker and user).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art before the effective filing date to modify the app of Van Os to further include the dashboard of Schmidt in order to manage interactions (see Schmidt, paragraph 261).

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Van Os in view of Lim, further in view of Hirsch as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Schmidt.

With reference to claim 10, Van Os and Lim teach all that is required with reference to claim 2, but fail to teach a graphical depiction of the logged interactions.

Schmidt teaches a graphical depiction of the logged interactions (see paragraph 261 and Figure 15B – graphical depiction of data).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art before the effective filing date to modify the app of Van Os to further include the dashboard of Schmidt in order to manage interactions (see Schmidt, paragraph 261).

Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Van Os in view of Lim as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of Jeong (KR 2022/0000972).

With reference to claim 23, Van Os and Lim teach all that is required with reference to claim 22, and Lim further teaches wherein at least one of the one or more real world triggers is a second trigger, and wherein the second trigger is an Near Field Communication tag or Quick Response Code (see paragraph 65 – using a QR code to establish the dialog), the method further comprising: enrolling staff of the client as users of the platform (see paragraph 7 – user and client can refer to a user, client, agent, or worker, such that when a user is enrolled per paragraph s43 and 75, it applies to staff as well).

Van Os and Lim fail to teach logging staff activation of the second trigger.

Jeong teaches logging staff activation of the second trigger (see page 2 – the app logs facility inspection information, i.e. inspection done by staff using a QR code/trigger).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art before the effective filing date to modify the wallet app of Van Os and Lim with the logging of staff activation of Jeong, to facilitate other types of use of a wallet app, including staff check-ins at various points of a facility (see Jeong page 2).

With reference to claim 24, Van Os, Lim, and Jeong teach all that is required with reference to claim 23, and Jeong further teaches allowing staff to attach images to a log record of activation of the second trigger (see page 2 – “take a photo”).

Combined under the same rationale as above.

Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Van Os in view of Lim as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hladik (US 8,463,299).

With reference to claim 25, Van Os and Lim teach all that is required with reference to claim 1, but fail to teach wherein the custom wallet app content comprises a map and customized locations of interest identified on the map for each of the one or more users identified on the map; providing a printout of the map at the site and a trigger on or near the printout, wherein the trigger when activated by the one or more users initiates a display of the map on the mobile device of the one or more users with the locations of interest of the one or more users highlighted.

Hladik teaches wherein the custom wallet app content comprises a map and customized locations of interest identified on the map for each of the one or more users identified on the map (see column 4, lines 41-49 – digital maps including additional information that can be considered customized locations of interest);

providing a printout of the map at the site and a trigger on or near the printout (see column 4, lines 1-3 – camera can take a picture of the bar code (trigger) on the paper map),

wherein the trigger when activated by the one or more users initiates a display of the map on the mobile device of the one or more users with the locations of interest of the one or more users highlighted (see column 4, lines 7-32 – unique bar code for each map, and user location identified on the map with a graphical element, i.e. a location of interest).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art before the effective filing date to incorporate the customized location map of Hladik into the wallet app of Van Os to assist a user in locating themself on the map and surrounding region (see Hladik, column 4, lines 10-12).

With reference to claim 26, Van Os, Lim, and Hladik teach all that is required with reference to claim 25, and Van Os further teaches wherein the trigger is an Near Field Communication tag, Quick Response Code, geofence, or Bluetooth beacon (see paragraph 304).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed December 31, 2025 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant initially argues that the claims are eligible in view of 35 USC 101. Applicant states that the claim as a whole recites a specific technological system; however, the elements identified as additional per the SME analysis are not a specific technological architecture, but generic computing components carrying out generic computing functions of storing, receiving, communicating, scanning, etc. Applicant further has not shown any support in the specification to demonstrate that these components are not generic, other than mere allegations. Applicant further argues that the claims are not directed to an abstract idea because they incorporate technological components rather than just organizational methods. However, that is not the standard for determining whether the claims recite an abstract idea. Further, Applicant has not recited claim language to demonstrate that an abstract idea is not recited, but summarized what Applicant believes to be the inventive concept of the claims. The features discussed by Applicant are not relevant to the analysis of the claim itself. Because Applicant only points out supposed fault with the rejection itself, rather than showing why the claims are eligible based on the claim language or support that can be found in the specification, these arguments are not persuasive.

Applicant further argues the prior art rejections. However, these arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection above.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH

shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any nonprovisional extension fee (37 CFR 1.17(a)) pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ILANA L SPAR whose telephone number is (571)270-7537. The examiner can normally be reached 8-4 M-F.

Examiner interviews are available via telephone, in-person, and video conferencing using a USPTO supplied web-based collaboration tool. To schedule an interview, applicant is encouraged to use the USPTO Automated Interview Request (AIR) at http://www.uspto.gov/interviewpractice.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Tariq Hafiz** can be reached at **571-272-5350**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of published or unpublished applications may be obtained from Patent Center. Unpublished application information in Patent Center is available to registered users. To file and manage patent submissions in Patent Center, visit: https://patentcenter.uspto.gov. Visit https://www.uspto.gov/patents/apply/patent-center for more information about Patent Center and https://www.uspto.gov/patents/docx for information about filing in DOCX format. For additional questions, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ILANA L SPAR/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3622