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.
13/957,932	08/02/2013	Vincent C. Lombardi	40000377-0036	3328

26263 7590 05/15/2015

DENTONS US LLP
P.O. BOX 061080
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER	
SHAFER, SHULAMITH H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1647	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/15/2015	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.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 13/957,932	Applicant(s) LOMBARDI ET AL.	
	Examiner SHULAMITH H. SHAFER	Art Unit 1647	AIA (First Inventor to File) Status No

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

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 2 MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

☐ A declaration(s)/affidavit(s) under **37 CFR 1.130(b)** was/were filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.

4)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance 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.

Disposition of Claims*

5)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

9)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

* If any claims have been determined allowable, you may be eligible to benefit from the **Patent Prosecution Highway** program at a participating intellectual property office for the corresponding application. For more information, please see http://www.uspto.gov/patents/init_events/pph/index.jsp or send an inquiry to PPHfeedback@uspto.gov.

Application Papers

10)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

11)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

Certified copies:

a)☐ All b)☐ Some** c)☐ None of the:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

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

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08a and/or PTO/SB/08b) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

3) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

4) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The present application is being examined under the pre-AIA first to invent provisions.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1, in part, 3, 4 in part, 5, 6-9, in part, 11-14, in part, drawn to a method of diagnosing a neuroimmune disease, the method comprising comparing a cytokine expression signature of a subject with a control, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.

II. Claims 1, in part, 2, 4, in part, 6-9, in part, 10, 11-14, in part, drawn to a method of diagnosing a retroviral infection, the method comprising comparing a cytokine expression signature of a subject with a control, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.

III. Claims 15 and 16, drawn to a device for detecting a cytokine expression signature, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1, for example.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed are directed to methods that are distinct both physically and functionally, and are not required one for the other. Inventions I and II are both drawn to diagnostic methods. However, Group I is drawn to diagnosis of a neuroimmune disease, wherein Group II is drawn to diagnosis of a retroviral infection. Thus, a search and examination of both methods in one patent application would result in an undue

burden, since the searches for the methods are not co-extensive. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Inventions III and I/II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, these conditions may be diagnosed by conventional methods, i.e. neuroimmune diseases may be diagnosed by assessing clinical symptoms and retroviral infections may be diagnosed by detecting viral genes.

Further Restriction Requirement Within Groups I-III

Inventions I-III are drawn to methods which require determining the expression of at least three cytokines to diagnose a neuroimmune or retroviral disease and a device for determining such expression. The claims are directed to numerous distinct methods recited in the alternative. The language “at least three cytokines” requires that three or any number more up to the 10 recited cytokines are detected within a subject. For example, a method requiring detection of IL-8, IL-13, and TNF-alpha is distinct from a method requiring detection of MCP-1, IL-7 and GM-CSF because the methods have a different mode of operation, do not overlap in scope, and they are not obvious variants of one another (see MPEP 806.05(j)).

The claims further encompass many subcombinations which are disclosed as usable together in a single combination and which are also separately usable. For example, consider the following combinations of a cytokine expression signature comprising “at least three” cytokines selected from those disclosed IL-8, IL-13, MIP- 1 β, TNF-α, MCP-1, IL-7, IFN- α, IL-6, MIP-Iα, and GM-CSF;

Subcombination (A): the expression signature comprising IL-8, IL-13, and TNF-alpha

Subcombination (B): the expression signature comprising MCP-1, IL-7 and GM-CSF

Combination (A+B): the expression signature comprising IL-8, IL-13, TNF-alpha, MCP-1, IL-7 and GM-CSF

Each of the combinations of cells comprising recited cytokines are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In this case subcombinations (A) and (B) do not overlap in scope and there is no evidence on the record to suggest that they are obvious variants of one another. The subcombinations are separately usable as evidenced by their presentation in the alternative within the claims. Further, subcombination "A" has separate utility such as detecting the cytokines, as markers for example. So, subcombinations (A) and (B) are distinct. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

These subcombinations are also distinct from the combination which comprises them because the combination does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed to show novelty or unobviousness and the subcombinations have utility by themselves or in another combination. The fact that the claim encompasses an embodiment which relies on only subcombination (B) is evidence that the details of subcombination (A) are not required for patentability of the combination (A+B), and likewise, the fact that the claim encompasses an embodiment which relies on only subcombination (A) is evidence that the details of subcombination (B) are not required for patentability of subcombination (A+B). The fact that the claim encompasses embodiments which use only subcombination (A) or subcombination (B) is evidence that the subcombinations have utility by themselves.

This example particularly discusses only the combinations (A), (B) and (A+B), but the same analysis could be applied to each of the different subcombinations and combinations set forth in the instant claims.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Each cytokine must be searched by a separate query of the electronic databases. See MPEP 808.02(C). Therefore, a search for methods/devices which use a cytokine expression signature comprising each cytokine or each combination of cytokines is not co-extensive with methods/devices which use cytokine expression signatures comprising each other cytokine or each other combination of cytokines, and subsequently, the search and examination for expression signatures comprising every cytokine and every combination of cytokines poses an enormous and serious burden on the examiner.

Applicant is required to select a single invention, ie, a cytokine expression signature comprising a single combination of "at least three cytokines", specifically identified as required for the claimed method/device. The invention may be a method/device utilizing an expression signature comprising a three cytokines, or a combination of more than three cytokines but less than all of the disclosed cytokines or a combination of all possible claimed cytokines. However, an election of a single invention, ie, a single combination of cytokines is required. This restriction requirement is predicated on the fact that the methods/device which use different cytokines or different combinations of cytokines do not appear obvious over one another. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the different cytokines or different combinations of cytokines are not patentably distinct over each other, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants over each other or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other inventions.

Applicant is also required to identify which claims read upon the elected invention.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

(a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;

(b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;

(c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);

(d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;

(e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) **and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention**.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Species Election

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: neuroimmune diseases:

1.chronic fatigue syndrome,

2. fibromyalgia,

3. myalgic encephalitis,

4. atypical multiple sclerosis,

5. non-epileptic seizures,

6. Gulf War Syndrome and

7. autism.

The species are independent or distinct because each condition comprises a disease of unique and distinct etiology, progression and prognosis. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

If Invention I is elected, Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, or a single grouping of patentably indistinct species, for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, Claim 1 is generic.

There is a search and/or examination burden for the patentably distinct species as set forth above because at least the following reason(s) apply: each condition comprises a disease of unique and distinct etiology, progression and prognosis. A search for a method of diagnosis of fibromyalgia, for example, would not reveal art reading on diagnosis of autism, for example.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) **and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species or grouping of patentably indistinct species**, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species or grouping of patentably indistinct species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species, or groupings of patentably indistinct species from which election is required, are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing them to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 or pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a

continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

The examiner has required restriction between product or apparatus claims and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product/apparatus, and all product/apparatus claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that include all the limitations of the allowable product/apparatus claims should be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must include all the limitations of an allowable product/apparatus claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product/apparatus claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product/apparatus are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product/apparatus claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product/apparatus claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04. Additionally, in order for rejoinder to occur, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product/apparatus claims. **Failure to do so may result in no rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHULAMITH H. SHAFER whose telephone number is

(571)272-3332. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joanne Hama can be reached on 571-272-2911. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published 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 on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SHULAMITH H. SHAFER
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1647

/SHULAMITH H. SHAFER/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1647