Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.
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 MONTH(S) 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 the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- 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 25 January 2005.
2a)☐ This action is FINAL. 2b)☑ This action is non-final.
3)☐ 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

4)☑ Claim(s) 18-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) ______ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) ______ is/are allowed.
6)☑ Claim(s) 18-21 is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) ______ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) ______ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ 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).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

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).
   a)☐ All  b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
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)  
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date: ______.
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)  
   5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
   6)☐ Other: ______.
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/05.
DETACHED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. 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 negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eipper, 6546602 in view of Anderson, 6257133.

Regarding claims 1-4, Eipper discloses

- a support (11, 21) formed from plastic fabric material, i.e. a woven polyamide fiber (col. 4, lines 42-50)
- a plurality of j-shaped hook elements (22) and loop elements (12)
- a magnetostrictive polymeric material (column 3, lines 15-32) adapted to change a directional orientation of the head elements of the second hook elements upon receipt of a magnetic signal (column, 2, lines 20-23, figures 2, (first position) and figure 3 (second position)
- an activation device (not shown in the drawings) is inherently disclosed in the reference, i.e., some sort of device for creating and applying a magnetic field must be used to cause the hook elements to deform

Eipper fails to disclose hook elements made from a magnetorheological elastomer. Eipper changes the orientation of the hook elements to vary the peel-off force required to separate the fastener.
Anderson discloses the use of a magnetorheological elastomer on the surface of a nip roll. Anderson discloses that the modulus of elasticity is changed by applying a magnetic field to the magnetorheological elastomer to vary the stiffness of the material, i.e., the surface of the roll can be made hard or soft to vary the nip pressure between the rolls. Anderson discloses varying the modulus of elasticity of the roll material to vary the amount of force required to deform the material.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have used a magnetorheological elastomer in place of Eipper's magnetostrictive polymeric material as an alternative design choice, since both materials would perform the same function of varying the amount of force required to deform the hooks upon separation of the fastener equally as well as the other. Eipper does this by changing the shape of the hook to make it easier or harder to remove the loop part of the fastener from the hooks. Anderson's magnetorheological elastomer would vary the peel-off force required to separate the hooks from the loops by increasing or decreasing the stiffness of the hooks, i.e., the stiffer hook would require a large peel-off force.

**Double Patenting**

3. Claims 18-21 of this application conflict with claim 7 of Application No. 10305376. 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. Applicant is required to either cancel the
conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822.

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 666 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, In re Thorton, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 18-21 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 6742227. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the scope of claims 18-21 encompass the scope of claims 1-10 in the patent, i.e., claims 18-21 are broader than claims 1-10 and if patented would extend the monopoly rights of the already issued patent.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jack W. Lavinder whose telephone number is 703-308-3421. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday, 9-4:00pm.
If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Swann can be reached on 703-306-4115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

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).

Jack W Lavinder
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3677
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