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.
11/637,726	12/13/2006	Yukio Kumazawa	130610	1762
25944 OLIFF & BERI	7590 11/30/200 RIDGE, PLC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3208	350	COLAN, GIOVANNA B		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2162	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/30/2009	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.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
11/637,726	KUMAZAWA ET AL.		
F	A (11 14		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	GIOVANNA COLAN	2162	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 November 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following r application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidav al (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	Iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH	ng date of the final rejection E FIRST REPLY WAS FII	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrumer 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropria	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the complexity. 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	isideration and/or search (see NO v);	TE below);	
appeal; and/or	er form for appear by materially re	ducing of simplifying the	10 133003 101
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	·		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allength. non-allowable claim(s). 	•	•	-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ill be entered and an e	∢planation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-18,20 and 21</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>19</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	before or on the data of filing a N	ation of Annual will not	be entered
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	ı of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/John Breene/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2162	/G. C./ Examiner, Art Unit 2162	2	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 1. Applicant argues that the applied art fails to disclose; "the securable memory has a higher access speed than the external storage apparatus."

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Duluk does disclose: securable memory has a higher access speed than the external storage apparatus ([0815], [1139], [0799], Duluk), wherein the securable memory has higher access speed then the external storage apparatus ([0817], "...a) one or more data processing units ("CPUs") 102; (b) memory 106a, 106b and 106c, such as fast primary memory 106a, cache memory 106b, and slower secondary memory 106c, for mass storage..., "and [1068], Duluk).

- 2. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "when the certain image data will not fit into memory without overflowing the memory's...") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
- 3. Applicant argues that; "Duluk fails to teach or suggest that when release of the memory (by a first buffer module) is detected, the storage resource management unit writes data written in the storage region of the external storage apparatus, and allocates the memory in which the data is written in place of the storage region of the external storage apparatus in which the data had been written, to the second buffer module".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Duluk does disclose the claim limitation: wherein the allocating further comprises monitoring release of the memory by a first buffer module which has been allocated with the memory as the storage resource and, when release of the memory is detected, writing the data written in the storage region of the external storage apparatus which has been already allocated to a second buffer module as the storage resource in the released memory, and allocating the memory in which the data is written in place of the storage region of the external storage apparatus in which the data had been written, to the second buffer module to which the storage region of the external storage apparatus had been already allocated as the storage resource ([0815], [1139], [0715], and [0799], Duluk).