



# 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.
11/853,501	09/11/2007	Adnan A. Hamid	AAH0005US	3142
33031 7590 09/04/2009 CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP 11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE BLDG. H, SUITE 250 AUSTIN, TX 78758			EXAMINER MEMULA, SURESH	
			ART UNIT 2825	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/04/2009	DELIVERY MODE 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.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 11/853,501	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HAMID ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> SURESH MEMULA	<b>Art Unit</b> 2825	

-- 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 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, 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 26 May 2009.
- 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) 1-23 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- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.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) 1-23 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 11 September 2007 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) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

This FINAL office action is a response to the amendments and remarks received on 05/26/2009. Applicant's remarks and amendments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Therefore, the §102(e) rejections under Koyfman are maintained. Claims 1-23 are pending.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. **Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)** as being anticipated by US Pub. No. 2005/0278702 to Koyfman et al. (Hereinafter: Koyfman).

3. As to claim 1 and similarly recited claims 8, 15, and 22,  
generating, by a processor coupled to a test bench configured to execute a test plan on a design under test (§7; Fig. 1), a first test case for the DUT (§15), said generating the first test case (§27) comprising

traversing a first path through a hierarchy of goals (§51, 54. Koyfman's DAG is a case analysis graph comprising a hierarchy of nodes, i.e., goals. Applicant further limits a hierarchy of goals to be comprised by a case analysis graphs, see claims 4, 11, 18) from a start goal (e.g., FIG. 2: element "STATE 1") to an end goal (e.g., FIG. 2: element "STATE 2"),

wherein a first parent goal traversed (§54) in a first level of the hierarchy of goals (e.g., FIG. 2 has two levels with "STATE 1" being in a first level.) comprises a first definition of one or more of a slot (§51, 59, i.e., condition values such as 0 or 1) and a method (§51, 59, e.g., attribute, edge, or address), and

assuming the first definition of the slot or the method (§46, 59) by a child goal (e.g., FIG. 2: element "STATE 2") in a second level of the hierarchy of goals (§59), if the child goal requires the slot or the method (§46, 59).

4. As to claim 2 and similarly recited claims 9, 16 and 23, generating a second test case for the DUT (§43, 78), said generating the second test case (§78, 83) comprising traversing a second path through the hierarchy of goals from the start goal to a second end goal (§54, 59, 78), wherein a second parent goal traversed in the first level of the hierarchy of goals comprises a second definition of one or more of the slot and the method (§51, 59, 78), and assuming the second definition of the slot or the method by the child goal in the second level of the hierarchy of goals if the child goal requires the slot or the method (§59, 78).

5. As to claim 3 and similarly recited claims 10 and 17, wherein the second level of the hierarchy is below the first level of the hierarchy in the hierarchy (§51, 59).

6. As to claim 4 and similarly recited claims 11 and 18, wherein a case analysis graph comprises the hierarchy of goals (§51, 54).

7. As to claim 5 and similarly recited claims 12 and 19, linking the first parent goal to a plurality of goals in a next lower level of the hierarchy (§46, 59) wherein the first parent goal is configured to select one goal of the plurality of goals in the next lower level as the next goal to traverse in said traversing (§59).

8. As to claim 6 and similarly recited claims 13 and 20, linking the first parent goal (§46, 59) to a plurality of goals in a next lower level of the hierarchy of goals (FIG. 3-5), wherein the first parent goal is configured to select each goal of the plurality of goals in the next lower level in a defined order as the next goal to traverse in said traversing (§54, 59-60).

9. As to claim 7 and similarly recited claims 14 and 21, assembling all slots and methods associated with the goals traversed along the first path in the hierarchy of goals (§24, 54, 59).

### ***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant states: "The cited sections of Koyfman fail to establish that 'State 2' assumes a definition of a slot or method, as claimed (Remarks: Page 12, ¶1)."

Examiner's response:

11. Koyfman's attributes, edges, and addresses are each functions set by the upstream state (§59; i.e., node). Applicant's recited methods are, in view of the instant specification at §53, functions. Therefore, it is maintained that Koyfman's attributes, edges, or addresses are anticipatory of Applicant's method(s). Furthermore, Koyfman teaches that depending upon which edge is transitioned a corresponding function is inherited from the upstream state (§59).

***Conclusion***

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

13. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Suresh Memula whose telephone number is (571) 272-8046, and any inquiry for a formal Applicant initiated interview must be requested via a PTOL-413A form and faxed to the Examiner's personal fax phone number: (571) 273-8046. Furthermore, Applicant is invited to contact the Examiner via email (suresh.memula@uspto.gov) on the condition the communication is pursuant to and in accordance with MPEP §502.03 and §713.01. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday 8am-6:30pm EST. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Jack Chiang can be reached on (571) 272-7483. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (i.e., central fax phone number) is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2825

15. 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).

/Suresh Memula/

Art Unit 2825  
September 4, 2009

/Vuthe Siek/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2825