



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.
95/002,351	09/14/2012	7726480	12-29270	3534
23363	7590	10/29/2012	EXAMINER	
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP			FETSUGA, ROBERT M	
PO BOX 29001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Glendale, CA 91209-9001			3993	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/29/2012	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.

Transmittal of Communication to Third Party Requester <i>Inter Partes</i> Reexamination	Control No. 95/002,351	Patent Under Reexamination 7726480	
	Examiner ROBERT M. FETSUGA	Art Unit 3993	

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

┌────────── (THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS) ─────────┐

LAUSON & TARVER LLP
880 APOLLO STREET
SUITE 301
EL SEGUNDO, CA 90245

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above-identified reexamination proceeding. 37 CFR 1.903.

Prior to the filing of a Notice of Appeal, each time the patent owner responds to this communication, the third party requester of the *inter partes* reexamination may once file written comments within a period of 30 days from the date of service of the patent owner's response. This 30-day time period is statutory (35 U.S.C. 314(b)(2)), and, as such, it cannot be extended. See also 37 CFR 1.947.

If an *ex parte* reexamination has been merged with the *inter partes* reexamination, no responsive submission by any *ex parte* third party requester is permitted.

All correspondence relating to this *inter partes* reexamination proceeding should be directed to the **Central Reexamination Unit** at the mail, FAX, or hand-carry addresses given at the end of the communication enclosed with this transmittal.

ORDER GRANTING/DENYING REQUEST FOR INTER PARTES REEXAMINATION	Control No.	Patent Under Reexamination
	95/002,351 Examiner	7726480 Art Unit
	ROBERT M. FETSUGA	3993

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

The request for *inter partes* reexamination has been considered. Identification of the claims, the references relied on, and the rationale supporting the determination are attached.

Attachment(s): PTO-892 PTO/SB/08 Other: _____

1. The request for *inter partes* reexamination is GRANTED.

An Office action is attached with this order.

An Office action will follow in due course.

2. The request for *inter partes* reexamination is DENIED.

This decision is not appealable. 35 U.S.C. 312(c). Requester may seek review of a denial by petition to the Director of the USPTO within ONE MONTH from the mailing date hereof. 37 CFR 1.927. EXTENSIONS OF TIME ONLY UNDER 37 CFR 1.183. In due course, a refund under 37 CFR 1.26(c) will be made to requester.

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

Art Unit: 3993

REQUEST FOR INTER PARTES REEXAMINATION

A reasonable likelihood of prevailing ("RLP"), with respect to patentability of at least one of claims 1-14 of United States Patent Number 7,726,480 to Nazari, is raised by the Request for *Inter Partes* Reexamination filed September 14, 2012 ("Request").

Proposed Prior Art

Requester presents the following references:

- Ritter (U.S. Patent 7,207,441)
- Wu et al. (U.S. Patent 5,575,418, "Wu")
- Spiess (U.S. Patent 2,637,251)
- Botley (U.S. Patent 2,324,757)
- Loheed et al. (British Patent 1,142,773, "Loheed")

Proposed Substantial New Question(s) of Patentability

Requester sets forth four (4) prior art rejections as issues proposed to establish a RLP with regard to unpatentability of claims 1-14. These rejections are summarily listed at page 8 of the Request, and addressed specifically below.

RLP Analysis

Art Unit: 3993

1. Claims 1-14 are proposed as being obvious over the combined disclosures of Ritter and Loheed.

Requester identifies at pages 10-21 of the Request how the Ritter and Loheed disclosures relate to the factual inquiries associated with a *prima facie* obviousness determination. In this regard, Loheed teaches the crushing of corrugated sheets in a peripheral overlapping area and applying adhesive thereto to increase the strength of the adhered sheets. Therefore, requester **HAS** established a RLP with respect to claims 1-14.

2. Claim 8 is proposed as being obvious over the combined disclosures of Ritter and Spiess.

Requester identifies at pages 21-23 of the Request how the Ritter and Spiess disclosures relate to the factual inquiries associated with a *prima facie* obviousness determination. In this regard, Spiess teaches the crushing of corrugated sheets in a peripheral area to facilitate accurate gluing of overlapping sheet portions. Therefore, requester **HAS** established a RLP with respect to claim 10.

3. Claim 8 is proposed at pages 24-26 of the Request as being obvious over the combined disclosures of Ritter and Wu.

The teachings identified in Wu of crushing corrugated sheets to minimize overlapping joint thickness and folding/compressing flaps to eliminate corrugated sheet edges,

Art Unit: 3993

do not relate to the display package disclosed by Ritter.

Therefore, requester **HAS NOT** established a RLP with respect to claim 8.

4. Claim 8 is proposed at pages 27-29 of the Request as being obvious over the combined disclosures of Ritter and Botley.

The teaching identified in Botley of crushing corrugated sheets in a peripheral area and applying adhesive thereto in order to provide a compact joint and allow a better fit of carton contents, does not relate to the display package disclosed by Ritter. Therefore, requester **HAS NOT** established a RLP with respect to claim 8.

Determination

For the reasons given above, the request for reexamination is GRANTED. Claims 1-14 will be reexamined.

Service of Papers

Any document filed by either the patent owner or the third party requester must be served on the other party in the reexamination proceeding in the manner provided in 37 CFR 1.248. See 37 CFR 1.903 and MPEP 2666.06.

Art Unit: 3993

Notification of Concurrent Proceedings

The patent owner is reminded of the continuing responsibility under 37 CFR 1.985 to apprise the Office of any litigation activity, or other prior or concurrent proceeding, involving the patent under reexamination throughout the course of this proceeding. The third party requester is also reminded of the ability to similarly apprise the Office of any such activity or proceeding throughout the course of this reexamination proceeding. See MPEP §§ 2686, and 2686.04.

All correspondence relating to this *inter partes* reexamination proceeding should be directed:

By EFS: Registered users may submit via the electronic filing system EFS-Web, at <https://efs.uspto.gov/efile/myportal/efs-registered>.

By Mail to: Mail Stop *Inter Partes* Reexam
Attn: Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner of Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

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

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

Art Unit: 3993

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

Signed:

/Robert M. Fetsuga/
Primary Examiner
Central Reexamination Unit
(571) 272-4886 (M-R)

Conferee: /JAK/

Conferee: /EDL/



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.
95/002,352	09/14/2012	8,205,747 B2	12-29271	8995
23363	7590	10/26/2012	EXAMINER	
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP			FETSUGA, ROBERT M	
PO BOX 29001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Glendale, CA 91209-9001			3993	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/26/2012	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.

Transmittal of Communication to Third Party Requester <i>Inter Partes</i> Reexamination	Control No.	Patent Under Reexamination	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	95/002,352	8,205,747 B2 ET AL.	
	ROBERT M. FETSUGA	3993	

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

┌────────── (THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS) ─────────┐

LAUSON & TARVER LLP
880 APOLLO STREET
SUITE 301
EL SEGUNDO, CA 90245

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above-identified reexamination proceeding. 37 CFR 1.903.

Prior to the filing of a Notice of Appeal, each time the patent owner responds to this communication, the third party requester of the *inter partes* reexamination may once file written comments within a period of 30 days from the date of service of the patent owner's response. This 30-day time period is statutory (35 U.S.C. 314(b)(2)), and, as such, it cannot be extended. See also 37 CFR 1.947.

If an *ex parte* reexamination has been merged with the *inter partes* reexamination, no responsive submission by any *ex parte* third party requester is permitted.

All correspondence relating to this *inter partes* reexamination proceeding should be directed to the **Central Reexamination Unit** at the mail, FAX, or hand-carry addresses given at the end of the communication enclosed with this transmittal.

ORDER GRANTING/DENYING REQUEST FOR INTER PARTES REEXAMINATION	Control No.	Patent Under Reexamination
	95/002,352	8,205,747 B2 ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	ROBERT M. FETSUGA	3993

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

The request for *inter partes* reexamination has been considered. Identification of the claims, the references relied on, and the rationale supporting the determination are attached.

Attachment(s): PTO-892 PTO/SB/08 Other: _____

1. The request for *inter partes* reexamination is GRANTED.

An Office action is attached with this order.

An Office action will follow in due course.

2. The request for *inter partes* reexamination is DENIED.

This decision is not appealable. 35 U.S.C. 312(c). Requester may seek review of a denial by petition to the Director of the USPTO within ONE MONTH from the mailing date hereof. 37 CFR 1.927. EXTENSIONS OF TIME ONLY UNDER 37 CFR 1.183. In due course, a refund under 37 CFR 1.26(c) will be made to requester.

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

Art Unit: 3993

REQUEST FOR INTER PARTES REEXAMINATION

A reasonable likelihood of prevailing ("RLP"), with respect to patentability of at least one of claims 1-20 of United States Patent Number 8,205,747 to Nazari, is raised by the Request for *Inter Partes* Reexamination filed September 14, 2012 ("Request").

Proposed Prior Art

Requester presents the following references:

- Ritter (U.S. Patent 7,207,441)
- Wu et al. (U.S. Patent 5,575,418, "Wu")
- Spiess (U.S. Patent 2,637,251)
- Botley (U.S. Patent 2,324,757)
- Loheed et al. (British Patent 1,142,773, "Loheed")

Proposed Substantial New Question(s) of Patentability

Requester sets forth four (4) prior art rejections as issues proposed to establish a RLP with regard to unpatentability of claims 1-20. These rejections are summarily listed at page 6 of the Request, and addressed specifically below.

RLP Analysis

Art Unit: 3993

1. Claims 1-20 are proposed as being obvious over the combined disclosures of Ritter and Loheed.

Requester identifies at pages 8-22 of the Request how the Ritter and Loheed disclosures relate to the factual inquiries associated with a *prima facie* obviousness determination. In this regard, Loheed teaches the crushing of corrugated sheets in a peripheral overlapping area and applying adhesive thereto to increase the strength of the adhered sheets by creating a solid sheet portion. Therefore, requester **HAS** established a RLP with respect to claims 1-20.

2. Claim 10 is proposed as being obvious over the combined disclosures of Ritter and Spiess.

Requester identifies at pages 22-25 of the Request how the Ritter and Spiess disclosures relate to the factual inquiries associated with a *prima facie* obviousness determination. In this regard, Spiess teaches the crushing of corrugated sheets in a peripheral area to facilitate accurate gluing of overlapping sheet portions. Therefore, requester **HAS** established a RLP with respect to claim 10.

3. Claim 10 is proposed at pages 26-29 of the Request as being obvious over the combined disclosures of Ritter and Wu.

The teachings identified in Wu of crushing corrugated sheets to minimize overlapping joint thickness and

Art Unit: 3993

folding/compressing flaps to eliminate corrugated sheet edges, do not relate to the display package disclosed by Ritter.

Therefore, requester **HAS NOT** established a RLP with respect to claim 10.

4. Claim 10 is proposed at pages 30-33 of the Request as being obvious over the combined disclosures of Ritter and Botley.

The teaching identified in Botley of crushing corrugated sheets in a peripheral area and applying adhesive thereto in order to provide a compact joint and allow a better fit of carton contents, does not relate to the display package disclosed by Ritter. Therefore, requester **HAS NOT** established a RLP with respect to claim 10.

Determination

For the reasons given above, the request for reexamination is GRANTED. Claims 1-20 will be reexamined.

Service of Papers

Any document filed by either the patent owner or the third party requester must be served on the other party in the reexamination proceeding in the manner provided in 37 CFR 1.248. See 37 CFR 1.903 and MPEP 2666.06.

Art Unit: 3993

Notification of Concurrent Proceedings

The patent owner is reminded of the continuing responsibility under 37 CFR 1.985 to apprise the Office of any litigation activity, or other prior or concurrent proceeding, involving the patent under reexamination throughout the course of this proceeding. The third party requester is also reminded of the ability to similarly apprise the Office of any such activity or proceeding throughout the course of this reexamination proceeding. See MPEP §§ 2686, and 2686.04.

All correspondence relating to this *inter partes* reexamination proceeding should be directed:

By EFS: Registered users may submit via the electronic filing system EFS-Web, at <https://efs.uspto.gov/efile/myportal/efs-registered>.

By Mail to: Mail Stop *Inter Partes* Reexam
Attn: Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner of Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

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

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

Art Unit: 3993

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

Signed:

/Robert M. Fetsuga/
Primary Examiner
Central Reexamination Unit
(571) 272-4886 (M-R)

Conferee: /JAK/

Conferee: /EDL/