

copy

Yours: 31857-3843/LA



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
06/273,909	06/15/81	KIWI	A D-17

ERNEST DERGELY
104 TENTH ST.
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530

Ref 5/20/82. 7

EXAMINER	
ALBRITTON, C	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
213	

DATE MAILED: 05/17/82

Due: 8-17-82
T: 8-1-82.

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined. ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire Three month(s), _____ days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

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

- ☒ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Drawing, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of References Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152
- ☐ _____

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

- ☒ Claims 1-8 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
- ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
- ☒ Claims 1-8 are rejected.
- ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
- ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
- ☐ The formal drawings filed on _____ are acceptable.
- ☐ The drawing correction request filed on _____ has been ☐ approved. ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has
☐ been received. ☐ not been received. ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____
filed on _____.
- ☐ Since this application appears to be 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.
- ☐ Other

ERNEST GERGELY
ATTORNEY AT LAW
104 TENTH STREET
GARDEN CITY, NEW YORK 11530

(516) 742-1725

1982 MAY 28

021699

May 21, 1982

Patentbureau Danubia
H-1368 Budapest 5
P.O.Box 198
Hungary

COPY

Dear Mr. Lantos:

RE: U.S. Application Serial No. 273,909
Inventor: A. Kun
Your Ref: 31857-3843/1A:unc
My ref: D-17

Wf

The attached Office Action has been received in the above case setting a due date for reply as of

August 17, 1982 .

Any references cited will follow under separate cover/are enclosed.

In your reply, please discuss fully the references cited, if any, and provide your instructions regarding all objections raised by the Examiner.

Any amendments you may wish to suggest to the claims or to the specification should be listed as to page and line or entered in the appropriate places on a copy of the pages involved.

If you have any questions regarding the objections, please do not hesitate to write to me.

In the absence of your instructions to the contrary, I shall commence preparing an amendment by

August 1

, 1982 , or will apply for a

one month extension.

Very truly yours,

E. Gergely

- PS:
- 1) Need your authorization for expenses of \$ 300-400 to prepare the amendment;
 - 2) Need your analysis of references A, B & C as applied;
 - 3) Need your suggestions for claim limitation especially if you have filed in Germany or other difficult countries.
 - 4) If you decide to drop the case, my Ret'd Note for reporting is limited to \$ 50.

Encs: under sep. cover.

This application has been examined.

Claims 1-8 are pending.

Claims 1-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Okuya ^(A). Although, the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of Title 35 U.S.C., the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Conductive layer 13 corresponds to metallic layer claimed. I-cross section obvious matter of design choice. The annular ~~resistor~~ resistor layer is not shown. See 37 CFR 1.83. The particular configuration desired is merely a matter of design choice.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Okuya ^(A) in view of ^(B) Sakamoto or ^(C) Lazarus. Although, the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of Title 35 U.S.C., the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Plural intermediate terminals are obvious in view of Sakamoto or Lazarus.

Albritton/dmb

703-557-5070

5/12/82