

EXHIBIT A



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.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

90/012,304	05/23/2012	7,469,381	P4304USREX2/120730-002US	4807
------------	------------	-----------	--------------------------	------

20872 7590 06/12/2013
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 MARKET STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2482

EXAMINER

BONSHOCK, DENNIS G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3992

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/12/2013

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.

Notice of Intent to Issue Ex Parte Reexamination Certificate	Control No. 90/012,304	Patent Under Reexamination 7,469,381
	Examiner DENNIS BONSHOCK	Art Unit 3992

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

1. Prosecution on the merits is (or remains) closed in this *ex parte* reexamination proceeding. This proceeding is subject to reopening at the initiative of the Office or upon petition. Cf. 37 CFR 1.313(a). A Certificate will be issued in view of
- (a) Patent owner's communication(s) filed: 13 May 2013 and 20 May 2013.
- (b) Patent owner's failure to file an appropriate timely response to the Office action mailed: _____.
- (c) Patent owner's failure to timely file an Appeal Brief (37 CFR 41.31).
- (d) The decision on appeal by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences Court dated _____
- (e) Other: _____.
2. The Reexamination Certificate will indicate the following:
- (a) Change in the Specification: Yes No
- (b) Change in the Drawing(s): Yes No
- (c) Status of the Claim(s):
- (1) Patent claim(s) confirmed: 14 and 17-19.
- (2) Patent claim(s) amended (including dependent on amended claim(s)): _____
- (3) Patent claim(s) canceled: 1-13, 15-16, and 20.
- (4) Newly presented claim(s) patentable: _____.
- (5) Newly presented canceled claims: _____.
- (6) Patent claim(s) previously currently disclaimed: _____
- (7) Patent claim(s) not subject to reexamination: _____.
3. Note the attached statement of reasons for patentability and/or confirmation. Any comments considered necessary by patent owner regarding reasons for patentability and/or confirmation must be submitted promptly to avoid processing delays. Such submission(s) should be labeled: "Comments On Statement of Reasons for Patentability and/or Confirmation."
4. Note attached NOTICE OF REFERENCES CITED (PTO-892).
5. Note attached LIST OF REFERENCES CITED (PTO/SB/08 or PTO/SB/08 substitute).
6. The drawing correction request filed on _____ is: approved disapproved.
7. 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
- been received.
- not been received.
- been filed in Application No. _____.
- been filed in reexamination Control No. _____.
- been received by the International Bureau in PCT Application No. _____.
- * Certified copies not received: _____.
8. Note attached Examiner's Amendment.
9. Note attached Interview Summary (PTO-474).
10. Other: _____.

All correspondence relating to this reexamination proceeding should be directed to the **Central Reexamination Unit** at the mail, FAX, or hand-carry addresses given at the end of this Office action.

/Dennis G. Bonshock/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3992

cc: Requester (if third party requester)

Application/Control Number: 90/012,304
Art Unit: 3992

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

***ex parte* Reexamination**

This Office Action address claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent Number: 7,469,381 and is responsive to the Patent Owner's after final response filed 5-13-2013. It has been determined in the Order Granting *ex parte* Reexamination mailed 7-30-2012 that a substantial new question of patentability was raised in the Request for *ex parte* reexamination filed 5-23-2012.

INTRODUCTION

During an interview on 5-9-2013, Patent Owner's Representatives presented their position that the Lira reference lacked the "stop condition" of the claims, where the translating in the second direction occurs "until the area beyond the edge of the electronic document is no longer displayed". To this, the Office noted that Lira does provide for animated snap-on-column functionality from an area off of the column upon pen lift (see page 15, lines 18-31), where the width of the column is sized to the window size so as to be less than or equal to the window width (see page 11, lines 10-17), with specific recitations to the column widths corresponding to the display width 425 (see column 10, lines 1-5). The Office believes this is important to point out as when the window snaps back to the column, corrective scrolling is stopped when the display is centered over the column, thereby placing the edges of the column at the edges of the equally sized display, where at the exact instance that the widow is centered the area beyond the edge ceases to be displayed (same result).

Application/Control Number: 90/012,304
Art Unit: 3992

Page 3

The Patent Owner's Representatives noted that claim 19, specifically teaches "instructions for" translating "until the area beyond the edge of the electronic document is no longer displayed", where the Office asked for further clarification as to whether there is support for actual coded instructions that effect this process, and noted that if there where this would be a good area to focus. The Office noted that though *corrective traversal* in Lira appears to stop when the area beyond the edge of the document is no longer displayed, it is not specifically responsive to instructions requiring said *stop condition* (area beyond the edge of the electronic document is no longer displayed) but rather a result of instructions to center (same effect, different cause).

In a subsequent response filed 5-13-2013, Patent Owner provided specific support in the specification for "instructions for" translating "until the area beyond the edge of the electronic document is no longer displayed" (specifically paragraphs [0009], [0012], [0013], and [0100]).

After further review by the Examiner, a call was placed to the Patent Owner on 5-22-2013 during which a decision was made to confirm claim 19 and cancel claims 1-13, 15, 16, and 20, where these canceled claims were neither previously confirmed (as were claims 14, 17, and 18) nor provided said specific recitation to "instructions for" translating... "until the area beyond the edge of the electronic document is no longer displayed".

Application/Control Number: 90/012,304
Art Unit: 3992

Page 4

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

During a telephonic interview with Peter Yim and Brian Ho on May 22, 2013 an agreement was made to cancel claims 1-13, 15, 16, and 20.

An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. The changes made by this examiner's amendment will be reflected in the reexamination certificate to issue in due course.

Claims 1-13 (cancelled)

Claim 15 (cancelled)

Claim 16 (cancelled)

Claim 20 (cancelled)

STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR PATENTABILITY AND/OR CONFIRMATION

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for patentability and/or confirmation of the claims over the prior art currently of record in this reexamination proceeding:

Claim 19 recites the feature of:

"programs including... instructions for translating the electronic document in a second direction until the area beyond the edge of the electronic document is no longer displayed to display a fourth portion of the electronic document,

Application/Control Number: 90/012,304

Page 5

Art Unit: 3992

wherein the fourth portion is different from the first portion, in response to detecting that the object is no longer on or near the touch screen display.”

The ‘381 Patent Specification defines these "instructions" as (from column 3, lines 33-37) (paragraph [0012]):

“The one or more programs further include instructions for translating the document in a second direction until the area beyond the edge of the document is no longer displayed, after the object is no longer detected on or near the touch screen display.”

Further reference to this program based executable instructions can be found in the specification at paragraphs [0009], [0013], and [0100].

In the supplemental response filed 5/13/2013, Patent Owner concedes that:

“While Lira’s snap-to-column function incidentally achieves the visual result of translating in the second direction “until the area beyond the edge of the electronic document is no longer displayed” (only when the width of the column corresponds to the width of the display), Lira’s function clearly does so through the use of executable program instructions having a different stop condition based on centering of the column.” (see page 7)

Van Den Hoven is further lacking in this respect, as there is no reliance on Van Den Hoven by the third party requestor, nor could support be found in the reference.

The rejections over the Ording ‘975 reference have been removed in response to the 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 declaration filed by Mr. Ording.

Application/Control Number: 90/012,304
Art Unit: 3992

Page 6

In summary, Claim 19 is Confirmed, as there is no prior art disclosure of a similar device with “*programs including... **instructions for translating the electronic document in a second direction until the area beyond the edge of the electronic document is no longer displayed to display a fourth portion of the electronic document, wherein the fourth portion is different from the first portion, in response to detecting that the object is no longer on or near the touch screen display.***”

Reasons for confirmation of 14, 17, and 19 (as previously provided):

Claims 14 specifically teach "the area beyond the edge of the document is visually distinct from the document", where Lira at no point mentions displaying the area beyond the edge of the document as visually distinct from the document. Claim 14 is herein confirmed for the reasons provided above.

Claim 17 specifically teaches “translating in the first direction prior to reaching the edge of the electronic document has a first associated translating distance that corresponds to a distance of movement of the object prior to reaching the edge of the electronic document; and wherein displaying an area beyond the edge of the electronic document comprises translating the electronic document in the first direction for a second associated translating distance, wherein the second associated translating distance is less than a distance of movement of the object after reaching the edge of the electronic document.” This basically has to do with dampening the movement of the display once the edge is crossed, where Lira at no point mentions such as dampening

Application/Control Number: 90/012,304

Page 7

Art Unit: 3992

of the movement once the edge is crossed. Claim 17 is herein confirmed for the reasons provided above.

Van Den Hoven is further lacking in this respect, as there is no disclosure of the deceleration being resultant upon the edge of a list or the edge of a document being reached and crossed.

Claim 18 specifically teaches “translating in the first direction prior to reaching the edge of the electronic document has a first associated translating speed that corresponds to a speed of movement of the object, and wherein displaying an area beyond the edge of the electronic document comprises translating the electronic document in the first direction at a second associated translating speed, wherein the second associated translating speed is slower than the first associated translating speed”. This basically has to do with dampening the speed of translation of the display once the edge is crossed, where Lira at no point mentions such as dampening of the speed of translation once the edge is crossed. Claim 18 is herein confirmed for the reasons provided above.

Van Den Hoven is further lacking in this respect, as there is no disclosure of the deceleration being resultant upon the edge of a list or the edge of a document being reached and crossed.

In summary, Claims 14, 17, 18, and 19 are Confirmed.

Application/Control Number: 90/012,304
Art Unit: 3992

Page 8

Any comments considered necessary by PATENT OWNER regarding the above statement must be submitted promptly to avoid processing delays. Such submission by the patent owner should be labeled: "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Patentability and/or Confirmation" and will be placed in the reexamination file.

Conclusion

All correspondence relating to this *ex parte* reexamination proceeding should be directed:

By Mail to: Mail Stop Ex Parte Reexam
Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By FAX to: (571) 273-9900
Central Reexamination Unit

Application/Control Number: 90/012,304
Art Unit: 3992

Page 9

By hand: Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

By EFS-Web:

Registered users of EFS-Web may alternatively submit such correspondence via the electronic filing system EFS-Web, at

<https://efs.uspto.gov/efile/myportal/efs-registered>

EFS-Web offers the benefit of quick submission to the particular area of the Office that needs to act on the correspondence. Also, EFS-Web submissions are “soft scanned” (i.e., electronically uploaded) directly into the official file for the reexamination proceeding, which offers parties the opportunity to review the content of their submissions after the “soft scanning” process is complete.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Reexamination Legal Advisor or Examiner, or as to the status of this proceeding, should be directed to the Central Reexamination Unit at telephone number (571) 272-7705.

/Dennis G. Bonshock/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3992

Conferees:

Application/Control Number: 90/012,304

Page 10


Art Unit: 3992

/Adam L Basehoar/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3992

/Alexander J Kosowski/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3992


Issue Classification 	Application/Control No. 90012304	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination 7,469,381
	Examiner DENNIS BONSHOCK	Art Unit 3992

CPC		
Symbol	Type	Version


CPC Combination Sets				
Symbol	Type	Set	Ranking	Version

US ORIGINAL CLASSIFICATION				INTERNATIONAL CLASSIFICATION								
CLASS		SUBCLASS		CLAIMED					NON-CLAIMED			
715		702		G	0	6	F	3 / 01 (2006.01.01)				
CROSS REFERENCE(S)												
CLASS	SUBCLASS (ONE SUBCLASS PER BLOCK)											
715	764	769	863	864								

NONE (Assistant Examiner) _____ (Date) _____ /DENNIS BONSHOCK/ Primary Examiner. Art Unit 3992 (Primary Examiner) _____ (Date) _____		Total Claims Allowed: 4
		O.G. Print Claim(s) O.G. Print Figure 19 8C

<p>Issue Classification</p> 	Application/Control No. 90012304	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination 7,469,381
	Examiner DENNIS BONSHOCK	Art Unit 3992

NONE (Assistant Examiner) (Date) /DENNIS BONSHOCK/ Primary Examiner. Art Unit 3992 (Primary Examiner) (Date)	Total Claims Allowed: 4 O.G. Print Claim(s) O.G. Print Figure 19 8C
6/5/201	

Issue Classification 	Application/Control No. 90012304	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination 7,469,381
	Examiner DENNIS BONSHOCK	Art Unit 3992

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claims renumbered in the same order as presented by applicant																<input type="checkbox"/> CPA		<input type="checkbox"/> T.D.		<input type="checkbox"/> R.1.47	
Final	Original	Final	Original	Final	Original	Final	Original	Final	Original	Final	Original	Final	Original	Final	Original						

NONE (Assistant Examiner) _____ (Date) _____		Total Claims Allowed: 4	
/DENNIS BONSHOCK/ Primary Examiner. Art Unit 3992 (Primary Examiner) _____ (Date) _____		O.G. Print Claim(s) 19	O.G. Print Figure 8C

Ex Parte Reexamination Interview Summary	Control No.	Patent Under Reexamination
	90/012,304	7,469,381
	Examiner	Art Unit
	DENNIS BONSHOCK	3992
All participants (USPTO personnel, patent owner, patent owner's representative):		
(1) <u>DENNIS BONSHOCK</u>	(3) <u>ADAM BASEHOAR</u>	
(2) <u>ALEXANER KOSOWSKI</u>	(4) <u>PETER YIM</u>	
<p>Date of Interview: <u>13 May 2013</u></p> <p>Type: a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic b) <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference c) <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (copy given to: 1) <input type="checkbox"/> patent owner 2) <input type="checkbox"/> patent owner's representative)</p> <p>Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes e) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No. If Yes, brief description: _____</p> <p>Agreement with respect to the claims f) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> was reached. g) <input type="checkbox"/> was not reached. h) <input type="checkbox"/> N/A. Any other agreement(s) are set forth below under "Description of the general nature of what was agreed to..."</p> <p>Claim(s) discussed: <u>1-20</u>.</p> <p>Identification of prior art discussed: <u>Lira</u>.</p> <p>Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>Agreement was reached that Lira does not provide for "instructions for" translating... "until the area beyond the edge of the electronic document is no longer displayed" as is stated in claim 19. Additionally Patent Owner agreed to cancel via Examiner's Amendment claims 1-13, 15, 16, and 20, where these claims were neither previously confirmed (as were claims 14, 17, and 18) nor provide said specific recitation to "instructions for" translating... "until the area beyond the edge of the electronic document is no longer displayed" .</u></p> <p>(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims patentable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims patentable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)</p> <p>A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE PATENT OWNER'S STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP § 2281). IF A RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION HAS ALREADY BEEN FILED, THEN PATENT OWNER IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO PROVIDE THE MANDATORY STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (37 CFR 1.560(b)). THE REQUIREMENT FOR PATENT OWNER'S STATEMENT CAN NOT BE WAIVED. EXTENSIONS OF TIME ARE GOVERNED BY 37 CFR 1.550(c).</p>		
/Dennis G. Bonshock/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3992	/AJK/	
cc: Requester (if third party requester)		

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-474)

Reexam Control No.

All participants (continued)

(5) Brian Ho

Ex Parte Reexamination Interview Summary	Control No.	Patent Under Reexamination
	90/012,304	7,469,381
	Examiner	Art Unit
	DENNIS BONSHOCK	3992

All participants (USPTO personnel, patent owner, patent owner's representative):

(1) DENNIS BONSHOCK

(3) ADAM BASEHOAR

(2) ALEXANDER KOSOWSKI

(4) JASON SKINDER

Date of Interview: 09 May 2013

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal (copy given to: 1) patent owner 2) patent owner's representative)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: Patent Owner's Representatives displayed a copy of the claims of the 11/956,969 application as they were initially presented prior to examination, the claims since being amended resulting in the '381 Patent.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Any other agreement(s) are set forth below under "Description of the general nature of what was agreed to..."

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 19, and 20.

Identification of prior art discussed: Lira.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Patent Owner's Representatives presented their position that the Lira reference lacked the "stop condition" in the claims where the translating in the second direction occurs "until the area beyond the edge of the electronic document is no longer displayed". To this, the Office noted that Lira does provide for animated snap-on-column functionality from an area off of the column upon pen lift (see page 15, lines 18-31), where the width of the column is sized to the window size so as to be less than or equal to the window width (see page 11, lines 10-17), with specific recitations to the column widths corresponding to the display width 425 (see column 10, lines 1-5). The Office believes this is important as when the window snaps back to the column, corrective scrolling is stopped when the display is centered over the column, thereby placing the edges of the column at the edges of the equally sized display, where at the exact instance that the widow is centered the area beyond the edge ceases to be displayed (same result). The Patent Owner's Representatives noted that claim 19, specifically teaches "instructions for" translating "until the area beyond the edge of the electronic document is no longer displayed", where the Office asked for further clarification as to whether there is support for actual coded instructions that effect this process, and noted that if there where this would be a good area to focus. The Office noted that though a corrective traversal appears in Lira to stop when the area beyond the edge of the document is no longer displayed, it may not be responsive to instructions requiring that but rather a result of instructions to center (same effect, different cause), pending further review. Patent Owner's Representatives noted that they would provide support.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims patentable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims patentable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE PATENT OWNER'S STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP § 2281). IF A RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION HAS ALREADY BEEN FILED, THEN PATENT OWNER IS GIVEN **ONE MONTH** FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO PROVIDE THE MANDATORY STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (37 CFR 1.560(b)). THE REQUIREMENT FOR PATENT OWNER'S STATEMENT CAN NOT BE WAIVED. **EXTENSIONS OF TIME ARE GOVERNED BY 37 CFR 1.550(c).**

/Dennis G. Bonshock/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3992

/AJK/

cc: Requester (if third party requester)

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-474)

Reexam Control No.

All participants (continued)

(5) Peter Yim

(6) Brian Ho



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

DO NOT USE IN PALM PRINTER

(THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS)

BRYAN CAVE LLP

1290 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS

NEW YORK, NY 10104

EX PARTE REEXAMINATION COMMUNICATION TRANSMITTAL FORM


REEXAMINATION CONTROL NO. 90/012,304.

PATENT NO. 7,469,381.

ART UNIT 3992.

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above identified *ex parte* reexamination proceeding (37 CFR 1.550(f)).

Where this copy is supplied after the reply by requester, 37 CFR 1.535, or the time for filing a reply has passed, no submission on behalf of the *ex parte* reexamination requester will be acknowledged or considered (37 CFR 1.550(g)).

Reexamination 	Application/Control No. 90012304	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination 7,469,381
	Certificate Date	Certificate Number C2

Requester Correspondence Address:	<input type="checkbox"/> Patent Owner	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Third Party
BRYAN CAVE LLP 1290 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 10104		

LITIGATION REVIEW <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DGB (examiner initials)	07/23/2012 (date)
Case Name		Director Initials
APPLE INC. v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO. case no. 5:11CV1846		
case no. 1:10CV167		

COPENDING OFFICE PROCEEDINGS	
TYPE OF PROCEEDING	NUMBER

--	--

ALTERNATIVE TO PTO/SB/08A/B
(Based on PTO 08-08 version)

Substitute for form 1449/PTO INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT <i>(Use as many sheets as necessary)</i>				Complete if Known	
				Control Number	90/012,304
				Filing Date	May 23, 2012
				First Named Inventor	Bas ORDING
				Art Unit	3992
				Examiner Name	D. G. Bonshock
Sheet	1	of	3	Attorney Docket Number	106842803800

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS					
Examiner Initials*	Cite No. ¹	Document Number	Publication Date MM-DD-YYYY	Name of Patentee or Applicant of Cited Document	Pages, Columns, Lines, Where Relevant Passages or Relevant Figures Appear
		Number-Kind Code ² (if known)			
	1.	US-5,241,674-A	08-31-1993	Kurosawa et al.	
	2.	US-5,463,725-A	10-31-1995	Henckel et al.	
	3.	US-2002/0189763-A1	12-19-2002	Kwon et al.	
	4.	US-2006/0268020-A1	11-30-2006	Han	
	5.	US-2011/0037725-A1	02-17-2011	Pryor	

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS						
Examiner Initials*	Cite No. ¹	Foreign Patent Document	Publication Date MM-DD-YYYY	Name of Patentee or Applicant of Cited Document	Pages, Columns, Lines, Where Relevant Passages Or Relevant Figures Appear	T ⁶
		Country Code ³ -Number ⁴ -Kind Code ⁵ (if known)				
	6.	EP-0493128-A2	07-01-1992	Canon KK		
	7.	JP-H09-160713-A	06-20-1997	Toshiba	Translation of abstract only	✓
	8.	JP-2000-163193-A	06-16-2000	Seiko Epson Corp	Translation of abstract only	✓
	9.	JP-2002-323850-A	11-08-2002	Matsushita Electric Ind. Co. Ltd.	Translation of abstract only	✓
	10.	JP-2006-090962-A	04-06-2006	Matsushita Electric Ind. Co. Ltd.	Translation of abstract only	✓

Examiner Signature	/Dennis Bonshock/	Date Considered	05/30/2013
--------------------	-------------------	-----------------	------------

*EXAMINER: Initial if information considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609. Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant. ¹ Applicant's unique citation designation number (optional). ² See Kinds Codes of USPTO Patent Documents at www.uspto.gov or MPEP 901.04. ³ Enter Office that issued the document, by the two-letter code (WIPO Standard ST.3). ⁴ For Japanese patent documents, the indication of the year of the reign of the Emperor must precede the serial number of the patent document. ⁵ Kind of document by the appropriate symbols as indicated on the document under WIPO Standard ST. 16 if possible. ⁶ Applicant is to place a check mark here if English language Translation is attached.

NON PATENT LITERATURE DOCUMENTS			
Examiner Initials*	Cite No. ¹	Include name of the author (in CAPITAL LETTERS), title of the article (when appropriate), title of the item (book, magazine, journal, serial, symposium, catalog, etc.), date, page(s), volume-issue number(s), publisher, city and/or country where published.	T ²
	11.	Baig, "Apple's iPhone Isn't Perfect, But It's Worthy of the Hype," USA Today, June 27, 2007	
	12.	Certificated of Grant dated January 23, 2012, received in the Turkish part of European Patent Application No. 2 126 678, which corresponds to U.S. Application No. 11/956,969, 2 pages.	
	13.	Data sheet of the HP iPAQ h4100 pocket PC series http://h20000.www2.hp.com/bizsupport/TechSupport/Document.jsp?lang=de&cc=de&taskId=120&prodSeriesId=349042&prodTypeId=215348&objectID=c00350648 , accessed May 17, 2013.	
	14.	Dietz et al., "Touch Recognition Technology "DiamondTouch" (Abstract), Mitsubishi Denki Giho (August 2002)	
	15.	Esenther et al., "Multi-User Multi-Touch Games on DiamondTouch with the DTFlash Toolkit," Intelligent Technologies for Interactive Entertainment 2005 (December 2005)	
	16.	Final Office Action dated February 14, 2013, received in U.S. Application No. 12/270,815, 13 pages.	

sf-3287705

ALL REFERENCES CONSIDERED EXCEPT WHERE LINED THROUGH. /D.B./

ALTERNATIVE TO PTO/SB/08A/B
(Based on PTO 08-08 version)

Substitute for form 1449/PTO				Complete if Known	
				Control Number	90/012,304
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT				Filing Date	May 23, 2012
				First Named Inventor	Bas ORDING
				Art Unit	3992
				Examiner Name	D. G. Bonshock
				Attorney Docket Number	106842803800
Sheet	2	of	3		
<i>(Use as many sheets as necessary)</i>					

	17.	Grant dated October 26, 2012, received in Japanese Patent Application No. 2010 157303, which corresponds to U.S. Application No. 11/956,969, 4 pages.	
	18.	Jul and Furnas (1998) "Critical Zones in Desert Fog: Aids to Multiscale Navigation," Proceedings of the 11th annual ACM symposium on User interface software and technology, p. 97-106.	
	19.	Keys, "[CHI] Is Microsoft's (U.S.) New User Interface Made for Next Generation Cell Phones?" Tech-On!, April 8, 2005	
	20.	Levy, "At Last, the iPhone," The Daily Beast, June 25, 2007	
	21.	Mossberg, "The iPhone is a Breakthrough Handheld Computer," ALL Things D, June 26, 2007	
	22.	Notice of Allowance dated September 19, 2012, received in U.S. Application No. 12/270,812, 25 pages.	
	23.	Office Action dated February 18, 2013, received in Chinese Patent Application No. 20088000019.9, which corresponds to U.S. Application No. 11/956,969, 12 pages [translation].	√
	24.	Office Action dated October 15, 2012, received in Japanese Patent Application No. 2010157303, which corresponds to U.S. Application No. 11/956,969, 4 pages.	√
	25.	Office Action dated September 9, 2012, received in Chinese Patent Application No. 20088000019.9, which corresponds to U.S. Application No. 11/956,969, 22 pages.	√
	26.	Pogue, "The iPhone Matches Most of Its Hype," The New York Times, June 27, 2007	
	27.	Printouts of HCIL Webpage: "Interface Supporting One-Handed Use of Small Devices", June 2005.	
	28.	Printouts of Microsoft webpage: "Microsoft Opens R&D to Small Companies and Entrepreneurs", May 4, 2005.	
	29.	Australian Case No. (P) NSD 308 of 2013, "Amended Particulars of Invalidity, Australian Standard Patent No. 2008201540", March 2013.	
	30.	Australian Case No. (P) NSD 308 of 2013, "Amended Particulars of Invalidity, Australian Standard Patent No. 2009200366", March 2013.	
	31.	Australian Case No. (P) NSD 308 of 2013, "Amended Particulars of Invalidity, Australian Standard Patent No. 2009208103", March 2013.	
	32.	Australian Case No. (P) NSD 308 of 2013, "Amended Particulars of Invalidity, Australian Standard Patent No. 2008100283", March 2013.	
	33.	Australian Case No. NSD 1243 of 2011, "Affidavit of Andrew Cockburn", January 14, 2013.	
	34.	Australian Case No. NSD 1243 of 2011, "Affidavit of Ravin Balakrishnan", January 16, 2013.	
	35.	Australian Case No. NSD 1243 of 2011, "Affidavit of Saul Greenberg", January 9, 2013.	
	36.	Australian Case No. NSD 1243 of 2011, "Apple's Outline of Opening Submissions on the Invalidity of HCI Patents", February 21, 2013.	
	37.	Australian Case No. NSD 1243 of 2011, "Samsung's Outline of Opening Submissions on the Invalidity of Apple's HCI Patents", February 14, 2013.	
	38.	Australian Case No. NSD 1243 of 2011, "Second Affidavit of Mark Nathan Billingham", January 16, 2013.	
	39.	Australian Case No. NSD 1243 of 2011, "Second Affidavit of Masahiro Takatsuka", January 15, 2013.	
	40.	Australian Case No. NSD 1243 of 2011, "Second Affidavit of Ravin Balakrishnan", May 2, 2013.	
	41.	Australian Case No. NSD 1243 of 2011, "Second Affidavit of Roderick Alexander Farmer", October 30, 2012.	
	42.	Australian Case No. NSD 1243 of 2011, "Second Affidavit of Saul Greenberg", January 9, 2013.	

ALTERNATIVE TO PTO/SB/08A/B
(Based on PTO 08-08 version)

Substitute for form 1449/PTO INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT <i>(Use as many sheets as necessary)</i>				Complete if Known	
				Control Number	90/012,304
				Filing Date	May 23, 2012
				First Named Inventor	Bas ORDING
				Art Unit	3992
				Examiner Name	D. G. Bonshock
				Attorney Docket Number	106842803800
Sheet	3	of	3		

	43.	Australian Case No. NSD 1243 of 2011, "Third Affidavit of Roderick Alexander Farmer", February 8, 2013.	
	44.	Australian Case No. NSD 308 of 2013, "Apple's Defence to Samsung's Statement of Cross-Claim", February 25, 2013.	
	45.	Australian Case No. NSD 308 of 2013, "Samsung's Notice of Cross-Claim", February 22, 2013.	
	46.	Australian Case No. NSD 308 of 2013, "Samsung's Statement of Cross-Claim", February 22, 2013.	
	47.	Australian Case Nos. NSD 308 of 2013 / NSD 1243 of 2011, "List of Topics for Discussion Between Experts on the HCI A Patents", February 2013.	
	48.	German Case No. 7070/12, Regional Court Mannheim, 7th Civil Chamber, "Decision", February 8, 2013.	
	49.	Japanese 2011 (Wa) No. 27781, Case of Petition for Damage Compensation, "Apple's Seventh Brief [Translation]", February 2013.	√
	50.	Japanese 2011 (Wa) No. 27781, Case of Petition for Damage Compensation, "Apple's Sixth Brief [Translation]", January 10, 2013.	√
	51.	Japanese 2011 (Wa) No. 27781, Case of Petition for Damage Compensation, "Samsung's Eighth Brief [Translation]", May 14, 2013.	√
	52.	Japanese 2011 (Wa) No. 27781, Case of Petition for Damage Compensation, "Samsung's Seventh Brief [Translation]", January 17, 2013.	√
	53.	Japanese Patent Invalidation Trial No. 2012-800075, "Oral Proceedings Statement Brief [Translation]", April 5, 2013.	√
	54.	Korean Case No. 2012 Na 76203, Action for Injunction to Cease Patent Infringement, etc., "Brief", February 26, 2013.	√
	55.	Korean Case No. 2012 Na 76203, Action for Injunction to Cease Patent Infringement, etc., "Appeal Brief", November 26, 2012.	√
	56.	Korean Case No. 2012 Na 76203, Action for Injunction to Cease Patent Infringement, etc., "Brief", February 1, 2013.	√

Examiner Signature	/Dennis Bonshock/	Date Considered	05/30/2013
--------------------	-------------------	-----------------	------------

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609. Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

¹Applicant's unique citation designation number (optional). ²Applicant is to place a check mark here if English language Translation is attached.



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



Bib Data Sheet

CONFIRMATION NO. 4807

SERIAL NUMBER 90/012,304	FILING OR 371(c) DATE 05/23/2012 RULE	CLASS 715	GROUP ART UNIT 3992	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 0331834.381
------------------------------------	---	---------------------	-------------------------------	---

APPLICANTS
 7,469,381, Residence Not Provided;
 APPLE INC. (OWNER), CUPERTINO, CA;
 JOSEPH J. RICHETTI (3RD PTY. REQ.), NEW YORK, NY;
~~BRYAN CAVE LLP, NEW YORK, NY~~

**** CONTINUING DATA *******
 This application is a REX of 11/956,969 12/14/2007 PAT 7469381
 which claims benefit of 60/879,253 01/07/2007
 and claims benefit of 60/883,801 01/07/2007
 and claims benefit of 60/879,469 01/08/2007
 and claims benefit of 60/945,858 06/22/2007
 and claims benefit of 60/946,971 06/28/2007
 and claims benefit of 60/937,993 06/29/2007


**** FOREIGN APPLICATIONS *******

Foreign Priority claimed <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no	STATE OR COUNTRY	SHEETS DRAWING	TOTAL CLAIMS 20	INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 3
35 USC 119 (a-d) conditions met <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> Met after Allowance				
Verified and Acknowledged <u>/Dennis Bonshock/</u> <u>DGB</u> Examiner's Signature Initials				

ADDRESS
 61725

TITLE
 LIST SCROLLING AND DOCUMENT TRANSLATION, SCALING, AND ROTATION ON A TOUCH-SCREEN DISPLAY

FILING FEE RECEIVED 2520	FEES: Authority has been given in Paper No. _____ to charge/credit DEPOSIT ACCOUNT No. _____ for following:	<input type="checkbox"/> All Fees
		<input type="checkbox"/> 1.16 Fees (Filing)
		<input type="checkbox"/> 1.17 Fees (Processing Ext. of time)
		<input type="checkbox"/> 1.18 Fees (Issue)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____
		<input type="checkbox"/> Credit

Search Notes 	Application/Control No. 90012304	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination 7,469,381
	Examiner DENNIS BONSHOCK	Art Unit 3992

CPC- SEARCHED

Symbol	Date	Examiner

CPC COMBINATION SETS - SEARCHED

Symbol	Date	Examiner

US CLASSIFICATION SEARCHED

Class	Subclass	Date	Examiner

SEARCH NOTES

Search Notes	Date	Examiner
Reviewed Previous Prosecution History	7-23-12	dgb
Reviewed Previous Prosecution History	10-9-12	dgb
Reviewed Previous Prosecution History	3-21-13	dgb
Reviewed Previous Prosecution History	5-30-13	dgb

INTERFERENCE SEARCH

US Class/ CPC Symbol	US Subclass / CPC Group	Date	Examiner

--	--