## 101 rejections of Software Patents(Date of Rejections After October-30-2008)

SI.No.	Patent/Publication No.	Date of Publication	Application Date	Date of Rejection	FR or N/FR	Rejection type	101 Rejection	102 Rejection	103 Ro
1	US20080201671A1	8/21/2008	2/16/2007	2/25/2009	N/FR	101 and 103 rejections	Claims 1-1 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	Claims 1-4 rejected ur U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Beaus US Patent 5,696,771 Higuchi, U No. 7,299,
2	US20080155477A1	6/26/2008	12/22/2006	3/4/2009	N/FR 101, 102 and 103 rejections Claim under becau inven non-s		Claims 1-1 1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-5, 7-14, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by "Optimize Your PocketPC Development" by MSDN Magazine (hereafter MSDN).	Claims 6 a rejected ur U.S.C. 103 being unpa over "Optir PocketPC Developme MSDN Ma (hereafter view of XP
3	US20080155460A1	6/26/2008	12/22/2006	3/17/2009	N/FR	101 and 102 rejections	Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by "Maps Tour" by Google Maps Help Center (hereafter Google Maps).	N/A
4	US20080127018A1	5/29/2008	10/31/2006	2/6/2009	N/FR	101 and 103 rejections	Claims 1-1 0 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	Claims 1-3 rejected ur U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Naga US Patent 5,917,729 Viswanath Page 2 "Fa Efficient Ai Placement CellShifting Local Refir a Hybrid N ISPD?04, . 2004, Pho Arizona, U Copyright 1 1-581 13-8 7-2/04/000
5	US20080127013A1	5/29/2008	10/25/2006	1/29/2009	N/FR	101, 102 and 112 rejections	1. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. 2. Claims 1-1 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-3, 7-1 0, 12-21, 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Levy (US 200610095869 A1 ).	N/A

			I	I	1	I	1	1	
6	US20080127005A1	5/29/2008	9/7/2006	12/17/2008	N/FR	101 rejection	Claims 1, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The invention claims a method for analyzing a circuit.	N/A	N/A
7	US20080097923A1	4/24/2008	3/9/2007	1/6/2009	N/FR	101, 102 and 112 rejections	Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §1 01 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-16 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ginter (US 5892900).	N/A
8	US20080092106A1	4/17/2008	9/13/2007	4/3/2009	N/FR	101 and 102 rejections	Claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.c. 101 because the claim invention is directed to nonstatutory subject mater. In re Bilski, 88 U.S.P.Q.2d 1391 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (en bane).	Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ye et al. (U.S Patent 7488933).	N/A
9	US20080204773A1	8/28/2008	2/26/2007	3/19/2009	N/FR	101 rejection	1. Claims 1-4, 7-10, 13-14 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. Supreme Court precedent1 and recent Federal Circuit decisions2 indicate that a statutory "process" under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to another statutory category (such as a particular apparatus), or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing. (2 In re Bilski, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008).) 2. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. 3. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venable et al. (6,972,867) in view of Kanamori et al. (4,929,978).	N/A	N/A
10	US20060070127A1	3/30/2006	9/15/2005	3/19/2009	N/FR	101, 103 and 112 rejections	Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 1 as recited is directed toward a method comprising a series of steps or acts. However, as per In re Bilski 88 USPQ2d 1385,	N/A	Claims 1-2 rejected uu U.S.C. 103 being unp over Lawr US 2004/0 (hereinafte "Lawrence Leary US

							for a method/process to be statutory, the claim must (1) be tied to a particular machine or apparatus, or (2) transform a particular article to a different state or thing.		2004/0193 (hereinafte
11	US20060067353A1	3/30/2006	11/29/2004	3/13/2009	N/FR	101, 102, 103 and 112 rejections	1. Claims 1-7 and 8-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. 2. claims 1-26 are rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In re Bilski, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Gir. 2008).	Claims 1-3, 8-10, 12-13, 19-22, 27-31, 33, 36-37 and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by 3GPP TR 23.846 1.0.0, Technical Report, pages 1-46, January 2002 (hereinafter "Doc").	1. Claims 4 14-18 and rejected ur U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Doc i Lee et al (I 200501856 (hereinafte Claims 6-7 are rejecte U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Doc.
12	US20060067887A1	3/30/2006	6/22/2005	3/18/2009	N/FR	101, 102, 103 and 112 rejections	Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.c. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. Supreme Court precedentl and recent Federal Circuit decisions indicate that a statutory "process" under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to a particular machine or apparatus, or (2) transform a particular article to a different state or thing. In re Bilski, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008).	Claims 10-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.c. 102(b) as being anticipated byUS 5,008,185 to Bacus (newly cited).	Claims 4,5 and 23 are under 35 L as being u over Bacus "Computer Detection o Cancer Nu Schnorren (previously Applicant? hereafter r as "Schnor
13	US20050075274A1	4/7/2005	9/8/2004	2/9/2009	N/FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 1-6 and 8-10 are drawn to a process. A process is statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101 if: (1) it is tied to a particular machine or apparatus or (2) it transforms an article to a different state or thing (In re Bilski, 88 USPQ2d 1385 Fed. Cir. 2008).	Claims 1-6 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Grass et al. (US 20010041964 Al).	Claims 1-6 are rejecte U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Grass 200100419 view ofAlm (US 6,340,
14	US20060067560A1	3/30/2006	9/26/2005	1/7/2009	N/FR	101 and 102	Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not	Claims 1,6,9, and 10 are	N/A

						rejections	falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. Supreme Court precedent 1 and recent Federal Circuit decisions(In re Bilski, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008).) indicate that a statutory "process" under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to another statutory category (such as a particular apparatus), or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing.	rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kasai (US 2001/0021251).	
15	US20050075953A1	4/7/2005	10/2/2003	12/16/2008	FR	101 and 103 rejections	Claims 10-18 and 28-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. Based on Supreme Court precedent and recent Federal Circuit decisions, a 35 U.S.C § 101 process must (1) be tied to a particular machine or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. In re Bilski et ai, 88 USPQ 2d 1385 CAFC (2008); Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); Parker v. Flook, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); Cochrane v. Deener, 94 U.S. 780,787-88 (1876).	N/A	Claims 1-3 rejected ur U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Yang (2003/023 view of Wa (2005/0038
16	US20050076103A1	4/7/2005	9/22/2003	2/5/2009	N/FR	101 and 102 rejections	Claim(s) 1- 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. While the claims recite a series of steps or acts to be performed, a statutory "process" under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to particular machine, or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing. See page 10 of In Re Bilski 88 USPQ2d 1385.	Claims 1- 10 & 23- 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nachman et al. (hereinafter Nachman) U.S. Publication No.: 2001/0027474 A1.	N/A
17	US20050076331A1	4/7/2005	10/2/2003	2/18/2009	N/FR	101 and 102 rejections	Claims 7, 14, 15,21,24,27-32,34,41-46, and 53-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. A claim that requires one or more acts to be performed defines a process. However, not all processes are statutory under 35 U.S.C. § 101. To be statutory, a claimed process must either: (1) be tied to a particular machine or apparatus, or (2) transform a particular article into a different state or thing. In re Bilski, 545 F.3d 943,954 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (en bane).	Claims 53-55 and 58-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Evans et al., "Splint Manual, Version 3.1.1-1," June 5, 2003 (prior art of record; hereinafter "[Splint]").	N/A
18	US20050078755A1	4/14/2005	10/14/2004	3/30/2009	N/FR	101 rejection	Claims 1-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. Supreme Court precedent	N/A	N/A

							1 and recent Federal Circuit decisions(In re Bilski, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008).) indicate that a statutory "process" under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to another statutory category (such as a particular apparatus), or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing.		
19	US20050078869A1	4/14/2005	7/23/2004	11/5/2008	N/FR	101 rejection	Claims 1-12, 14-21,23-33,36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for nonstatutory subject matter.	N/A	N/A
20	US20080109315A1	5/8/2008	12/21/2007	2/13/2009	N/FR	101 and 112 rejections	Claim 42 recites a method where a payoff indicator is calculated, but no particular machine is used for the calculations.	N/A	N/A
21	US20080109314A1	5/8/2008	12/21/2007	12/29/2008	N/FR	101 and 103 rejections	Claims 33-36 are not tied to a particular machine or apparatus nor do they transform a particular article into a different state or thing; therefore, claims 33-36 are non-statutory under § 101.	N/A	Claims 33- rejected ur U.S.C. 103 being unpa over US Pa 5930764 fi 8/23/1996 Melchione view of US Applicatior 200300188 7/7/2002 (t 6/7/2001)
22	US20050078866A1	4/14/2005	1/23/2004	12/29/2008	N/FR	101 amd 103 rejections	Claims 1,2,4-12, 37 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. Supreme Court precedent 1 and recent Federal Circuit decisions(In re Bilski, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008).) indicate that a statutory "process" under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to another statutory category (such as a particular apparatus), or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing.	N/A	1. Claims 3 are rejecte U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Ishika no 6,549,6 of Yoshiga pat no 7,0 <sup>-</sup> Claim 39 is under 35 L 103(a) as I unpatentał Ishikawa ( view of Yo (?951) and notice.
23	US20060069519A1	3/30/2006	12/2/2005	11/28/2008	FR	101 and 112 rejections	In light of the recent court decisions in In re Bilski, etc., the method claims would have been rejected also because the claims such as claim 1 are not tied to another statutory category such as a machine or apparatus.	N/A	N/A

24	US20080235259A1	9/25/2008	3/23/2007	2/20/2009	N/FR	101 and 103 rejections	1. Claim 1 and its dependent claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. 2. Claim 9 and its dependent claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	Claims 1-2 rejected ur U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Collin al. (U.S. Po Number 6, ("Collins-R hereinafter Dunn et all Patent Nur 5,721,829) hereinafter
25	US20080209464A1	8/28/2008	2/23/2007	3/17/2009	N/FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claim (s) 1-1 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 10 1 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a process, machines, manufactures and composition of matter asserted utility or a well established utility.	Claims 1-9, 1 1-15 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Broussard et al. (US 200410221305 Al), here in refer to as Broussard.	1. Claims <sup>1</sup> are rejecte U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Brous (US 20041 Al), here ir Broussard Pinder et a 200410233 herein refe Pinder. 2. ( rejected ur U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Brous (US 20041 Al), here ir Broussard Pinder et a 200410233 herein refe Pinder et a 20041023 herein refe Pinder and View of Va (US 20061 Al).
26	US20080163148A1	7/3/2008	10/2/2007	2/3/2009	N/FR	101 and 102 rejections	Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pub. No. 200310237064 to White et al. (Hereinafter: White).	N/A
27	US20080177702A1	7/24/2008	1/23/2007	1/7/2009	N/FR	101 and 103 rejections	Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed Page 3 invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	Claims 1-2 current ap (effective f Jan. 23, 20 rejected ur U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Hecko (US 571 5 patent: Fel hereinafter "Heckerma of Yemini e 200501 37 date: Jun. hereinafter

28	US20080168409A1	7/10/2008	1/9/2007	2/3/2009	N/FR	101, 102, 103 and 112 rejections	Claims 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because claim 15 recites a computer program product comprising a computer readable medium.	Claims I, 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tieg et al. (US 6526555).	1. Claims 2 rejected ur U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Teig 6 of Na. et a effects of c package d capacitors efficient AS decoupling methodolo Claims 3, are rejecte U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Teig 6 of Na et al to claims 2 above, and view of Do (US20060) Claims 5, 6 14, 19 and rejected ur U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Teig 6 of Na et al view Douri applied to and 16 abd further in v Gasparik 6 200501 14
29	US20080162377A1	7/3/2008	12/19/2007	1/7/2009	N/FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 26-49 and 51 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because based on Supreme Court precedent (Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1 981 ); Parker v. Flook, 437	Claims 1-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being disclosed by Cifrese et al., USPAP 2007101 92223.	Claim 1-51 rejected ur U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Cifres USPAP 20 92223, and view of Ho al., USPAF 200510246
30	US20080235177A1	9/25/2008	3/22/2007	1/27/2009	N/FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.IO1 because the language of the claim raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine which would result in a practice application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C 101.	Claims 1, 9-1 1 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lawrence et al. (US Patent No. 7,389,265 B2, hereinafter "Lawrence").	Claims 2-8 20-21 are under 35 L 103(a) as l unpatental Lawrence Patent No. B2) as app claims 1, 9 above, and view of Air (US Paten 6,078,924 hereinafter "Ainsbury"
31	US20080197846A1	8/21/2008	3/10/2008	12/17/2008	N/FR	101 and 103 rejections	Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	Claims I, 3 are rejecte U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Hurd 5,657,757) further in v Haase et a 6,400,151)

32	US20080235739A1	9/25/2008	11/13/2006	11/25/2008	N/FR	101, 102, 103 and 112 rejections	Claims 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because computer programs per se cannot be patentable.	Claims 1-3, 10-15, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dureau et al. (U.S. Publication No. 200310093806).	1. Claims 4 are rejecte U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Durea (U.S. Publi 200310093 applied to above, and view of Sa (U.S. Publi 200210055 Claim 7 is under 35 L 103(a) as I unpatental Dureau et Publicatior 200310093 Sano et al, Publicatior 200210055 applied to above, and view of Ro (U.S. Pate 5,623,613)
33	US20080235429A1	9/25/2008	3/23/2007	12/5/2008	N/FR	101 and 103 rejections	Claims 13, 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 10 1 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 13 and 15 are directed to a program on a propagating signal13	N/A	Claim 1 is under 35 L 103(a) as I unpatentat Landis et a WO-20051 in view of a1 PN 7,29
34	US20080162427A1	7/3/2008	12/28/2006	12/10/2008	N/FR	101 and 102 rejections	Claims 15- 20 are rejected under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Choi et al (US Pub. No. 2004101 86826), herein after "Choi".	N/A
35	US20080154907A1	6/26/2008	12/22/2006	1/15/2009	N/FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claim 23 and depending claims 24-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they pertain to nonstatutory subject matter.	Claims 1-18, 21-40, and 43-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Plastina et al. (?Plastina? hereafter) which filed U.S. Patent Application 20041001 9658.	Claims 19- similar clai are rejecte U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Plasti applied to 21-40, and above, and view of Ne (?New? he who filed U Applicatior 2006/0195
36	US20080155641A1	6/26/2008	12/20/2006	3/18/2009	N/FR	101 and 102 rejections	Claims 1-1 4, 15, 16-25, 26, and 27-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Heim (US Publication 2006101 84490).	N/A
37	US20080155592A1	6/26/2008	12/22/2006	2/3/2009	N/FR	101 and 103 rejections	Claims 15-21 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter as follows: Claims 15-21 claim "a computer readable	N/A	Claims 1-2 rejected ur U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Pelke 7,032,235) Bove (US 1 2331 4).

							medium containing a computer program for" and Claims 25-27 claim "a data structure stored in		
38	US20080155476A1	6/26/2008	12/20/2006	11/26/2008	N/FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 13-1 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1, 4-6, 9-12, 17-18, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Callegari (PGPub. No. 200310004802).	1. Claim 2 under 35 L 103(a) as I unpatental Callegari ( 20031000- view of No (PGPub N 200510130 Claim 3 is under 35 L 103(a) as I unpatental Callegari ( 20031000- view of Ma No. 20071 Filing date 2006). 3. C 13, 15-16, rejected ur U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Calleg (PGPub N 20031000- view of Elii (PGPub N 200810086 Provisiona Oct. 10, 20 further in v Northcutt ( 200510130
39	US20080155471A1	6/26/2008	12/20/2006	3/6/2009	N/FR	101 and 102 rejections	Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. \$101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter (i.e., computer data signal that is not tied to any machine).	Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. App. Pub. 200310065721 to Roskind.	N/A
40	US20080155342A1	6/26/2008	12/21/2006	4/2/2009	N/FR	101, 103 and 112 rejections	Claims 7, 9-14 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to nonstatutory subject matter	N/A	1. Claims <sup>-</sup> 1 and 16-1 rejected ur U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Thekł Patent Apr Publicatior 20061022
41	US20080155332A1	6/26/2008	10/30/2006	12/29/2008	N/FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims are	Claims 1-2, 4, 6-7, 11-12, and 14 are rejected	1. Claims 3 rejected ur U.S.C. 103

							directed to non-statutory subject matter.	under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Loison (US 200310046529 Al).	being unpa over Loiso 200310044 view of Tai 2004101 3 2. Claims § rejected ur U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Loiso 200310046 view of Bai 2002101 5 3. Claims § rejected ur U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Loiso 200310046 view of Mai 6,922,722
42	US20080127229A1	5/29/2008	9/8/2006	3/5/2009	N/FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	1. Claims 1-2, 6, 11-12 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Garnett (US 2003/0033459), hereafter referred to as Garnett?459. 2. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 1 1-1 4, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pecone et al. (US 6,098,140), hereafter referred to as Pecone et a1.?140.	1. Claims rejected ur U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Garne 2003/0033 hereafter r as Garnett view of Pe (US 6,098, hereafter r as Pecone Claims 3-5 13-16, and rejected ur U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Garne view of Pe (US 6,098, hereafter r as Pecone Claims 5, 9 are rejecte U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Pecon a1.?140.
43	US20080127219A1	5/29/2008	9/15/2006	2/27/2009	N/FR	101 and 102 rejections	Claims 10-1 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Upton (US 200310093471).	N/A
44	US20080127103A1	5/29/2008	7/27/2006	12/10/2008	N/FR	101 and 103 rejections	Claims 21 -30,34,35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	Claims are under 35 L 103(a) as l unpatental Voruganti Publication 200501378 view of Pa (US Public Number 20 62090A1).
45	US20080098443A1	4/24/2008	1/11/2007	11/28/2008	N/FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 17, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention.	Claims 2-4, 7-1 1, 13-1 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ellis et al. (US 200210174430).	1. Claims 9 rejected ur U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Ellis e 2002101 7 view of Sh (US 6,353, Claims 1 a rejected ur U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Ellis e 2002101 7 view of Kn (20051020
46	US20080098423A1	4/24/2008	10/20/2006	2/27/2009	FR				

									101, 103 a 112 reject	and	Claims 1-9 rejected und 101 becaus invention is non-statutor matter.	der 35 U.S.C. e the claimed directed to	Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-1 2, 14-1 7, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zigmond et al. (US 6698020).	1. Claims 4 rejected ur U.S.C. 103 being unpa over Zigmo of Lu (US 2 571 15). 2. and 18 are under 35 U 103(a) as I unpatental Young in v Palazzo et 2003101 1
47	US20080098242A1	4/24/2008	3	10/19/2	006	3/31/20	009	N/FR	101 a 102 reject		Claims 7-1 under 35 U. because the invention is non-statutor matter.	e claimed directed to	Claims 1-4, 7-1 0, 13-1 5 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pessolano, U.S. Patent No. 7,340,628.	N/A
48	US20080098187A1	4/24/2008	3	10/18/2	006	1/16/20	009	N/FR	101 a 102 reject		Claims 7-1 : under 35 U. because the limitation lin "computer L medium" is non-statutor matter.	e claimed les 2-3, lisable directed to	Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Micka (US. Pub. No. 2003101 58869).	N/A
49	US20080098131A1	4/24/2008	3	9/26/20	07	1/22/20	009	N/FR	101 a 102 reject		35 U.S.C. 1 the claimed	nonstatutory	Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Application Publication No. US 200710033225 A1 to Davis.	N/A
50	US20080098067A1	4/24/2008	3	10/20/24	006	2/20/20	009	N/FR	101, and 1 reject	103	Claims 21 - rejected und 101 becaus invention is non-statutor matter.	der 35 U.S.C. e the claimed directed to	Claim 1-1 8, 21 -24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Santos (US 2003/0158900 Al)	1. Claim 19 under 35 U 103(a) as I unpatental Santos (U§ 200310158 view of Do al. (US 200 Al). Herein "Dorenbos Claim 20 is under 35 U 103(a) as I unpatental Santos (US 2003/0158 view of Ma (US 20060 Hereinafte "Mannaru"
51	US20080098066A1 4	4/24/2008	10/20	0/2006	2/19/	2009	N/FR	101 a 102 reject		are re under 101 b claime invent direct non-s	tion is	U.S.C. 102(b)	e rejected under 35 as being anticipated I. (US 20051000499 r "Durazo".	10 N/A
52	US20080098062A1	4/24/2008	10/2	0/2006	12/10	0/2008	N/FR	101, and 1 reject	03	are re under 10 1 k the cla invent direct non-s	is 15-18 ejected ' 35 U.S.C. because aimed tion is ed to tatutory ct matter.	U.S.C. 102(e) by Deng et al. Al). 2. Claims J under 35 U.S.C anticipated by 20060184609 are rejected ur	are rejected under 33 as being anticipated (US 20060184609 7-14 are rejected C. 102(e) as being Deng et al. (US Al). 3. Claims 19-22 nder 35 U.S.C. 102(e pated by Deng et al. 609 Al).	Claims rejected 103(a) a unpater et al. (U Al), in v et al. (U

53	US20080098051A1	4/24/2008	1/24/2007	1/12/2009	N/FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 12-1 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 12 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Apple Inc - Technical Note TNI 150 - HFS Plus Volume Format dated March 5, 2004 - Applicant?s IDS (hereinafter, Technical note TNI 150).	1. Claim are reje U.S.C. unpater Inc - Te 150 - HI Format 2004 - A (hereina note TN Okada ( A2 - Ap Claim 1 under 3 as being over Ap Technic - HFS P Format 2004 - A (hereina note TN Gotoh e 200310
54	US20080097974A1	4/24/2008	10/18/2006	3/6/2009	FR	101 and 102 rejections	Claim 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	Claims 11-20 a 35 U.S. being un Roberts al. (U.S 2005002 Bumgar in view al. (U.S 7,003,4 Humphr
55	US20080098054A1	4/24/2008	10/23/2006	3/4/2009	N/A	101, 102 and 112 rejections	Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-11 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Subramoney et al. US Publication 2005/0198088.	Claims rejected 103(a) a unpater Subram Publicat 2005/01 Little et Publicat 2005/01
56	US20080097945A1	4/24/2008	12/19/2007	12/18/2008	N/FR	101, 102, 103 and 112 rejections	Claims 1-2, 7,12-19,23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the disclosed invention is inoperative and therefore lacks utility.	Claims 13-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al. "A framework for constructing features and models for intrusion detection systems", TISSEC, 2000, pp 227-261), hereinafter LS.	Claims 23 and 3 under 3 as being over LS Zhang e
57	US20080097899A1	4/24/2008	7/13/2007	10/30/2008	N/FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-6, 8-9, 15-20, 22-29, and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Josephson et al. (hereinafter "Josephson"); (US 5,412,190).	Claims rejected 103 (a) unpater Josephs 5,412,1 Official
58	US20080086556A1	4/10/2008	10/10/2006	1/9/2009	N/FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-2,4-5,8,12-17,19-20,22-24,26-27, and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vanderbeck et al. (US 7,000,016, hereinafter Vanderbeck).	1. Claim under 3 as being over Va applied view of al("Enl Dynami with Ind

		I					1		
									Informa Worksh Proceed Fifth An hereinat Claims 28, and under 3 as being over Va applied view of 2004/01 hereinat
59	US20080082613A1	4/3/2008	9/28/2006	3/30/2009	N/FR	101, 103 and 112 rejections	Claims 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	1. Claim 10-14, a rejected 103(a) a unpater (US 677 Gilbert ( 2005/00 Claims 20 are r U.S.C. unpater (US 677 Gilbert ( 2005/00 Bill (US A1).
60	US20080082400A1	4/3/2008	9/28/2007	3/23/2009	N/FR	101, 102 and 112 rejections	Claims 1-7 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by US Patent Application Publication Number 2006/0173744 by Kandasamy et al.	N/A
61	US20080079923A1	4/3/2008	8/9/2007	11/13/2008	N/FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-4, 8-11 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jain [US 20030206281 A1].	Claims 18-20 a 35 U.S. being u Jain in V Sandstr 200400 teaching been di
62	US20080098264A1	4/24/2008	12/19/2007	4/6/2009	N/FR	101 rejection	Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	N/A
63	US20080092001A1	4/17/2008	10/3/2006	3/20/2009	N/FR	101, 103 and 112 rejections	Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because: Regarding claim 34, the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. "A computer program product" is non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has failed to recite a physical media	N/A	1. Claim 24 are r U.S.C. unpater Toyoda Patent 7 Toyoda Roberts rejected 103(a) a unpater Toyoda

							for the computer program. Therefor the claim is not directed as a useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or improvement thereof. MPEP 2106.01		
64	US20080091978A1	4/17/2008	10/13/2006	12/31/2008	N/FR	101 and 102 rejections	Claims 1-11 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ta et al. U.s. Publication No. 2005/0262086 (herein as ?Ta?).	N/A
65	US20080091843A1	4/17/2008	10/12/2006	3/17/2009	N/FR	101, 103 and 112 rejections	Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	Claims under 3 as being over Se (seocon archive. 10, 200- Seo) in (Zann M page or dated M hereina
66	US20060069914A1	3/30/2006	8/17/2005	12/31/2008	N/FR	101 and 103 rejections	Regarding claims 1-10, the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	Claims under 3 as being over Al Applicat Web/Mo authent web acc and Kar Applicat 03/0775
67	US20060069741A1	3/30/2006	5/26/2005	11/14/2008	N/FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claim 41 is rejected under U.S.C.IOI because the claimed invention is directed to non- statutory subject matter.	Claims 41-42 are rejected under 35 US.Cl02 (b) as being anticipated by Bays et al hereinafter Bays (US. 2003/0204619 Al).	Claims rejected 103(a) a unpater (US 200 view of 6,944,5
68	US20060067686A1	3/30/2006	9/29/2005	3/31/2009	FR	101 rejection	Claims 1,3-5,7-9,11-13, and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.c. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to	N/A	N/A

							non-statutory subject matter.		
69	US20060069615A1	3/30/2006	9/29/2004	1/9/2009	N/FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	1. Claims 1-12, 21-22 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1,3,4,8,9,21,23,28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Taub et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0105666).	Claims : 5-7,10-2 30 are r U.S.C. unpater et al. (2 view of (2003/0
70	US20060067714A1	3/30/2006	6/7/2005	3/13/2009	N/FR	101, 102, 103 and 112 rejections	Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-4, 8, and 10-16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Maeda et al. (US 5,491,678).	Claims rejected 103(a) a unpater Maeda 5,491,6 Official
71	US20060067425A1	3/30/2006	8/24/2005	4/6/2009	N/FR	101, 103 and 112 rejections	Claims 4-10, and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention.	N/A	Claims 17, 19 a rejected 103(a) a unpater Burgin ( 6,298,0 Hilborn after Hil Publicat Direct C Transm 1994).
72	US20060068745A1	3/30/2006	9/27/2004	12/10/2008	N/FR	101 and 103 rejections	Claim(s) 14-25, 29, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention.	N/A	Claims under 3 as being over Mo (McLeoo (US 7,2 view of (Schmid (US 7,1

				1	1		1	1	
73	US20060070060A1	3/30/2006	9/28/2004	1/21/2009	N/FR	101 and 102 rejections	Claims 1 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hartsell et al. (US 2003/0236745).	N/A
74	US20060070037A1	3/30/2006	9/30/2004	1/5/2009	N/FR	101, 102, 103 and 112 rejections	Claims 1-11 and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.c. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1,2, 12, 13, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.c. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 2005/0065803 (hereinafter "Creamer").	Claims : 23-26 a 35 U.S. being ul Creame 7,216,1 "Chintal
75	US20060069991A1	3/30/2006	9/23/2005	12/26/2008	N/FR	101 and 103 rejections	Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	1. Claim rejected 103(a) a unpater et al. US 7,461,0' "Blinn") view of US Pate 6,704,6' "Paulse and 4 re U.S.C. "Paulse and 4 re U.S.C. "Blinn") Paulser No. 6,70 (hereina and furt Tsochai Patent 1 (hereina Claim 5 35 U.S. being ul Blinn et No. 7,46 (hereina view of US Pate 6,704,6' "Blinn") Paulser No. 6,70 (hereina and furt Tsochai Patent 1 (hereina view of US Pate 6,704,6' "Paulser No. 7,46' (hereina view of US Pate (hereina view of US Pate(hereina view of US Pate(h
76	US20060069972A1	3/30/2006	9/28/2004	3/18/2009	FR	101 and 103 rejections	Claim 7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to nonstatutory subject matter.	N/A	1. Claim under 3 as being over Ch Pat. 7,2 hereina Cheng) Griswoll 7,055,11 Lach et 5,909,4 referred Claim 1 35 U.S.

									being ul Cheng i Griswol in view o Pat. 6,9 Claims rejected 103(a) a unpater Cheng i Griswol in view o Pat. 5,6 hereina Lindber
77	US20060069916A1	3/30/2006	8/17/2005	12/30/2008	N/FR	101 and 103 rejections	claims 1-10, the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims recite only perfunctory recitation of functional material (device, product, etc.). Aside from this, the claims recite only nonfunctional descriptive material. In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994); In re Ngai, 367 F.3d 1336,70 USPQ2d 1862 (Fed. Cir. 2004).	N/A	Claims under 3 as being over Ha Applicat (AlQaye Web/Mo authenti web acc
78	US20060069906A1	3/30/2006	9/30/2004	4/8/2009	N/FR	101, 103 and 112 rejections	Claim 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.c. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims recite a BIOS (basic input output system) containing instructions.	N/A	1. Claim rejected 103(a) a unpater Patent I Natu et 2004/01 et al. 2. 12,14-1 rejected 103(a) a unpater Patent I Natu et Patent I Singer Patent I Natu et Patent I Natu et Patent I Singer Patent I Natu et Patent I
79	US20060069713A1	3/30/2006	8/27/2004	3/18/2009	N/FR	101, 102, 103 and 112 rejections	Claims 33-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	1. Claims 1-2,4-7, 9, 11-15, 33-34, 36-37, and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thurlow et al. (US 5,917,489). 2. Claims 16-18, 20-28, 30-32, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Geiger et al. (US 6,073,142).	1.Claim under 3 as being over Th Claims rejected 103(a) a unpater Thurlow RFC 28 Transfe Claims rejected 103(a) a unpater Thurlow Geiger ( 19 and 1 under 3 as being

									over Ge
80	US20060069667A1	3/30/2006	9/30/2004	1/21/2009	N/FR	101 and 103 rejections	Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	of RFC Claims 1-10,12 &28-29 under 3 as being over Dw Pub No A1), her to as Dv Rothwe Patent 1 81), her to as Ro
81	US20060069631A1	3/30/2006	9/21/2005	1/6/2009	FR	101, 102, 103 and 112 rejections	Claims 14 - 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1, 7, 8,11 -14,17,20,21 and 25 are rejected under35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by O?Brien et al (USPub. No. 2003/0144950).	Claims : under 3 as being over 0? Rudmar No. 200
82	US20060068783A1	3/30/2006	3/15/2005	11/6/2008	N/FR	101 and 112 rejections	Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	Claims 1,8-9,14 29 are r U.S.C. unpater Hyvarin 2002/00 view of 2003/01
83	US20060067591A1	3/30/2006	9/26/2005	1/29/2009	N/FR	101 and 102 rejections	Claims 1-10 and 22-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-2, 9-12, 19-23, and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wang et al (US Patent No 6,915,025).	N/A
84	US20060067587A1	3/30/2006	9/26/2005	12/22/2008	N/FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 13-15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention.	Claims 4-5,13-14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hoshi (US Patent No.: 7,379,624).	Claims under 3 as being over Ho No.: 7,3
85	US20060067503A1	3/30/2006	6/7/2005	11/13/2008	N/FR	101 and 103 rejections	Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because The claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 39 includes computer - readable medium, but in specification, computer readable medium is described as electrical signal, e.g., in [0011].	N/A	Claim 1 21-22, 2 39 are r U.S.C unpater (2005/0 of West
86	US20060067343A1	3/30/2006	9/28/2005	12/3/2008	N/FR	101, 102 and 103	Claim 26 is rejected under	Claims 1-6, 8, 9,11,12, , 16-21,26, and 27 are rejected under 35	Claims 22-25 a

						rejections	35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takeuchi, U.S. Pub. No. 20020105946 A1.	35 U.S. being ur Takeuch claims 1-6,8,9, and 27 a further i et al (Er No. 200
87	US20050074169A1	4/7/2005	11/23/2004	1/6/2009	N/FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	1. Claims 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.c. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter as follows. Claims 8-14 recite a computer program product embodying functional descriptive material (i.e., a computer program or computer executable code). 2. Claims 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.c. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter as follows. Claims 15-20 define a "system". However, while the preamble defines a "system", which would typically be indicative of an "apparatus", the body of the claim lacks definite structure indicative of a physical apparatus.	Claims 1-3, 7-11, and 13-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Su et al (US 6,519,363).	1. Claim under 3 as being over Su 6,519,3 Claim 1 view of Claims : rejecteo 103(a) a unpater al (US 6 applied 19, resp further i et al (US
88	US20050076132A1	4/7/2005	3/11/2004	4/2/2009	FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-9 and 11-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Blinn et al. (US 5897622).	Claim 9 35 U.S. being u Blinn in Gershm 640108
89	US20050075975A1	4/7/2005	10/2/2003	11/18/2008	N/FR	101, 103 and 112 rejections	Claims 1 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not directed to a secondary statutory subject matter/class.	N/A	Claims 21-25 a 35 U.S.1 being ui Allen-Re PG Pub 2002/01 [hereina Allen-Re Bissone Pat. No [hereina further i Notice.

90	US20050076005A1	4/7/2005	9/15/2003	1/9/2009	N/FR	101 and 103 rejections	Claims 1,3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.c. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	Claims and 19- under 3 as being over Ho Pat. No view of S. Pat. I
91	US20050076241A1	4/7/2005	12/29/2003	3/18/2009	N/FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 37-39 and 80-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-57,60-77 and 80-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ryan et ai, (Ryan) US Patent Application Pub. No. 2004/0215793.	Claims are reje U.S.C. unpater et al.(Ry Applicat 2004/02 Roskinc Applicat 2003/00
92	US20050080704A1	4/14/2005	10/7/2004	11/25/2008	N/FR	101, 103 and 112 rejections	Claim 1, 34 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	N/A	Claim 1 and 70 under 3 as being over.
93	US20050081193A1	4/14/2005	10/18/2004	2/19/2009	FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 23-25 and 27 are rejected under 35 US.c. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kawachi et al. (US. Patent Number 6,690,981).	1. Claim 28-35 a 35 US.c unpater McInerr Patent N 5,325,55 Conner Patent N 5,428,7 is reject U.S.C. unpater Kawach Patent N 6,690,9 McInerr Patent N 5,325,5
94	US20050081208A1	4/14/2005	9/27/2004	1/30/2009	N/FR	101 and 103 rejections	Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to nonstatutory subject matter.	N/A	Claim 1,6,10,1 28 are r U.S.C. unpater et al. (JI in view Ap Configu Schedu based c Image

									Technol 2003).
95	US20050078748A1	4/14/2005	10/19/2004	1/29/2009	N/FR	101 and 103 rejections	Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four categories of inventions.	N/A	Claims under 3 as being over Ha (US Pat in view al. (US 5,60258
96	US20050078671A1	4/14/2005	7/14/2004	1/23/2009	N/FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Computer programs are non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1,2,4, 6, 7, 38-48, 50, 51,53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Laksono (US 2003/0156218).	Claims under 3 as being over La 2003/01 of Mats 093390
97	US20070094414A1	4/26/2007	10/20/2005	3/4/2009	N/FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 16-20 and 36-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-6, 8-9, 11-26, 28-29, 31-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Guest (U.S. Application No. 2006/0200522 A1).	Claims rejected 103(a) a unpater (U.S. Ag 2006/02 view of (U.S. Pa 6,718,5
98	US20080109349A1	5/8/2008	11/8/2006	1/8/2009	FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 16-23,24,26,28, and 29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 16-18, 20-22, 24, 26, 28-30, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tengel et al. (hereinafter "Tengel"); (US 5,940,812).	Claims under 3 as being over Te Freema (hereina (US 200
99	US20050078699A1	4/14/2005	10/10/2003	1/22/2009	N/FR	101, 103 and 112 rejections	Claims 25-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.c. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter since it fails to be limited to embodiments which fall within a statutory category.	N/A	Claims are reje U.S.C. unpater et al. (U Publicat 200700 of Liva e Patent F 200201
100	US20050078751A1	4/14/2005	7/29/2003	3/3/2009	FR	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.c. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1 and 3-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.c. 102(b) as being anticipated by lung (US 5,825,423) as set forth in the previous Office Action, dated 07/18/08.	Claims and 21- under 3 as being over Kir as set fo previous dated 0