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REEXAMINATION CONTROL NO. 90/008,549.
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ART UNIT 3991.

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 requestor, 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)).
Office Action in Ex Parte Reexamination

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

- Responsive to the communication(s) filed on 4/30/07.
- A statement under 37 CFR 1.530 has not been received from the patent owner.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 2 month(s) from the mailing date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in termination of the proceeding and issuance of an ex parte reexamination certificate in accordance with this action. 37 CFR 1.550(d). EXTENSIONS OF TIME ARE GOVERNED BY 37 CFR 1.550(c).

If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.

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

1. [ ] Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. [ ] Information Disclosure Statement, PTO/SB/08.
3. [ ] Interview Summary, PTO-474.
4. [ ]

Part II  SUMMARY OF ACTION

1a. [x] Claims 1 are subject to reexamination.
1b. [ ] Claims _____ are not subject to reexamination.
2. [ ] Claims _____ have been canceled in the present reexamination proceeding.
3. [ ] Claims _____ are patentable and/or confirmed.
4. [x] Claims 1 are rejected.
5. [ ] Claims _____ are objected to.
6. [ ] The drawings, filed on _____ are acceptable.
7. [ ] The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ has been (7a)[ ] approved (7b)[ ] disapproved.
8. [ ] 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
      1. [ ] been received.
      2. [ ] not been received.
      3. [ ] been filed in Application No. _____.
      4. [ ] been filed in reexamination Control No. _____.
      5. [ ] been received by the International Bureau in PCT application No. _____.

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

9. [ ] Since the proceeding appears to be in condition for issuance of an ex parte reexamination certificate 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.

10. [ ] Other: _____

cc: Requester (if third party requester)
EX PARTE REEXAMINATION

Detailed Non-Final Action

Procedural Posture


On 13 July 2007 an Order granting the reexamination was mailed. No Response was received from the Patent Owner under 37 CFR §1.530.

The Claim in Arimilli '230

In the Arimilli '230 patent there is a single claim drawn to a method of contacting cells with a prodrug of an antiviral nucleotide analogs.

Claim 1. A method comprising contacting a cell with a compound having formula (1a)

\[
\begin{align*}
    &\text{O} \\
    &\text{II} \\
    &\text{A--OCH}_2\text{P(Z)}_2
\end{align*}
\]

(1a)

wherein

Z is independently \(\text{---OC(R}^2\text{)}_2\text{OC(O)X(R)}_a\), an ester, an amidate or \(\text{--H}\), but at least one Z is \(\text{---OC(R}^2\text{)}_2\text{OC(O)X(R)}_a\);

A is the residue of an antiviral phosphonomethoxy nucleotide analog;

X is N or O;

R\(^2\) independently is \(\text{--H, C}_1\text{-C}_{12}\) alkyl, C\(_5\)-C\(_{12}\) aryl, C\(_2\)-C\(_{12}\) alkenyl, C\(_2\)-C\(_{12}\) alkynyl, C\(_7\)-C\(_{12}\) alkenylaryl, C\(_7\)-C\(_{12}\) alkynylaryl, or C\(_6\)-C\(_{12}\) alkaryl, any one of which is unsubstituted or is substituted with 1 or 2 halo, cyano, azido, nitro or \(\text{---OR}^3\) in which R\(^3\) is C\(_1\)-C\(_{12}\) alkyl, C\(_2\)-C\(_{12}\) alkenyl, C\(_2\)-C\(_{12}\) alkynyl or C\(_5\)-C\(_{12}\) aryl;
R is independently --H, C₁₋₁₂ alkyl, C₅₋₁₂ aryl, C₂₋₁₂ alkenyl, C₂₋₁₂ alkynyl, C₇₋₁₂ alkenylaryl, C₇₋₁₂ alkynylaryl, or C₆₋₁₂ alkaryl, any one of which is unsubstituted or is substituted with 1 or 2 halo, cyano, azido, nitro, --N(R⁴)₂ or --OR³, where R⁴ independently is --H or C₁₋₈ alkyl, provided that at least one R is not H; and

a is 1 when X is O, or 1 or 2 when X is N;

with the proviso that when a [is] 2 and X is N, (a) two N-linked R groups can be taken together to form a carbocycle or oxygen-containing heterocycle, (b) one N-linked R additionally can be --OR³ or (c) both N-linked R groups can be --H;

Priority


In order for a patent to gain the benefit of priority under 35 USC §119(e), the provisional application must fully comply with 35 USC §112, first paragraph. This means that the provisional application must provide enablement and adequate written description for the entire claim of the Arimilli '230 patent. In this instance, the provisional application 60/022,708 fails to provide adequate written description for claim 1 of the Arimilli '230 patent. (See Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co., 358 F.3d 916, 922 (Fed. Cir. 2004). To satisfy the written description requirement, a specification must describe the claimed invention so that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized what is claimed. In addition, the provisional application must provide sufficient detail in the specification to show one of ordinary skill in the art that the Patent Owner possessed the claimed invention at the time of the filing.
of the application. The provisional application 60/022,708 ('708 application) fails to provide the necessary written description of the claimed invention of Arimilli '230 for the following reasons.

The Third Party Requester asserts at pages 4 - 7 that claim 1 of Arimilli '230 should not receive benefit of the filing date of the '708 provisional application because the '708 application does not provide adequate written description for the invention of claim 1 since Formula 1a in the provisional and Formula 1a in claim 1 of Arimilli '230 are different. Furthermore, the Third Party Requester points out that the Arimilli '230 patent has added about 26 columns to the specification, from column 6, line 55 to column 32, line 45. Based upon a detailed analysis of the specification of the '708 provisional application, the examiner agrees with the Third Party Requester that claim 1 is not fully supported by the specification of the provision '708 application.

The following parts of claim 1 of Arimilli '230 are not supported by the '708 provisional application:

(1) Regarding variable Z, the general terms of an "ester" and an "amidate" in the definition of variable Z in the Arimilli '230 patent are not present in the definition of Z in the '708 provisional application. Furthermore, Formula 1a of the '708 provisional application shows one \( R^2 \) variable within variable Z while the Arimilli '230 patent contains two "\( R^2 \)'s" within the variable "Z."

(2) Regarding the definition of variable R in claim 1, the specific carbon limits of C5-C12 aryl, C2-C12 alkenyl, C2-C12 alknyl, C7-C12 alkenylaryl, C7-C12 alkynylaryl, or C6-C12 alkaryl are not found in the '708 provisional application.
(3) Regarding the definition of variable $R^2$ in claim 1, the specific carbon limits of the C5-C12 alkenyl, C2-C12 alkynyl, C7-C12 alkenylaryl, C7-C12 alkynylaryl, or C6-C12 alkaryl are not described in the '708 application. The '708 application also fails to describe cyano as a substituent for $R^2$. Finally, the '708 application fails to teach that $R^2$ can be $-\mathrm{N}(R^4)_2$. See page 2, lines 4 - 6 and 28 and page 36, lines 12 - 14 of the '708 application.

(4) Regarding the definition of variable $R^3$ in claim 1, C2-C12 alkenyl, C2-C12 alkynyl, and C5-C12 aryl are unsupported matter with respect to the '708 provisional application.

(5) Regarding the definition of variable $R^4$ in claim 1, this variable does not even appear in the '708 provisional application.

(6) Variable "n" in claim 1 is absent from Formula 1a in the Arimilli '230 patent. The following table provides a variable by variable comparison of claim 1 of Arimilli '230 and the '708 provisional application. The bold font represents information that is present in claim 1 of the Arimilli '230 patent and absent from the definition of Formula 1a in the provisional '708 application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>PROVISIONAL '708</th>
<th>'230 PATENT Claim 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formula 1a</td>
<td>A(Z)n</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A----O-CH₂ - P - (Z)₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; is the residue of an antiviral phosphonomethoxy nucleotide analog. Therefore &quot;A&quot; represents [ \text{O} \quad | \quad \text{Base} - \text{W} - \text{O} - \text{CH}_2 - \text{P} - \text{O} - ] Where &quot;W&quot; is an unspecified linkage between phosphonomethoxy and the base.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>O or N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Independently [ --\text{CH}(R^2)\text{OC(O)}\text{X(R)a or H, but at least one } Z \text{ is} ] [ --\text{CH}(R^2)\text{OC(O)}\text{X(R)a} ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Independently [ --\text{OC}(R^2)\text{OC(O)}\text{X(R)a, an ester, an amidate} \text{ or H, but at least one } Z \text{ is} ] [ --\text{OC}(R^2)\text{OC(O)}\text{X(R)a} ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R^2</td>
<td>Independently H, C1-C12 alkyl, aryl, alkenyl, alkynyl, alkynylaryl, alkynylaryl, alkaryl, arylalkynyl, arylalkenyl or arylalkyl which is unsubstituted or substituted with halo, azido, nitro, or OR3 in which R3 is C1-C12 alkyl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R^2</td>
<td>Independently --H, C1-C12 alkyl, C5 - 12 aryl, C2-C12 alkenyl, C2-C12 alkynyl, C7-C12 alkyenylaryl, C7-C12 alkynylaryl, or C6-C12 alkaryl, any one of which is unsubstituted or substituted with 1 or 2 halo, cyano, azido, nitro, --OR3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R^3</td>
<td>C1-12alkyl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R^3</td>
<td>C1-C12 alkyl, C2-C12 alkenyl, C2-C12 alkynyl, or C5-C12 aryl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Independently H, C1-C12 alkyl, aryl, alkenyl, alkynyl, alkyenylaryl, alkynylaryl, alkaryl, arylalkynyl, arylalkenyl or arylalkyl which is unsubstituted or substituted with halo, azido, nitro, or OR3, provided that at least one R is not H; Page 2 lines 7 - 9; page 5, lines 7 - 33; page 36, lines 15 - 17</td>
<td>Independently --H, C1-C12 alkyl, C5 - 12 aryl, C2-C12 alkenyl, C2-C12 alkynyl, C7-C12 alkyenylaryl, C7-C12 alkynylaryl, or C6-C12 alkaryl, any one of which is unsubstituted or substituted with 1 or 2 halo, cyano, azido, nitro, --N(R4)2, or --OR3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R⁴</td>
<td>R⁴ is not mentioned in the '708 provisional specification</td>
<td>independently --H or C1-C8 alkyl, provided that at least one R is not H; and a is 1 when X is O, or 1 or 2 when X is N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>“n” not present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proviso</td>
<td>With the proviso that then a is 2 and X is N, (a) two R groups can be taken together to form a carbocycle or oxygen-containing heterocycle, or (b) one R additionally can be --OR³ page 2, lines 12 - 14; page 36, lines 20 - 22</td>
<td>With the proviso that when a is 2 and X is N, (a) two N-linked R groups can be taken together to form a carbocycle or oxygen-containing heterocycle; (b) one N-linked R additional can be --OR³; or (c) both N-linked R-groups can be --H.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the proviso when "a" is 2 and X is "N" in claim 1 of Arimillia '230, the phrase “both N-linked R-groups can be hydrogen” is not present in the '708 provisional application.

For all of the above reasons, the invention of claim 1 of the Arimilli '230 patent is not fully described in the '708 provisional application, and therefore, does not receive
benefit of the earlier filing date under 35 USC §119(e). Thus, claim 1 of the Arimilli ’230 patent has a priority date that is the filing date of the parent application 08/990,746: July 25, 1997.

Claim Rejections

Claim Rejection - 35 USC §102(a)

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. §102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC §102(a) as being clearly anticipated by Bischofberger et al. (Bis(POC)PMPA, an orally bioavailable prodrug of the antiviral agent PMPA,” Abstract No. 214, 4th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections, Washington, D.C., January 22 - 26, 1997.

Claim 1 is directed to a method comprising contacting a cell with a carbonate prodrug of an antiviral phosphonomethoxy nucleotide analog. One of the preferred carbonate prodrugs of the Arimilli ’230 patent is shown in Example 16 and Table 2 in column 60 as compound 5f: bis(isopropylxy carbonyloxymethyl) 9-[(R)-2-(phosphonomethoxy)propyl]adenine, also known as bis(POC)PMPA. Formula Ia of claim 1 becomes bis(POC)PMPA when:

“\(A\)” is 9-[(R)-2-(phosphomethoxy)propyl]adenine

“\(Z\)” is \(-\text{OCH}_2\text{OC(O)OCH(CH}_3\text{)}_2\)

“\(X\)” is oxygen

“\(R\)” is isopropyl
"R²" is hydrogen

As explained previously in the "Priority" discussion, the effective priority of claim 1 of the Arimilla '230 patent is July 25, 1997 because the entire claim was not fully described by the '708 provisional application. Therefore, the Bischofberger et al. Abstract of January 22, 1997 becomes intervening prior art under 35 USC §102(a).

The Bischofberger et al. abstract discloses one of the Patent Owner's preferred carbonate prodrugs, Bis(POC)PMPA, and a method of contacting a cell with this compound to inhibit SIV infections. This disclosure reads on claim 1 of the Arimilli '230 patent. Thus, Bischofberger et al. clearly anticipates claim 1 of the Arimilli '230 patent.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC §103(a)

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

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if 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. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.


Claim 1 is directed to a method comprising contacting a cell with a carbonate ester of an antiviral prodrug of phosphonomethoxy nucleotide analogs.

The Arimilli '230 patent admits that "the parental compounds have the structure AOCH₂P(O)(OH)₂ [and they were] well known and have demonstrated antiviral activity"
(col. 3, line 67 to col. 4, line 2). Arimilli '230 lists fourteen patents and published patent applications which support this concession at column 4, lines 6 - 10. More specifically, Holy et al. disclose specific antiviral phosphonomethoxyalkyl adenine derivatives which exhibit antiviral activity against DNA-viruses and Mononey sarcoma virus (page 4, lines 27 - 30). In Example 2 on page 5 Holy et al. disclose the specific antiviral compound 9-(3-phosphonyl-methoxypropyl)adenine.

Holy et al. are silent about any prodrugs of the antiviral compounds they disclose.

However, Jones et al. teach that nucleotides (which include 9-(3-phosphonyl-methoxypropyl)adenine) exhibit the disadvantage of being unable to efficiently penetrate the lipid membrane surrounding cells because of the charge on the phosphonic moiety. This problem leads to a poor oral bioavailability (page 4, first paragraph). Jones et al. further explain that nucleotide prodrugs can potentially overcome these difficulties (page 4, second paragraph):

Masking the negative charge(s) on the phosphorus by suitable functionalities, which can be converted chemically or biologically to the parent nucleotide, can make nucleotides orally bioavailable, increase intracellular delivery, and alter pharmacokinetics/ tissue distribution/ metabolism resulting in improved efficacy and target organ specificity.

As an additional benefit, prodrugs may reduce the toxicity of a particular nucleotide analog and enhance its intracellular stability (page 11, third paragraph). Jones et al. continues at page 27:

Nucleoside and nucleotide analogues have great therapeutic potential for the treatment of viral diseases and cancer. [ ] The
area of nucleotide analogues has received a lot of attention recently due to the discovery of nucleotides with potent antiviral activities (Holy, 1993). Since the negative charge(s) on the phosphorus entail(s) nucleotides with shortcomings (low permeability and bioavailability), increasing work in the literature is focusing on overcoming these difficulties with nucleotide prodrugs [ ]

Jones et al. specifically teach bis(acyloxy)methyl esters of (phosphonomethoxy)ethyl adenine (PMEA) at page 5, lines 7 - 11 which exhibit increased oral bioavailability. Jones et al. also discuss the use of phosphoramidates as nucleotide prodrugs (page 7, third paragraph). Thus, Jones et al. establish that increasing the bioavailability of an antiviral drug is compelling motivation to prepare and use neutral prodrugs of therapeutic nucleotides.

Jones et al. are silent about the use of carbonate ester prodrugs of nucleotide analogues.

However, Notari teaches that known drugs with disadvantages such as undesirable statiblity or solubility could be improved through the creation of a prodrug and that "possible enzyme-reversible prodrug linkages [include] . . . carbonate esters [and] carbamates." Notari further discloses at page 27, second paragraph:

Although the list [of possible enzyme-reversible prodrug linkages] is short the list [ ] of prodrug linkages commonly employed is much shorter. By far the most widely used prodrug linkage is that of an ester wherein the original drug provides either the carboxylic acid or hydroxyl group. Add to this the phosphates, carbonates and hemiesters and one has accounted for the large majority of prodrugs.

(Emphasis added.)
Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have prepared bis-carbonate prodrugs of 9-(phosphono-methoxy)propyl adenine by combining the the antiviral compound disclosed by Holy et al. with the carbonate prodrugs taught by Notari et al. for the purpose as set forth by Jones et al.: a reasonable expectation of improving the bioavailability of the antiviral drug. The simplest carbonate esters would have been the most obvious where both of the hydroxyls of the phosphonic group are with blocked by the smallest and simplest carbonate group: \(-\text{CH}_2\text{-O-C(O)-O-CH}_3\). Furthermore, it would have been obvious to substitute the hydrogen atoms in the carbonate structure with any alkyl or other neutral moiety that would not create steric interference in the enzyme hydrolysis of said carbonate linkage. A method of using obvious prodrugs to treat cells infected by a virus would also have been obvious to the artisan at the time of the invention.

**Conclusion**

The claim of the Arimilli '230 patent is rejected.

**Continuing Duty to Disclose**

The patent owner is reminded of the continuing responsibility under 37 CFR §1.565(a) to apprise the Office of any litigation activity, or other prior or concurrent proceeding, involving Patent No. 6,043,230 throughout the course of this reexamination 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 §§ 2207, 2282, and 2286.
Patent Owner Amendment

Patent owner is notified that any proposed amendment to the specification and/or claims in this reexamination proceeding must comply with 37 CFR §1.530(d)-(j), must be formally presented pursuant to 37 CFR §1.52(a) and (b), and must contain any fees required by 37 CFR 1.20(c). In order to ensure full consideration of any amendments, affidavits or declarations, or other documents as evidence of patentability, such documents must be submitted in response to this Office action. Submissions after the next Office action, will be governed by requirements of 37 CFR §1.116, after final rejection and 37 CFR §41.33 after appeal, which will be strictly enforced.

Extensions of Time

Extensions of time under 37 CFR §1.136(a) will not be permitted in these proceedings because of the provisions of 37 CFR §1.136 apply only to an applicant and not to parties in a reexamination proceeding. Additionally, 35 USC §305 requires that ex parte reexamination proceedings “will be concluded with special dispatch” (37 CFR §1.550(a)). Extensions of time in ex parte reexamination proceedings are provided for in 37 CFR §1.550(c).

Service on the Other Party (3rd Party Request)

After the filing of a request for reexamination by 3rd party requester, any document filed by either the patent owner or the third party requester must be served on the other party (or parties where two or more third party requester proceedings have been merged) in the reexamination proceedings in the manner provided in 37 CFR §1.248. See 37 CFR §1.530(f).

NOTICE RE PATENT OWNER’S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS

Effective May 16, 2007, 37 CFR 1.33(c) has been revised to provide that:

The patent owner’s correspondence address for all communications in an ex parte reexamination or an inter partes reexamination is designated as the correspondence address of the patent.

Revisions and Technical Corrections Affecting Requirements for Ex Parte and Inter Partes Reexamination, 72 FR 18892 (April 16, 2007)(Final Rule)

The correspondence address for any pending reexamination proceeding not having the same correspondence address as that of the patent is, by way of this
revision to 37 CFR 1.33(c), automatically changed to that of the patent file as of the effective date.

This change is effective for any reexamination proceeding which is pending before the Office as of May 16, 2007, including the present reexamination proceeding, and to any reexamination proceeding which is filed after that date.

Parties are to take this change into account when filing papers, and direct communications accordingly.

In the event the patent owner's correspondence address listed in the papers (record) for the present proceeding is different from the correspondence address of the patent, it is strongly encouraged that the patent owner affirmatively file a Notification of Change of Correspondence Address in the reexamination proceeding and/or the patent (depending on which address patent owner desires), to conform the address of the proceeding with that of the patent and to clarify the record as to which address should be used for correspondence.

Telephone Numbers for reexamination inquiries:

Reexamination and Amendment Practice (571) 272-7703
Central Reexam Unit (CRU) (571) 272-7705
Reexamination Facsimile Transmission No. (571) 273-9900

Further Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary L. Kunz, whose telephone number is 571-272-0887. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday (with alternative Fridays off) between 7:00 AM and 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones, can be reached at 571-272-1535. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-9900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for unpublished applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions about access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

All correspondence relating to this Ex parte Reexamination proceeding should be directed to:

By Mail to:
Attn: Mail Stop “Ex Parte Reexam”
Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA  22313-1450

By FAX to:

(571) 273-9900
Central Reexamination Unit

By hand to:

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria VA  22314

Conferee:

Debara
SPE 3991

Conferee:

[Signature]
Primary Examiner 3991

GARY L. KUNZ
PRIMARY EXAMINER
CRU - AU 3991