



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

Table with 5 columns: APPLICATION NO., FILING DATE, FIRST NAMED INVENTOR, ATTORNEY DOCKET NO., CONFIRMATION NO. Includes details for application 90/015,984, inventor EDELL, SHAPIRO & FINNAN, LLC, and examiner CHOI, WOO H.

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

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

DO NOT USE IN PALM PRINTER

(THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS)

WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02210-2206

***EX PARTE* REEXAMINATION COMMUNICATION TRANSMITTAL FORM**

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NO. 90/015,984 .

PATENT UNDER REEXAMINATION 8810458 .

ART UNIT 3990 .

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 requester, 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)).

Order Denying Request For Ex Parte Reexamination	Control No. 90/015,984	Patent Under Reexamination 8810458	
	Examiner Woo Choi	Art Unit 3990	AIA (FITF) Status No

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

The request for *ex parte* reexamination filed 02/23/2026 has been considered and a determination has been made. An identification of the claims, the references relied upon, and the rationale supporting the determination are attached.

Attachments: a) PTO-892, b) PTO/SB/08, c) Other: _____

The request for *ex parte* reexamination is DENIED.

This decision is not appealable (35 U.S.C. 303(c)). Requester may seek review by petition to the Commissioner under 37 CFR 1.181 ~~within ONE MONTH from the mailing date of this communication (37 CFR 1.515(e)).~~ **EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE SUCH A PETITION UNDER 37 CFR 1.181 ARE AVAILABLE ONLY BY PETITION TO SUSPEND OR WAIVE THE REGULATIONS UNDER 37 CFR 1.183.**

In due course, a refund under 37 CFR 1.26 (c) will be made to requester:

- a) by Treasury check or,
- b) by credit to Deposit Account No. 23/2825 , or
- c) by credit to a credit card account, unless otherwise notified (35 U.S.C.303(c)).

--	--	--

cc: Requester (if third party requester)

DECISION DENYING EX PARTE REEXAMINATION

Procedural History

Inter Partes Review IPR2025-00929

The current Requester previously challenged claims 1–10 and 12–19 of U.S. Patent No. 8,810,458 in a petition for *inter partes* review in IPR2025-00929. The petition included the following proposed grounds which are material for the 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) analysis:

1. Claims 1–9, 12, and 13 as obvious over Wong and Lee
2. Claims 14, 15, and 17–19 as obvious over Wong
3. Claims 1–10, 12, and 13 as obvious over Gaucher
4. Claims 14–18 as obvious over Zhao.

The petition was denied.

The Current Ex Parte Reexamination 90/015,984

The current Requester subsequently challenged claims 1–19 of the '458 patent in a request for reexamination. The request included the following proposed grounds which are material for the 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) analysis:

1. Claims 1–9, 12, and 13 as obvious over Wong and Lee
2. Claims 14, 15, and 17–19 as obvious over Wong
3. Claims 1–10, 12, and 13 as obvious over Gaucher
4. Claims 14–18 as obvious over Zhao.

Determination

Requester is the same challenger as in the prior *inter partes* review (IPR2025-00929). The current Request includes at least some of the same or substantially the same prior art or arguments previously presented to the Office.

After considering the record, and in view of all relevant considerations, the request for reexamination is denied under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).

/Woo Choi/
Patent Reexamination Specialist
Art Unit 3992

Conferee:

/Hetul Patel/
Supervisory Patent Reexamination Specialist
Art Unit 3992