UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE			UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCI 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.
95/001,261	11/13/2009	INV001 7,139,761 B2	LTI0002-RXM	5286
74877 7590 03/18/2013 King and Spalding LLP 1700 Pennsylvania Ave, NW Suite 200 Washington, DC 20006			EXAMINER	
			HUGHES, DEANDRA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
0 ,			3992	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE

### 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.

			UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMER United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virguia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
95/001,261	11/13/2009	INV001 7,139,761 B2	LTI0002-RXM	5286
74877 7590 03/18/2013 King and Spalding LLP 1700 Pennsylvania Ave, NW Suite 200 Washington, DC 20006			EXAMINER	
			HUGHES, DEANDRA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
0			3992	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE

### 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.

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FACEBOOK, INC., Requester, Appellant

v.

LEADER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. Patent Owner, Respondent

Appeal 2012-009270 Reexamination Control No. 95/001,261 United States Patent 7,139,761 B2 Technology Center 3900

STEPHEN C. SIU, Administrative Patent Judge.

# ORDER REMANDING INTER PARTES REEXAMINATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.77(d) TO THE EXAMINER

Patent Owner submits a Request to Reopen Prosecution Before the Examiner Under 37 C.F.R. § 41.77(b)(1) (dated November 16, 2012) ("Request") in response to our Decision dated October 17, 2012 in which we designated new grounds of rejection as follows: Appeal 2012-009270 Reexamination Control 95/001,261 Patent 7,139,761 B2

1) Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Hess;

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12-15, 24, 26, 29, 33, and 34 under 35
U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hess and Dourish; and

3) Claims 10, 12-15, 24, 26, 33, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hess and Microsoft.

(Decision 12).

The Request includes "either an amendment of the claims so rejected or new evidence relating to the claims so rejected, or both" pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.77(b)(1). In particular, Patent Owner submits claim amendments to claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12-15, 24, 26, 29, 33, and 34. Patent Owner's request to reopen prosecution of claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12-15, 24, 26, 29, 33, and 34 is GRANTED.

Patent Owner provides new evidence purportedly supporting the validity of claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 11, 16, 21, 23, 25, 31, and 32 (i.e., Disclosure of Expert Testimony for James Herbsleb, Ph.D. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Pr. 26(A)(2)) and appears to restate previously provided arguments with respect to these claims (Request to Reopen Prosecution under 37 C.F.R. 41.77(b)(1), filed November 16, 2012, pp. 12-15). As we stated in our prior Decision, claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 11, 16, 21, 23, 25, 31, and 32 were held to be invalid in a final judgment of invalidity issued by the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit on May 8, 2012 (No. 2011-1366) (*see, e.g.*, Decision 5). We therefore did not consider Patent Owner's arguments and evidence in our prior Decision regarding the validity of claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 11, 16, 21, 23, 25, 31, and 32. Patent Owner's re-asserted arguments and/or evidence in the presently filed Request to Reopen Prosecution will likewise not be

Appeal 2012-009270 Reexamination Control 95/001,261 Patent 7,139,761 B2

considered and will not be entered for at least the previously stated reasons. Patent Owner's request to reopen prosecution of claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 11, 16, 21, 23, 25, 31, and 32 is DENIED.

Requester has proposed additional rejections for the amended claims. (*See* Third Party Requester's Comments on the Patent Owner's Amendment and Request to Reopen Prosecution In *Inter Partes* Reexamination, filed December 17, 2012, 6-7.)

# SUMMARY

Accordingly, Patent Owner's Request is GRANTED-IN-PART. This matter will be remanded to the Examiner for consideration of claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12-15, 24, 26, 29, 33, and 34 in view of the newly submitted claim amendments pertaining to the new grounds of rejection as enumerated in our prior Decision dated October 17, 2012 and for consideration of Requester's proposed rejections.

Patent Owner's arguments and/or evidence pertaining to claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 11, 16, 21, 23, 25, 31, and 32 will not be entered and will not be considered.

#### **GRANTED-IN-PART**

#### PATENT OWNER:

King and Spalding, LLP 1700 Pennsylvania Ave., NW Suite 200 Washington, DC 20006

#### THIRD PARTY REQUESTER:

Cooley Godward Kronish, LLP 777 6<sup>th</sup> Street, NW Suite 1100 Washington, DC 20001