

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Application Number : 90/006,492 and Confirmation No.: 9466  
90/006,679  
Applicant : Campana, Jr. et al.  
Filed : December 26, 2002  
Title : SYSTEM FOR TRANSFERRING INFORMATION FROM A RF  
RECEIVER TO A PROCESSOR UNDER CONTROL OF A  
PROGRAM STORED BY THE PROCESSOR AND METHOD OF  
OPERATION THEREOF  
TC/Art Unit : 2682  
Examiner: : Charles R. Craver  
Docket No. : 49671.000006

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE**

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated March 21, 2005 (the period of time for response has been extended one-month to June 21, 2005), Patent Owner remarks as follows:

**IN THE CLAIMS:**

A listing of the status of all claims 1-185 in the present patent application is provided below:

1. (Original Patent Claim) A system for transmitting originated information from one of a plurality of originating processors contained in an electronic mail system to at least one RF receiver with the originated information originating from one of the plurality of originating processors and being transmitted by an RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver and for transmitting other originated information originating from one of the originating processors with the electronic mail system without using the RF information transmission network to at least one of a plurality of destination processors comprising:

at least one interface, one of the at least one interface connecting the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors to the RF information transmission network; and wherein

the originated information is transmitted in association with an address of the one interface from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface with the electronic mail system responding to the address of the one interface to direct the originated information from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface; and

the originated information is transmitted from the one of the at least one interface to the RF information transmission network with an address of the at least one RF receiver to receive the originated information being associated with the originated information before transmission of the originated information to the at least one RF receiver.

2. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 1 wherein:

a processor is coupled to one of the at least one RF receiver and receives the originated information.

3. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 1 wherein:

the one interface stores the originated information, assembles the originated information with originated information received from a plurality of the originating processors into a packet and transmits the packet to the RF transmission network.

4. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 1 wherein:

the other originated information is transmitted between the one of the plurality of originating processors and the at least one of the plurality of destination processors using a different address than the address used during transmission of the originated information to the at least one RF receiver by the RF information transmission network.

5. (Original Patent Claim) A method for transmitting originated information from one of a plurality of originating processors contained in an electronic mail system to at least one RF receiver with the originated information originating from one of the plurality of originating processors and being transmitted by an RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver and for transmitting other originated information originating from one of the originating processors with the electronic mail system without using the RF information transmission network to at least one of a plurality of destination processors comprising:

connecting the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors to the RF information transmission network with one of at least one interface;

transmitting the originated information in association with an address of the one interface from one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface with the electronic mail

system responding to the address of the one interface to direct the originated information from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface; and

transmitting the originated information from the one of the at least one interface to the RF information transmission network with an address of the at least one RF receiver to receive the originated information being associated with the originated information before transmission of the originated information to the at least one RF receiver.

6. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 5 further comprising: one of the at least one RF receiver transmits the originated information to a processor.

7. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 5 further comprising: storing the originated information, assembling the originated information with originated information received from a plurality of the originating processors into a packet and transmitting the packet to the RF transmission network.

8. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 5 wherein: the other originated information is transmitted between the one of the plurality of originating processors and the at least one of the plurality of destination processors using a different address than the address used during transmission of the originated information to the at least one RF receiver by the RF information transmission network.

9. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 1 wherein: the system removes from the originated information information added by the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors and adds information, used by the RF information transmission network during transmission of the originated information through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver in the RF information



transmission network, to the originated information.

10. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 1 wherein:

the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and

the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information including an identification number of the at least one RF receiver from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information and the identification number is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information and the identification number to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

11. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 8 wherein:

the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and

the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information including an identification number of the at least one RF receiver from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information and the identification number is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information and the identification number to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

12. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 3 wherein:

the system removes from the originated information information added by the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors and adds information, used by the RF information transmission network during transmission of the originated information through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network, to the originated information.

13. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 3 wherein:

the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and

the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information including an identification number of the at least one RF receiver from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information and the identification number is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information and the identification number to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

14. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 12 wherein:

the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and

the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information including an identification number of the at least one RF receiver from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information and the

identification number is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information and the identification number to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

15. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 4 wherein:  
the system removes from the originated information information added by the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors and adds information, used by the RF information transmission network during transmission of the originated information through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network, to the originated information.

16. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 4 wherein:  
the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and  
the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information including an identification number of the at least one RF receiver from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information and the identification number is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information and the identification number to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

17. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 15 wherein:  
the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and

the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information including an identification number of the at least one RF receiver from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information and the identification number is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information and the identification number to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

18. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 5 further comprising: removing from the originated information information added by the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors and adding information, used by the RF information transmission network during transmission of the originated information through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network, to the originated information.

19. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 5 wherein:  
the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and

the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information including an identification number of the at least one RF receiver from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information and the identification number is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information and the identification number to the at least one RF receiver

by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

20. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 18 wherein:  
the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and  
the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information including an identification number of the at least one RF receiver from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information and the identification number is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information and the identification number to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

21. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 7 further comprising:  
removing from the originated information information added by the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors and adding information, used by the RF information transmission network during transmission of the originated information through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network, to the originated information.

22. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 7 wherein:  
the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and  
the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information including an identification number of the at least one RF receiver from the RF information transmission

network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information and the identification number is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information and the identification number to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

23. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 21 wherein:  
the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and  
the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information including an identification number of the at least one RF receiver from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the Rf information transmission network to which the originated information and the identification number is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information and the identification number to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

24. (Original Patent Claim) A system for transmitting originated information from one of a plurality of originating processors, contained in any one of a plurality of electronic mail systems, to at least one RF receiver with the originated information originating from one of the plurality of originating processors and being transmitted by an RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver and for transmitting other originated information originating from one of the originating processors with one of the plurality of electronic mail systems without using the RF information transmission network to at least one of a plurality of

destination processors comprising:

at least one interface, one of the at least one interface connecting at least one of the plurality of electronic mail systems containing the plurality of originating processors to the RF information transmission network; and wherein

the originated information is transmitted in association with an address of the one interface from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface with one of the plurality of electronic mail systems responding to the address of the one interface to direct the originated information from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface; and

the originated information is transmitted from the one of the at least one interface to the RF information transmission network with an address of the at least one RF receiver to receive the originated information being associated with the originated information before transmission of the originated information to the at least one RF receiver.

25. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 24 wherein:

a processor is coupled to one of the at least one RF receiver and receives the originated information.

26. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 24 wherein:

the one interface stores the originated information, assembles the originated information with originated information received from a plurality of the originating processors into a packet and transmits the packet to the RF transmission network.

27. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 24 wherein:

the other originated information is transmitting between the one of the plurality of

originating processors and the at least one of the plurality of destination processors using a different address than the address used during transmission of the originated information to the at least one RF receiver by the RF information transmission network.

28. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 26 wherein:

the system removes from the originated information information added by the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors and adds information, used by the RF information transmission network during transmission of the originated information through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network, to the originated information.

29. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 26 wherein:

the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and

the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information including an identification number of the at least one RF receiver from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information and the identification number is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information and the identification number to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

30. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 28 wherein:

the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and



the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information including an identification number of the at least one RF receiver from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information and the identification number is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information and the identification number to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

31. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 27 wherein:

the system removes from the originated information information added by the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors and adds information, used by the RF information transmission network during transmission of the originated information through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network, to the originated information.

32. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 27 wherein:

the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and

the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information including an identification number of the at least one RF receiver from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information and the identification number is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information and the identification number to the at least one RF receiver

by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

33. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 31 wherein:

the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and

the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information including an identification number of the at least one RF receiver from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information and the identification number is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information and the identification number to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

34. (Original Patent Claim) A method for transmitting originated information from one of a plurality of originating processors, contained in any one of a plurality of electronic mail systems, to at least one RF receiver with the originated information originating from one of the plurality of originating processors and being transmitted by an RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver and for transmitting other originated information originating from one of the originating processors with one of the plurality of electronic mail systems without using the RF information transmission network to at least one of a plurality of destination processors comprising:

connecting at least one of the plurality of electronic mail systems containing the plurality of originating processors to the RF information transmission network with at least one interface;  
transmitting the originated information in association with an address of the one interface

from one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface with one of the plurality of electronic mail system responding to the address of the one interface to direct the originated information from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface; and

transmitting the originated information from one of the at least one interface to the RF information transmission network with an address of the at least one RF receiver to receive the originated information being associated with the originated information before transmission of the originated information to the at least one RF receiver.

35. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 34 further comprising:

one of the at least one RF receiver transmits the originated information to a processor.

36. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 34 wherein:  
the one interface stores the originated information, assembles the originated information with originated information received from a plurality of the originating processors into a packet and transmits the packet to the RF transmission network.

37. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 34 wherein:  
the other originated information is transmitted between the one of the plurality of originating processors and the at least one of the plurality of destination processors using a different address than the address used during transmission of the originated information to the at least one RF receiver by the RF information transmission network.

38. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 34 further comprising:

removing from the originated information information added by the one of the plurality

of electronic mail systems containing the one of the plurality of originating processors and adding information, used by the RF information transmission network during transmission of the originated information through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network, to the originated information.

39. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 34 wherein:  
the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and  
the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information including an identification number of the at least one RF receiver from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information and the identification number is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information and the identification number to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

40. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 38 wherein:  
the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and  
the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information including an identification number of the at least one RF receiver from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information and the identification number is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and

transmits the originated information and the identification number to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

41. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 36 further comprising:

removing from the originated information information added by the one of the plurality of electronic mail systems containing the one of the plurality of originating processors and adding information, used by the RF information transmission network during transmission of the originated information through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network, to the originated information.

42. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 36 wherein:  
the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and

the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information including an identification number of the at least one RF receiver from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information and the identification number is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information and the identification number to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

43. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 41 wherein:  
the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and

the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information including an identification number of the at least one RF receiver from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information and the identification number is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information and the identification number to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

44. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 37 further comprising:

removing from the originated information information added by the one of the plurality of electronic mail systems containing the one of the plurality of originating processors and adding information, used by the RF information transmission network during transmission of the originated information through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network, to the originated information.

45. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 37 wherein:

the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and

the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information including an identification number of the at least one RF receiver from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information and the identification number is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and

transmits the originated information and the identification number to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

46. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 44 wherein:  
the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and  
the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information including an identification number of the at least one RF receiver from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information and the identification number is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information and the identification number to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

47. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 24 further comprising:  
a plurality of RF information transmission networks with each RF information transmission network being connected to at least one of the at least one interface with the originated information being transmitted to the at least one RF receiver by one of the plurality of RF information transmission networks through the one of the at least one interface.

48. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 34 further comprising:

a plurality of RF information transmission networks with each RF information transmission network being connected to at least one of the at least one interface with the

originated information being transmitted to the at least one RF receiver by one of the plurality of RF information transmission networks through the one of the at least one interface.

49. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 1 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

50. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 3 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

51. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 4 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

52. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 5 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

53. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 7 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

54. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 8 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

55. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 9 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted



by the RF information transmission network.

56. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 10 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

57. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 11 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

58. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 12 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

59. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 13 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

60. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 14 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

61. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 15 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

62. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 16 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

63. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 17 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

64. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 18 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

65. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 19 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

66. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 20 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

67. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 21 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

68. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 22 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

69. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 23 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

70. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 24 wherein:

information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted by the RF information transmission network.

71. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 26 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted by the RF information transmission network.

72. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 27 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted by the RF information transmission network.

73. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 28 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted by the RF information transmission network.

74. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 29 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted by the RF information transmission network.

75. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 30 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted by the RF information transmission network.

76. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 31 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted by the RF information transmission network.

77. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 32 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted

by the RF information transmission network.

78. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 33 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

79. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 34 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

80. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 35 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

81. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 37 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

82. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 38 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

83. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 39 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

84. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 40 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.

85. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 41 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.
86. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 42 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.
87. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 43 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.
88. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 44 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.
89. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 45 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.
90. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 46 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.
91. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 47 wherein:  
information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted  
by the RF information transmission network.
92. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 48 wherein:

information is compared to determine if the originated information should be transmitted by the RF information transmission network.

93. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 5 wherein:  
the compared information is the address of the at least one RF receiver and permissible numbers.

94. (Original Patent Claim) method in accordance with claim 5 wherein:  
the address of the at least one RF receiver added to the originated information before transmission of the originated information by the RF transmission network to the at least one RF receiver is added in response to information inputted at the originating processor.

95. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 44 wherein:  
the information inputted at the originating processor is processed to identify the address of the at least one receiver.

96. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 7 wherein:  
the address of the at least one RF receiver added to the originated information before transmission of the originated information by the RF transmission network to the at least one RF receiver is added in response to information inputted at the originating processor.

97. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 96 wherein:  
the information inputted at the originating processor is processed to identify the address of the at least one receiver.

98. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 5 wherein:  
the address of the at least one RF receiver added to the originated information before transmission of the originated information by the RF transmission network to the at least one RF

receiver is added in response to information inputted at the originating processor.

99. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 98 wherein:  
the information inputted at the originating processor is processed to identify the address  
of the at least one receiver.

100. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 9 wherein:  
the address of the at least one RF receiver added to the originated information before  
transmission of the originated information by the RF transmission network to the at least one RF  
receiver is added in response to information inputted at the originating processor.

101. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 100 wherein:  
the information inputted at the originating processor is processed to for identify the  
address of the at least one receiver.

102. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 10 wherein:  
the address of the at least one RF receiver added to the originated information before  
transmission of the originated information by the RF transmission network to the at least one RF  
receiver is added in response to information inputted at the originating processor.

103. (Original Patent Claim) method in accordance with claim 102 wherein:  
the information inputted at the originating processor is processed to identify the address  
of the at least one receiver.

104. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 11 wherein:  
the address of the at least one RF receiver added to the originated information before  
transmission of the originated information by the RF transmission network to the at least one RF  
receiver is added in response to information inputted at the originating processor.

105. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 104 wherein:  
the information inputted at the originating processor is processed to identify the address  
of the at least one receiver.

106. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 5 wherein:  
the address of the one interface is added to the originated information at the one  
originating processor.

107. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 7 wherein:  
the address of the one interface is added to the originated information at the one  
originating processor.

108. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 5 wherein:  
the address of the one interface is added to the originated information at the one  
originating processor.

109. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 18 wherein:  
the address of the one Interface is added to the originated information at the one  
originating processor.

110. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 19 wherein:  
the address of the one interface is added to the originated information at the one  
originating processor.

111. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 20 wherein:  
the address of the one interface is added to the originated information at the one  
originating processor.

112. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 52 wherein:



the address of the one interface is added to the originated information at the one originating processor.

113. (Original Patent Claim) method in accordance with claim 44 wherein:  
the address of the one interface is added to the originated information at the one originating processor.

114. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 45 wherein:  
the information inputted at the originating processor is processed to identify the address of the at least one receiver.

115. (Original Patent Claim) A system for transmitting originated information from one of a plurality of originating processors contained in an electronic mail system to at least one RF receiver with the originated information originating from one of the plurality of originating processors and being transmitted by a RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver and for transmitting other originated information originating from one of the plurality of originating processors with the electronic mail system without using the RF information transmission network to at least one of a plurality of destination processors comprising:

at least one interface, one of the at least one interface connecting the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors to the RF information transmission network; and wherein

the originated information is transmitted in association with an address of the one interface from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface with the electronic mail system responding to the address of the one interface to direct the originated

information from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface; and  
the RF information transmission system provides transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver in response to information inputted to the system.

116. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 115 wherein:  
a processor is coupled to one of the at least one RF receiver and receives the originated information.

117. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 115 wherein:  
the one interface stores the originated information, assembles the originated information with originated information received from a plurality of the originating processors into a packet and transmits the packet to the RF transmission network.

118. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 115 wherein:  
the other originated information is transmitted between the one of the plurality of originating processors and the at least one of the plurality of destination processors to a different address than an address to which the originated information is transmitted to the at least one RF receiver by the RF information transmission network.

119. (Original Patent Claim) A method for transmitting originated information from one of a plurality of originating processors contained in an electronic mail system to at least one RF receiver with the originated information originating from one of the plurality of originating processors and being transmitted by a RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver and for transmitting other originated information originating from one of the plurality of originating processors with the electronic mail system without using the RF

information transmission network to at least one of a plurality of destination processors comprising:

connecting the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors to the RF information transmission network with one of at least one interface;

transmitting the originated information in association with an address of the one interface from one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface with the electronic mail system responding to the address of the one interface to direct the originated information from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface; and

transmitting the originated information through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver in response to inputted information.

120. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 119 further comprising:

one of the at least one RF receiver transmits the originated information to a processor.

121. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 120 further comprising:

storing the originated information, assembling the originated information with originated information received from a plurality of the originating processors into a packet and transmitting the packet to the RF transmission network.

122. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 119 wherein:  
the other originated information is transmitted between the one of the plurality of originating processors and the at least one of the plurality of destination processors to a different address than an address to which the originated information is transmitted to the at least one RF

receiver by the RF information transmission network.

123. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 115 wherein:  
the system removes from the originated information information added by the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors.

124. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 115 wherein:  
the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and  
the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

125. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 123 wherein:  
the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and  
the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

126. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 117 wherein:  
the system removes from the originated information information added by the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors.

127. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 117 wherein:  
the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and  
the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

128. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 126 wherein:  
the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and  
the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

129. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 118 wherein:

the system removes from the originated information information added by the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors.

130. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 118 wherein:

the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and

the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

131. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 129 wherein:

the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and

the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

132. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 119 further comprising:

removing from the originated information information added by the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors.

133. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 119 wherein:  
the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and  
the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

134. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 132 wherein:  
the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and  
the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the Rf information transmission network to which the originated information is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

135. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 121 further comprising:

removing from the originated information information added by the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors.

136. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 121 wherein: the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and

the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

137. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 135 wherein: the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and

the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

138. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 122 further comprising:



removing from the originated information information added by the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors.

139. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 122 wherein: the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and

the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

140. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 138 wherein: the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and

the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

141. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 123 further comprising:

removing from the originated information information added by the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors.

142. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 123 wherein: the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and

the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

143. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 141 wherein: the RF information transmission network comprises a RF information transmission network switch which receives the originated information; and

the RF information transmission network transmits the originated information from the RF information transmission network switch to another RF transmission network switch at a destination of the at least one RF receiver in the RF information transmission network to which the originated information is to be transmitted by the RF information transmission network and transmits the originated information to the at least one RF receiver by RF broadcast to the at least one RF receiver.

144. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 115 further comprising:

a plurality of RF information transmission networks with each RF information transmission network being connected to at least one of the at least one interface with the originated information being transmitted to the at least one RF receiver by one of the plurality of RF information transmission networks through the one of the at least one interface.

145. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 119 further comprising:

a plurality of RF information transmission networks with each RF information transmission network being connected to at least one of the at least one interface with the originated information being transmitted to the at least one RF receiver by one of the plurality of RF information transmission networks through the one of the at least one interface.

146. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 115 wherein:

an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

147. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 116 wherein:

an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

148. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 117 wherein:

an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is

transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

149. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 118 wherein:

an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

150. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 119 wherein:

an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

151. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 120 wherein:

an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

152. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 121 wherein:

an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network

to the at least one RF receiver.

153. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 122 wherein:  
an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by  
the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated  
information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at  
least one RF receiver.

154. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 123 wherein:  
an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is  
transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the  
originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network  
to the at least one RF receiver.

155. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 124 wherein:  
an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is  
transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the  
originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network  
to the at least one RF receiver.

156. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 125 wherein:  
an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is  
transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the  
originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network  
to the at least one RF receiver.

157. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 126 wherein:

an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

158. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 127 wherein:

an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

159. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 128 wherein:

an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

160. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 129 wherein:

an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

161. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 130 wherein:

an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated

information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

162. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 131 wherein:  
an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

163. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 132 wherein:  
an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

164. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 133 wherein:  
an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

165. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 134 wherein:  
an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

166. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 135 wherein:  
an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

167. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 136 wherein:  
an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

168. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 137 wherein:  
an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

169. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 138 wherein:  
an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

170. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 139 wherein:  
an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by



the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

171. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 140 wherein:  
an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

172. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 141 wherein:  
an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

173. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 142 wherein:  
an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

174. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 144 wherein:  
an address of the at least one RF receiver to which the originated information is transmitted by the RF transmission network is inputted to the system before transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network

to the at least one RF receiver.

175. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 115 wherein:  
the address of the one interface is inputted to the system at the one of the plurality of  
originating processors.

176. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 116 wherein:  
the address of the one interface is inputted to the system at the one of the plurality of  
originating processors.

177. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 117 wherein:  
the address of the one interface is inputted to the system at the one of the plurality of  
originating processors.

178. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 118 wherein:  
the address of the one interface is inputted to the system at the one of the plurality of  
originating processors.

179. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 119 wherein:  
the address of the one interface is inputted at the one of the plurality of originating  
processors.

180. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 120 wherein:  
the address of the one interface is inputted at the one of the plurality of originating  
processors.

181. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 121 wherein:  
the address of the one interface is inputted at the one of the plurality of originating  
processors.

182. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 122 wherein:  
the address of the one interface is inputted at the one of the plurality of originating  
processors.

183. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 123 wherein:  
the address of the one interface is inputted at the one of the plurality of originating  
processors.

184. (Original Patent Claim) A system in accordance with claim 146 wherein:  
the address of the one interface is inputted at the one of the plurality of originating  
processors; and  
the information inputted to the system is inputted at the one of the plurality of originating  
processors.

185. (Original Patent Claim) A method in accordance with claim 150 wherein:  
the address of the one interface is inputted to the system at the one of the plurality of  
originating processors; and  
the inputted information is inputted at the one of the plurality of originating processors.

186. (New Claim) A system in accordance with one of claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12-17, 49-51,  
55, 56, 58-63, 100-103, 115-118, 126-131, 144, 146-149, 157-162, 174-178, and 184, further  
comprising:

a communication system, including said electronic mail system, which transmits  
electronic mail inputted to said electronic mail system and further other information from a  
processor included in said communication system, wherein:

said processor included in said communication system sends said further other information to one of said destination processors using the RF information transmission network.

187. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 186, wherein said further information is transmitted to the one destination processor via the interface.

188. (New Claim) A system in accordance with one of claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12-17, 49-51, 55, 56, 58-63, 100-103, 115-118, 126-131, 144, 146-149, 157-162, 174-178, and 184, wherein:

after reception of electronic mail including said originated information from the electronic mail system, information is deleted from the electronic mail prior to transmission by the RF information transmission network; and

the deleted information is a header in the electronic mail.

189. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 188, wherein the information is deleted by the interface.

190. (New Claim) A system in accordance with one of claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12-17, 49-51, 55, 56, 58-63, 100-103, 115-118, 126-131, 144, 146-149, 157-162, 174-178, and 184, wherein:

the at least one RF receiver is coupled to a memory which stores the originated information received by the RF receiver, and

the at least one destination processor processes the originated information, after the originated information has been output from the memory, by executing an application program.

191. (New Claim) A system in accordance with one of claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12-17, 49-51, 55, 56, 58-63, 100-103, 115-118, 126-131, 144, 146-149, 157-162, 174-178, and 184, wherein:

after reception of the originated information, a security check is performed to determine if the originated information should be transmitted by the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

192. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 191, wherein:

said security check is performed by comparing an identification of the one RF receiver device with identifications of permissible RF receivers in the RF information transmission network that are permitted to receive RF transmissions and supplying the originated information to the RF information transmission network for transmission to the one RF receiver if the identification of the one RF receiver device matches one of the identifications of the permissible RF receivers.

193. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 192, wherein said comparing is performed by the interface.

194. (New Claim) A system in accordance with one of claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12-17, 49-51, 55, 56, 58-63, 100-103, 115-118, 126-131, 144, 146-149, 157-162, 174-178, and 184, wherein:

said electronic mail system includes a processor which receives originated information from an originating processor, and causes the originated information to be transmitted to the destination processor via the interface and the RF information transmission network.

195. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 194, wherein said processor adds an address of the interface.

196. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 194, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

197. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 195, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

198. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 194, wherein:  
an address of the at least one destination processor is added to the originated information by the processor, said address being an identification of the at least one RF receiver which is to receive the originated information.

199. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 198, wherein said identification is an identifier number of the RF receiver.

200. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 198, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

201. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 199, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

202. (New Claim) A system in accordance with one of claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12-17, 49-51, 55, 56, 58-63, 100-103, 115-118, 126-131, 144, 146-149, 157-162, 174-178, and 184, wherein:  
said interface receives the originated information from the at least one originating processor, processes the originated information, and supplies processed originated information to said RF information transmission network for transmission to the at least one RF receiver.

203. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 202, wherein said processes performed by said interface includes varying content of the originated information.

204. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 203, wherein said varying of content includes one of adding and deleting information.

205. (New Claim) A computer program stored on a storage medium when executed by the interface as set forth in one of claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12-17, 49-51, 55, 56, 58-63, 100-103, 115-118, 126-131, 144, 146-149, 157-162, 174-178, and 184, causes the interface to perform the steps of:

receiving the originated information from the at least one originating processor; and  
supplying the originated information and an identification of the at least one RF receiver to the RF information transmission network which thereafter broadcasts the originated information to the at least one RF receiver.

206. (New Claim) A computer program in accordance with claim 205, wherein said computer program when executed by the interface further causes the interface to perform the steps of:

deleting, after reception of the electronic mail by the interface, information from the electronic mail; and

not transmitting deleted information by the RF information transmission network.

207. (New Claim) A computer program in accordance with claim 206, wherein the deleted information is a header of the electronic mail.

208. (New Claim) A computer program stored on a storage medium when executed by the processor as set forth in claim 194, causes the processor to perform the steps of:

receiving the originated information from the at least one originating processor; and  
causing the originated information to be transmitted to the destination processor via the interface and the RF information transmission network which thereafter broadcasts the originated information to the at least one RF receiver.

209. (New Claim) A computer program in accordance with claim 208, wherein said processor adds an address of the interface.

210. (New Claim) A computer program in accordance with claim 208, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

211. (New Claim) A computer program in accordance with claim 209, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

212. (New Claim) A computer program in accordance with claim 208, wherein said computer program when executed by the processor further causes the processor to perform the step of:

adding an address of the at least one destination processor to the originated information, said address being an identification of the at least one RF receiver which is to receive the originated information.

213. (New Claim) A computer program in accordance with claim 212, wherein said identification is an identifier number of the RF receiver.

214. (New Claim) A computer program in accordance with claim 212, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

215. (New Claim) A computer program in accordance with claim 213, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

216. (New Claim) A system in accordance with one of claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12-17, 49-51, 55, 56, 58-63, 100-103, 115-118, 126-131, 144, 146-149, 157-162, 174-178, and 184, wherein said interface, being coupled to at least one other electronic mail system, receives originated information from an originating processor in said electronic mail system, and transmits said



originated information to a RF receiver coupled to a destination processor in one of the at least one other electronic mail system via said RF information transmission network.

217. (New Claim) A method in accordance with one of claims 5-8, 11, 18-23, 52-54, 57, 64-69, 93, 94, 96-99, 104, 112, 119-125, 132-143, 145, 150-156, 163-173, 179-183, and 185, further comprising:

transmitting by a communication system, including said electronic mail system, electronic mail inputted to said electronic mail system and further other information from a processor included in said communication system; and

sending by said processor included in said communication system said further other information to one of said destination processors using the RF information transmission network.

218. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 217, wherein said further information is transmitted to the one destination processor via the interface.

219. (New Claim) A method in accordance with one of claims 5-8, 11, 18-23, 52-54, 57, 64-69, 93, 94, 96-99, 104, 112, 119-125, 132-143, 145, 150-156, 163-173, 179-183, and 185, further comprising:

deleting, after reception of electronic mail including said originated information from the electronic mail system, information from the electronic mail and not transmitting the deleted information by the RF information transmission network, wherein:

the deleted information is a header in the electronic mail.

220. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 219, wherein the information is deleted by the interface.

221. (New Claim) A method in accordance with one of claims 5-8, 11, 18-23, 52-54, 57, 64-69, 93, 94, 96-99, 104, 112, 119-125, 132-143, 145, 150-156, 163-173, 179-183, and 185, further comprising:

storing in a memory coupled to the at least one RF receiver the originated information received by the RF receiver; and

processing, by executing an application program by the at least one destination processor, the originated information after the originated information has been output from the memory.

222. (New Claim) A method in accordance with one of claims 5-8, 11, 18-23, 52-54, 57, 64-69, 93, 94, 96-99, 104, 112, 119-125, 132-143, 145, 150-156, 163-173, 179-183, and 185, further comprising:

performing, after reception of the originated information, a security check to determine if the originated information should be transmitted by the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

223. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 222, further comprising:

performing said security check by comparing an identification of the one RF receiver device with identifications of permissible RF receivers in the RF information transmission network that are permitted to receive RF transmissions and supplying the originated information to the RF information transmission network for transmission to the one RF receiver if the identification of the one RF receiver matches one of the identifications of the permissible RF receivers.

224. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 223, wherein said comparing is performed by the interface.

225. (New Claim) A method in accordance with one of claims 5-8, 11, 18-23, 52-54, 57, 64-69, 93, 94, 96-99, 104, 112, 119-125, 132-143, 145, 150-156, 163-173, 179-183, and 185, further comprising:

receiving, by a processor included in each electronic mail system, originated information from an originating processor; and

causing the originated information to be transmitted to the destination processor via the interface and the RF information transmission network.

226. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 225, wherein said processor adds an address of the interface.

227. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 225, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

228. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 226, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

229. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 225, further comprising:  
adding, by the processor, an address of the at least one RF receiver to the originated information, said address being an identification of the at least one RF receiver which is to receive the originated information.

230. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 229, wherein said identification is an identifier number of the RF receiver.

231. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 229, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

232. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 230, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

233. (New Claim) A method in accordance with one of claims 5-8, 11, 18-23, 52-54, 57, 64-69, 93, 94, 96-99, 104, 112, 119-125, 132-143, 145, 150-156, 163-173, 179-183, and 185, further comprising:

receiving, by said interface, the originated information from the at least one originating processor;

processing the originated information; and

supplying processed originated information to said RF information transmission network for transmission to the at least one RF receiver.

234. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 233, wherein said processes performed by said interface includes varying content of the originated information.

235. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 234, wherein said varying of content includes one of adding and deleting information.

236. (New Claim) A method in accordance with one of claims 5-8, 11, 18-23, 52-54, 57, 64-69, 93, 94, 96-99, 104, 112, 119-125, 132-143, 145, 150-156, 163-173, 179-183, and 185, wherein said interface, being coupled to at least one other electronic mail system, receives originated information from an originating processor in said electronic mail system, and transmits said originated information to a RF receiver coupled to a destination processor in one of the at least one other electronic mail system via said RF information transmission network.

237. (New Claim) A system in accordance with one of claims 24-33, 47, 70-78, and 91, further comprising:

a communication system, including said electronic mail systems, which transmits electronic mail inputted to said electronic mail systems and further other information from a processor included in said communication system, wherein:

said processor included in said communication system sends said further other information to one of said destination processors using the RF information transmission network.

238. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 237, wherein said further information is transmitted to the one destination processor via the interface.

239. (New Claim) A system in accordance with one of claims 24-33, 47, 70-78, and 91, wherein:

after reception of electronic mail including said originated information from one of the electronic mail systems, information is deleted from the electronic mail prior to transmission by the RF information transmission network; and

the deleted information is a header in the electronic mail.

240. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 239, wherein the information is deleted by the interface.

241. (New Claim) A system in accordance with one of claims 24-33, 47, 70-78, and 91, wherein:

the at least one RF receiver is coupled to a memory which stores the originated information received by the RF receiver, and

the at least one destination processor processes the originated information, after the originated information has been output from the memory, by executing an application program.

242. (New Claim) A system in accordance with one of claims 24-33, 47, 70-78, and 91, wherein:

after reception of the originated information, a security check is performed to determine if the originated information should be transmitted by the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

243. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 242, wherein:

said security check is performed by comparing an identification of the one RF receiver device with identifications of permissible RF receivers in the RF information transmission network that are permitted to receive RF transmissions and supplying the originated information to the RF information transmission network for transmission to the one RF receiver if the identification of the one RF receiver device matches one of the identifications of the permissible RF receivers.

244. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 243, wherein said comparing is performed by the interface.

245. (New Claim) A system in accordance with one of claims 24-33, 47, 70-78, and 91, wherein:

each electronic mail system includes a processor which receives originated information from an originating processor, and causes the originated information to be transmitted to the destination processor via the interface and the RF information transmission network.

246. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 245, wherein said processor adds an address of the interface.

247. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 245, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

248. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 246, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

249. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 245, wherein:  
an address of the at least one destination processor is added to the originated information by the processor, said address being an identification of the at least one RF receiver which is to receive the originated information.

250. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 249, wherein said identification is an identifier number of the RF receiver.

251. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 249, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

252. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 250, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

253. (New Claim) A system in accordance with one of claims 24-33, 47, 70-78, and 91, wherein:

said interface receives the originated information from the at least one originating processor, processes the originated information, and supplies processed originated information to said RF information transmission network for transmission to the at least one RF receiver.

254. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 253, wherein said processes performed by said interface includes varying content of the originated information.

255. (New Claim) A system in accordance with claim 254, wherein said varying of content includes one of adding and deleting information.

256. (New Claim) A computer program stored on a storage medium when executed by the interface as set forth in one of claims 24-33, 47, 70-78, and 91, causes the interface to perform the steps of:

receiving the originated information from the at least one originating processor; and  
supplying the originated information and an identification of the at least one RF receiver to the RF information transmission network which thereafter broadcasts the originated information to the at least one RF receiver.

257. (New Claim) A computer program in accordance with claim 256, wherein said computer program when executed by the interface further causes the interface to perform the steps of:

deleting, after reception of the electronic mail by the interface, information from the electronic mail; and

not transmitting deleted information by the RF information transmission network.

258. (New Claim) A computer program in accordance with claim 257, wherein the deleted information is a header of the electronic mail.

259. (New Claim) A computer program stored on a storage medium when executed by the processor as set forth in claim 245, causes the processor to perform the steps of:

receiving the originated information from the at least one originating processor; and



causing the originated information to be transmitted to the destination processor via the interface and the RF information transmission network which thereafter broadcasts the originated information to the at least one RF receiver.

260. (New Claim) A computer program in accordance with claim 259, wherein said processor adds an address of the interface.

261. (New Claim) A computer program in accordance with claim 259, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

262. (New Claim) A computer program in accordance with claim 260, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

263. (New Claim) A computer program in accordance with claim 259, wherein said computer program when executed by the processor further causes the processor to perform the step of:

adding an address of the at least one destination processor to the originated information, said address being an identification of the at least one RF receiver which is to receive the originated information.

264. (New Claim) A computer program in accordance with claim 263, wherein said identification is an identifier number of the RF receiver.

265. (New Claim) A computer program in accordance with claim 263, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

266. (New Claim) A computer program in accordance with claim 264, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

267. (New Claim) A system in accordance with one of claims 24-33, 47, 70-78, and 91, wherein said interface, being coupled to at least one other electronic mail system, receives originated information from an originating processor in said electronic mail system, and transmits said originated information to a RF receiver coupled to a destination processor in one of the at least one other electronic mail system via said RF information transmission network.

268. (New Claim) A method in accordance with one of claims 34-46, 48, 79-90, 92, 95, 113 and 114, further comprising:

transmitting by a communication system, including said electronic mail systems, electronic mail inputted to said electronic mail systems and further other information from a processor included in said communication system; and

sending by said processor included in said communication system said further other information to one of said destination processors using the RF information transmission network.

269. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 268, wherein said further information is transmitted to the one destination processor via the interface.

270. (New Claim) A method in accordance with one of claims 34-46, 48, 79-90, 92, 95, 113 and 114, further comprising:

deleting, after reception of electronic mail including said originated information from one of the electronic mail systems, information from the electronic mail and not transmitting the deleted information by the RF information transmission network, wherein:

the deleted information is a header in the electronic mail.

271. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 270, wherein the information is deleted by the interface.

272. (New Claim) A method in accordance with one of claims 34-46, 48, 79-90, 92, 95, 113 and 114, further comprising:

storing in a memory coupled to the at least one RF receiver the originated information received by the RF receiver; and

processing, by executing an application program by the at least one destination processor, the originated information after the originated information has been output from the memory.

273. (New Claim) A method in accordance with one of claims 34-46, 48, 79-90, 92, 95, 113 and 114, further comprising:

performing, after reception of the originated information, a security check to determine if the originated information should be transmitted by the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.

274. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 273, further comprising:

performing said security check by comparing an identification of the one RF receiver device with identifications of permissible RF receivers in the RF information transmission network that are permitted to receive RF transmissions and supplying the originated information to the RF information transmission network for transmission to the one RF receiver if the identification of the one RF receiver matches one of the identifications of the permissible RF receivers.

275. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 274, wherein said comparing is performed by the interface.

276. (New Claim) A method in accordance with one of claims 34-46, 48, 79-90, 92, 95, 113 and 114, further comprising:

receiving, by a processor included in each electronic mail system, originated information from an originating processor; and

causing the originated information to be transmitted to the destination processor via the interface and the RF information transmission network.

277. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 276, wherein said processor adds an address of the interface.

278. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 276, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

279. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 277, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

280. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 276, further comprising:  
adding, by the processor, an address of the at least one RF receiver to the originated information, said address being an identification of the at least one RF receiver which is to receive the originated information.

281. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 280, wherein said identification is an identifier number of the RF receiver.

282. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 280, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

283. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 281, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.

284. (New Claim) A method in accordance with one of claims 34-46, 48, 79-90, 92, 95, 113 and 114, further comprising:

receiving, by said interface, the originated information from the at least one originating processor;

processing the originated information; and

supplying processed originated information to said RF information transmission network for transmission to the at least one RF receiver.

285. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 284, wherein said processes performed by said interface includes varying content of the originated information.

286. (New Claim) A method in accordance with claim 285, wherein said varying of content includes one of adding and deleting information.

287. (New Claim) A method in accordance with one of claims 34-46, 48, 79-90, 92, 95, 113 and 114, wherein said interface, being coupled to at least one other electronic mail system, receives originated information from an originating processor in said electronic mail system, and transmits said originated information to a RF receiver coupled to a destination processor in one of the at least one other electronic mail system via said RF information transmission network.

## **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated March 21, 2005, has been received and carefully considered. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present reexamination proceeding of the '946 Patent is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

### **I. THE '946 PATENT**

#### **A. Generally**

The '946 patent relates to a method and system of transferring information from a RF receiver to a processor under control of a program stored by the processor. Information is transmitted with a RF transmitter to the RF receiver. The RF receiver signals the processor on a transmission medium of the processor used for transmission of information by the processor that received information is stored within a memory of the receiver. The transfer of the stored information from the memory of the receiver to a memory of the processor on the transmission medium is controlled with the program. The information in the memory of the processor is processed with an application program stored in the memory of the processor. *See* Abstract of the '946 Patent under reexamination.

#### **B. Claim Terms and Phrases**

The claims of the '946 patent make repeated use of several terms and phrases that have significant meaning and context. The terms and phrases important for review of the claims of the '946 Patent are: (1) "electronic mail system," (2) "originating processor," (3) "destination processor," (4) "RF information transmission network / RF information network / RF information transmission system / RF transmission system," (5) "interface / interface switch," (6) "RF receiver," and (7) "originated information." As set forth in the Declaration of Dr. V.

Thomas Rhyne Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 (hereinafter “Rhyne Declaration”) submitted herewith, these terms and phrases have been defined in claim-construction rulings made by the Honorable Judge James R. Spencer of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia and the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (hereinafter “CAFC”)<sup>1</sup>, as follows:

1. “Electronic mail system”

The phrase “electronic mail system,” as used in the Campana patents, refers to a type of communication system which includes a plurality of processors running electronic mail programming. The processors and the electronic mail programming are configured to permit communication by way of electronic mail messages among recognized users of the electronic mail system. The various constituent processors in the electronic mail system typically function as both “originating processors” and “destination processors.” *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 5.

2. “Originating processor”

The phrase “originating processor,” as used in the Campana patents, refers to the processor that initiates the transmission of the electronic mail message text into the electronic mail system and is separate from the gateway or interface switch. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 6.

3. “Destination processor”

The phrase “destination processor,” as used in the Campana patents, refers to any one of the constituent processors in an electronic mail system to which information is transmitted by the

---

<sup>1</sup> The claim construction rulings were made in connection with patent litigation in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia between Patent Owner and Research In Motion, Ltd., the makers of the Blackberry<sup>TM</sup> system. *NTP, Inc. v. Research in Motion, Ltd. (RIM)*, Civil Action No. 3:01CV767 (E.D. Va. Aug. 5, 2003) (hereinafter “the litigation”).

system. The destination processor is identified by an address which initiates the transmission of the originated information from the originated processor. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 7.

4. “RF information transmission network / RF information network / RF information transmission system / RF transmission system”

The phrase “RF information transmission network” as well as the other similar terms listed above, as used in the Campana patents, refers to a combination of circuits and devices for transmitting data, which combination includes a plurality of RF transmitters for transmitting RF signals carrying data and one or more RF receivers for receiving data. Each RF transmitter has a substantial geographic RF coverage area and is interconnected with other RF transmitters. The combination may include pluralities of local, lata and hub switches. (Underlining added.) *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 8.

5. “Interface / interface switch”

The terms “interface” and “interface switch,” as used in the Campana patents, refer to a device or system, which includes a processor, that transmits electronic mail messages to a wireless system for delivery to a mobile processor which can be carried by a person outside of a home or office and which executes electronic mail programming to function as a destination and/or source of electronic mail. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 9.

6. “RF receiver”

The phrase “RF receiver,” as used in the Campana patents, refers to a device for receiving radio frequency electromagnetic signals, for demodulating the radio frequency electronic signals, and for recovering data that is carried by the radio frequency electromagnetic signals. The RF receiver can be carried by a person outside a home or office and can receive data while being carried. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 10.



7. “Originated information”

The phrase “originated information,” as used in the Campana patents, refers to the text of an electronic mail message. As originally inputted to an electronic mail system by the sender, the electronic mail message includes the following characteristics: (a) a destination address identifying the person(s), place(s) or object(s) to which the message is directed; (b) an indication of the sender (which may be added automatically by the electronic mail programming); (c) a subject field (which may be blank); and (d) the inputted message text. An electronic mail message encompasses all forms of the message as it moves through the communication system (information may be added or deleted to facilitate further transmission as it proceeds through the system). *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 11.

The above definitions are hereby adopted by the Patent Owner, NTP, Inc. (hereinafter “Patent Owner”), and will be used in applying the terms of the ‘946 Patent under reexamination and in distinguishing the various references relied upon in the office action.

**II. THE ANTICIPATION REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 15, 18, 24, 25, 27, 31, 34, 35, 37, 38, 44, 115, 116, 118-120, 122, 123, 129, 132, 138 AND 141**

Under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Patent Office bears the burden of presenting at least a prima facie case of anticipation. Anticipation requires that a prior art reference disclose, either expressly or under the principles of inherency, each and every element of the claimed invention. *Id.* “In addition, the prior art reference must be enabling.” *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. International Trade Commission*, 808 F.2d 1471, 1479, 1 USPQ2d 1241, 1245 (Fed. Cir. 1986), *cert. denied*, 482 U.S. 909 (1987). That is, the prior art reference must sufficiently describe the claimed invention so as to have placed the public in possession of it. *In re Donohue*, 766 F.2d 531, 533, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621 (Fed. Cir. 1985). “Such possession is effected if one of ordinary skill in the

art could have combined the publication's description of the invention with his own knowledge to make the claimed invention." *Id.*

As stated in MPEP § 706.02(b), a rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) can be overcome by filing an affidavit or declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 showing prior invention. The declaration shall set forth facts that establish reduction to practice prior to the effective date of the reference, or conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference coupled with due diligence from prior to said date to a subsequent reduction to practice or to the filing of the application. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 (b); MPEP § 715.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 15, 18, 24, 25, 27, 31, 34, 35, 37, 38, 44, 115, 116, 118-120, 122, 123, 129, 132, 138 and 141 under U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by either: (1) "An Architecture for a Mobile OSI Mail Access System," Cole *et al.*, February, 1989, IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications, Vol. 7, No. 2 (hereinafter "Cole"); (2) "PHASE, A Portable Host Access System Environment (hereinafter "Verjinski"); or (3) United States Patent No, 5,159,592 to Perkins (hereinafter "Perkins"). Each reference is discussed below:

**A. Cole Reference**

On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 5, 24, 34, 115 and 119 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Cole. This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

1. Cole Does Not Disclose or Suggest Numerous Limitations of Claim 1 of the '946 Patent Under Reexamination

Patent Owner respectfully submits that Cole does not teach or suggest numerous recitations of the independent claims of the '946 patent under reexamination. In particular, in

view of the claim constructions made by Judge Spencer and the CAFC, Patent Owner respectfully submits that Cole fails to teach or suggest at least one recitation of each of the independent claims of the '946 Patent and indeed, fails to disclose most of the limitations of those claims.

- a. Cole fails to disclose or suggest the recitation of claim 1 requiring an "interface connecting the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors to the RF information transmission network

Patent Owner respectfully submits that Cole fails to disclose or suggest the recitation of Claim 1 requiring an "interface connecting the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors to the RF information transmission network."

Patent Owner respectfully submits that the Office Action's reliance on Cole's Message Transfer Agent (MTA) as meeting the "interface" recitation is not correct. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 16.

This recitation of Claim 1 requires three elements: (1) electronic mail system, (2) an interface, and (3) the RF information transmission network. An "electronic mail system," as defined by Judge Spencer and the CAFC, means a plurality of processors running electronic mail programming. The processors and the electronic mail programming are configured to permit communication by way of electronic mail messages among recognized users of the electronic mail system. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 17.

Thus, at a minimum, this recitation of Claim 1 requires that there is a system comprising at least two processors running electronic mail programming configured in a way to permit communication among recognized users of the electronic mail system, plus an additional processor (the required "interface") to connect that system to the RF information transmission

network. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 18.

Cole simply does not provide that configuration. Cole's User Agents cannot individually be "an electronic mail system" because they are *single* processors. Even groups of User Agents cannot be electronic mail systems because such groups would have no way of "permitting communication among" that group without having something within that group that knows how to deliver messages between them. Cole provides no structure other than the Message Transfer Agent to serve that purpose. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 19.

Thus, even if one viewed the hypothetical combination of one or more User Agents and the Message Transfer Agent as "an electronic mail system," there is nothing in the Cole system that serves as the "interface" that Claim 1 requires. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 20.

In addition, nothing disclosed by Cole connects the User Agent / Message Transfer Agent group of elements to an "RF information transmission network" as that term has been defined by Judge Spencer and the CAFC. Specifically, the only wireless network disclosed is the cellular network that is located within (in between) the User Agents and the MTA's. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 21.

Moreover, Patent Owner respectfully submits that Cole does not teach or suggest that the X.25 system may comprise an electronic mail system. Even if that were the case, nothing in Cole suggests an "interface" as that term has been defined by Judge Spencer and the CAFC which would connect such an X.25 electronic mail system to the cellular system of Cole. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 22.

- b. Cole Fails to Disclose or Suggest the Transmission of Originating Information “in Association with an Address of the one Interface from the one of the Plurality of Originating Processors to the one Interface to Direct the Originating Information from the one of the Plurality of Originating Processors to the one Interface”

Patent Owner respectfully submits that Cole fails to disclose or suggest the transmission of originating information “in association with an address of the one interface from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface to direct the originating information from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface” as required by Claim 1.

Even if the hypothetical system identified above was disclosed by Cole (which Patent Owner contends it was not), there was no disclosure or suggestion of the originating information being transmitted “in association with an address of the one interface from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface to direct the originating information from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface” as required by Claim 1. In this hypothetical system, the “originating processor” would have to be a computer within the X.25 system that is hypothesized to include an electronic mail system. There is absolutely nothing to suggest that such a computer could address a message to the MTA of Cole. Rather, Cole explicitly teaches away from that by stating that all messages are addressed to the User Agent of the recipient user. Certainly, there is nothing in Cole to suggest a message being “transmitted in association with an address of the one interface.” Rather, messages are transmitted in Cole with the address of the user device. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 23.

2. Independent Claims 5, 24, 34, 115 and 119

Independent Claims 5, 24, 34, 115 and 119 include the above recitations and thus, are not anticipated by Cole for the above reasons. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 24.

In addition, as described above, Cole does not disclose a plurality of electronic mail systems as required by Claims 24 and 34. Cole also fails to disclose transmission of the originated information by an RF interface network switch through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver in response to information inputting to the system as required by Claims 115 and 119. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 25.

For at least the reasons, Cole fails to anticipate Claims 1, 5, 24, 34, 115 and 119.

**B. Verjinski Reference**

On page 6 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 15, 18, 24, 25, 27, 31, 34, 35, 37, 38, 44, 115, 116, 118-120, 122, 123, 129, 132, 138 and 141 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Verjinski. This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

1. Verjinski Teaches Nothing More than did the Prior Art Systems Described and Distinguished in the '946 Patent

Patent Owner respectfully submits that Verjinski teaches nothing more than did the prior art systems described and distinguished in the '945 Patent specification with reference to FIGS. 2 and 7. Similar to the prior art systems described in that specification, a portable host PC in the Verjinski system must dial into the system (the Portable Host Access Component or "PHAC") via a cellular phone to connect the portable host PC to the system. The portable host PC uses that connection to transmit its IP address to a Dynamic Domain Name Server (DDNS). A remote host PC sender of an email message (the "originating processor") must also dial into the system via the portable host PC's phone to connect to the system. The remote host PC queries the DDNS for the portable host PC's IP address and receives it. The remote host PC can then transmit an email message directly to the portable host PC using this IP address. The remote

host PC then disconnects from the system. The portable host PC receives the email and then disconnects from the system. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 58.

Thus, in the system described in Verjinski, there are not two different networks for transmission of information. Both the processor that transmits a communication and the processor that receives the communication must dial in and remain connected to the system, and all data / email is transmitted via the single network. *See* pages 0808-0809 of Verjinski. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 59.

Moreover, in the Verjinski system, if the receiving processor is not connected to the system at the same time as the transmitting processor, the email message remains queued at the transmitting processor. The transmitting processor and the system cannot push the email message to an “interface” as recited in the claims of the ‘946 Patent. *See* page 0808 (“If the mail recipient domain name is resolved to an address, but the *sendmail* program cannot connect to the address, then the mail message is queued at the sending machine for future transmission. This would be the case when the Portable Host is not connected.”). *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 60.

2. Verjinski Does Not Disclose or Suggest Numerous Limitations of Claim 1 of the ‘946 Patent Under Reexamination

Patent Owner respectfully submits that Verjinski does not teach or suggest numerous recitations of the independent claims of the ‘946 patent under reexamination. In particular, in view of the claim constructions made by Judge Spencer and the CAFC, Patent Owner respectfully submits that Verjinski fails to teach or suggest at least one recitation of each of the independent claims of the ‘946 Patent and indeed, fails to disclose most of the limitations of those claims.

- a. Verjinski Fails to Disclose or Suggest the Recitation of Claim 1 Requiring Transmission of “Other Originated Information from one of the Originating Processors with the Electronic Mail System Without Using the RF Information Transmission Network

Patent Owner respectfully submits that Verjinski fails to disclose or suggest the recitation of Claim 1 requiring transmission of “other originated information originating from one of the originating processors with the electronic mail system without using the RF information transmission network.”

In the Verjinski system, all information is sent from one processor to another through a single network connection. Verjinski fails to disclose or suggest communication of data without using the alleged “RF information transmission network.” *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 62.

- b. Verjinski Fails to Disclose or Suggest the Recitation of Claim 1 Requiring an “Interface Connecting the Electronic Mail System Containing the Plurality of Originating Processors to the RF Information Transmission Network

Patent Owner respectfully submits that Verjinski also fails to disclose or suggest the limitation of Claim 1 requiring an “interface switch connecting the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors to the RF information transmission network.”

The PHAC, identified by the PTO as the required “interface,” is not an interface “connecting the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processor to the RF information transmission network.” The only RF information network mentioned is a cellular connection between a single computer and the PHAC. On one side of that cellular connection is a single computer running an SMTP client. A single computer running a mail program is not an electronic mail system as defined by Judge Spencer and the CAFC. On the other side is a single computer dialing into the PHAC using X.PC. That other single computer also is not an



electronic mail system as defined by Judge Spencer and the CAFC. Thus, the PHAC does not “connect” any electronic mail system as defined above with an RF information transmission network. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 63.

- c. Verjinski Fails to Disclose or Suggest the Recitation of Claim 1 Requiring an “Originating Information [Being] Transmitted in Association with an Address of the one Interface from the one of the Plurality of Originating Processors

Patent Owner respectfully submits that Verjinski does not disclose or suggest the recitation of Claim 1 requiring a “originating information [being] transmitted in association with an address of the one interface from the one of the plurality of originating processors.”

There is nothing in Verjinski to suggest that any “originating information” may be transmitted in associated with an address of the PHAC. Rather, the protocol described in Verjinski involves determining the address of the PC first. Then, the remote SMPT client communicates with the PC’s SMTP server using the address of the PC provided to it. Thus, the information is not transmitted in association with an address for the PHAC. Instead, as illustrated in the example in Section 6.0 and Figure 4 of Verjinski, the purported “originating processor” and “destination processor” must both be simultaneously connected via telephone to the network at the time of the transmission of the electronic mail message, and the electronic mail message is transmitted directly from the “originating processor” to the “destination processor” once the originating processor receives the temporary IP address assigned to the destination processor from the DDNS. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 64.

3. Verjinski Fails to Disclose the Recitations in the Other Claims Rejected by the PTO Under Section 102

Patent Owner respectfully submits that all of the other independent claims of the '946 Patent also include the above recitations and this, are not anticipated by Verjinski for the above reasons. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 65.

Further, with respect to Claims 4, 8, 27, 37, 118, and 122, there is no “other originated information” transmitted between an “originating processor” and a “destination processor” in Verjinski. All of the information transmitted by the originating processor to the destination processor is sent via the same email message using the single network. Thus, there is no information transmitted to the destination processor “using a different address than the address used during transmission of the originated information to the at least one RF receiver.” While the originating processor must first query the DDNS to receive the destination processor’s current IP address, all of the information transmitted by the originating processor to the destination processor is then sent to that same current IP address in a single email transmission. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 66.

For at least these reasons, Verjinski fails to anticipate Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 15, 18, 24, 25, 27, 31, 34, 35, 37, 38, 44, 115, 116, 118-120, 122, 123, 129, 132, 138 and 141.

**C. Perkins Reference**

On page 8 of the Office Action, claims 1, 5, 24, 34, 115 and 119 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Perkins. This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

1. The Perkins Reference is Not Prior Art

The Perkins reference was filed October 29, 1990, and thus has a reduction to practice date of October 29, 1990.

Patent Owner respectfully submits that the invention disclosed and claimed in the '946 Patent under reexamination was conceived and reduced to practice prior to October 29, 1990. Patent Owner supports the above-stated submission with a Declaration of Thomas J. Campana, Jr., Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 (hereinafter "Campana Declaration"), previously submitted. Mr. Campana, who is now deceased, was the Vice President and one of two board members of the Assignee, NTP, Inc., of the '946 Patent under reexamination. The Campana declaration sets forth numerous facts and details showing conception and reduction to practice of the claimed systems and methods of the '946 Patent under reexamination prior the October 29, 1990 filing date of Perkins. Mr. Campana also provided trial and deposition testimony in the litigation between Patent Owner and Research in Motion, Ltd. that demonstrated reduction to practice of the systems and methods claimed in the '946 Patent under reexamination.<sup>2</sup>

The Office Action acknowledges receipt of the Campana Declaration but asserts, *inter alia*, that: (1) it is signed by less than all named inventors, (2) it fails to show that the patent holder was in possession of the instant invention as a whole -- particularly the transmission of email to an RF receiver via an RF network -- before the date of the Perkins patent, and (3) it fails to indicate when the inventive concept was actually reduced to practice other than constructively (i.e., at the time of filing.) Patent Owner respectfully traverses these findings.

---

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Campana's trial and deposition testimony is attached as appendices to the Declaration of William C. White under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132, submitted herewith.

First, Patent Owner respectfully submits that as the owner of the '946 Patent under Reexamination, Mr. Campana is permitted to submit an appropriate oath or declaration to establish invention of the subject matter of the rejected claim prior to the effective date of the Perkins reference. Section § 1.131(a) of the Code of Federal Regulations clearly states that “[w]hen any claim of an application or a patent under reexamination is rejected, ..., the owner of the patent under reexamination, ..., may submit an appropriate oath or declaration to establish invention of the subject matter of the rejected claim prior to the effective date of the reference or activity on which the rejection is based.”

Second, Patent Owner respectfully submits that the Campana Declaration does in fact sufficiently demonstrate reduction to practice of the claimed systems and methods prior to October 29, 1990. The table attached as Appendix A, for example, sets forth exemplary excerpts from the Campana Declaration and Campana’s trial and deposition testimony that illustrate reduction to practice of the various recitations of independent Claims 1, 5, 24, 34, 115 and 119.

Patent Owner respectfully submits that the table Appendix A clearly demonstrates reduction to practice of each of the recitations of the independent claims of the '946 Patent under reexamination, including the transmission of email to an RF receiver via an RF network.

Moreover, to the extent the Campana Declaration is not found to demonstrate reduction to practice of the systems and methods of the '946 Patent prior to October 29, 1990, Patent Owner respectfully submits that the Campana Declaration and the Declaration of Donald E. Stout Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 (hereinafter “Stout Declaration”), previously submitted, demonstrate diligence on the part of the inventors from just prior to October 29, 1990, the filing date of the Perkins reference, to May 20, 1991, the filing date of the application that issued into

'946 Patent under reexamination. For example, paragraph 45 of the Campana Declaration and paragraphs 2-12 of the Stout Declaration describe in detail the diligent and substantial efforts undertaken by the inventors and their patent attorney, Mr. Stout, to reduce to practice and obtain patent protection on the systems and methods claimed by the '946 Patent under reexamination.

Accordingly, Patent Owner respectfully submits that the Perkins reference is not a proper prior art reference for application against the claims of the '946 Patent under reexamination.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the aforementioned anticipation rejection of claims 1, 5, 24, 34, 115 and 119 be withdrawn.

2. The Perkins Reference Does Not Teach or Suggest Numerous Recitations of Claim 1 of the '946 Patent Under Reexamination

Patent Owner respectfully submits that even if Perkins were to qualify as prior art against the pending claims -- which it does not -- Perkins would still not anticipate the pending claims because it does not teach or suggest numerous recitations of the '946 Patent under reexamination. In particular, in view of the claim constructions made by Judge Spencer and the CAFC, Patent Owner respectfully submits that Perkins fails to teach or suggest at least one recitation in each of the independent claims of the '946 Patent and indeed, fails to disclose most of the limitations in those claims.

- a. Perkins fails to disclose or suggest the required "[s]ystem for transmitting originated information from one of a plurality of originating processors contained in an electronic mail system ..."

Patent Owner respectfully submits that Perkins fails to disclose or suggest the required system and method for "[s]ystem for transmitting originated information from one of a plurality of originating processors contained in an electronic mail system ..." In particular, Patent Owner respectfully submits that Perkins contains no teachings or suggestions relating to an "electronic

mail system” as that term has been defined by Judge Spencer and the CAFC. While Perkins does make passing reference to “mail” in its specification and Figure 1, Perkins does not disclose any processors, electronic mail server computers, or electronic mail programming that are configured to permit communication by way of electronic mail messages among recognized users of the electronic mail system. In fact, at 7:37-44 Perkins states that “if a remote user obtains the pseudo-IP address of a registered mobile unit 10, the remote user is enabled to send messages, such as mail, to the mobile unit 10, even if the mobile unit is inactive.” (Emphasis added.) Patent Owner respectfully submits that such a statement does not disclose “an electronic mail system,” but rather an addressing scheme that if properly effected or implemented, may be used by an electronic mail system to transmit communication of electronic mail messages among users. The fact that the systems described in Perkins may be used to transmit mail does not convert those systems into electronic mail systems as that term has been defined by Judge Spencer and the CAFC. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 29.

Further, Claim 1 of the ‘946 Patent requires one or more components that have a particular relationship or association with an electronic mail system. For example, Claim 1 expressly requires “[a] system for transmitting *originated information from one of a plurality of originating processors contained in an electronic mail system* to at least one RF receiver with the originated information originating from one of the plurality of originating processors and being transmitted by an RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver ....” (Emphasis added.) This claim language makes clear that the originated information comes from an originating processor that is part of the electronic mailing system. Similar relationships and associations between the electronic mail system and other components are set forth in the other

claims of the Campana patents. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 30.

Moreover, none of the components disclosed by Perkins (*e.g.*, a global gateway, a local gateway, mobile units, *etc.*) are described as having any relationship or association with an electronic mail system. In fact, given the technology of Perkins – managing network address assignments in a network that includes mobile users – one of skill in the art would not understand any of the components disclosed by Perkins to have any relationship or association with electronic mail systems. Electronic mail systems involve email servers that run specialized email software and maintain an account for each subscriber or authorized user who can receive email on the server. Authorized users communicate with such an email server via simple text conversations from the user’s processor, which also runs specialized email software. Perkins described no such relationship between electronic mail systems and any component within his system. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 31.

For example, the remote users and mobile units disclosed in Perkins are not described as being part of an electronic mail system, or as being able to process electronic mail messages. In fact, the mobile units disclosed by Perkins are associated with a particular local gateway in their own localized wireless LAN, but those mobile units have no addressing relationship with any reasonably defined electronic mail system. This is unlike the Campana patents -- including the ‘946 Patent -- in which fundamentally there are an electronic mail system and specifically identified originating and destination processors and RF devices, all of which are associated with particular electronic mail system(s). *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 32.

- b. Perkins does not disclose the requirement for an “originating processor in an electronic mail system”

Patent Owner respectfully submits that because Perkins does not teach or suggest an

electronic mail system, he does not teach or suggest a processor in an electronic mail system that initiates the transmission of a message in the system. The remote users and the mobile units disclosed by Perkins cannot comprise an “originating processor” as that term has been defined by Judge Spencer and the CAFC because neither is described as being part of an electronic mail system, nor as being able to process electronic mail programming. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 33.

- c. Perkins does not disclose any of the required “destination processors” as that term has been defined by Judge Spencer and the CAFC.

Patent Owner respectfully submits that because Perkins does not teach or suggest an electronic mail system, it does not teach or suggest a “destination processor” as defined above – *i.e.*, as a constituent processor in an electronic mail system to which information is transmitted by the system. The remote users and mobile units disclosed in Perkins cannot comprise “destination processors” because neither is described as being part of an electronic mail system, nor as being able to process electronic mail programming. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 34.

- d. Perkins fails to disclose the requirement for transmission using “an RF information transmission network” as that term has been defined by Judge Spencer and the CAFC.

Patent Owner respectfully submits that Perkins does not teach or suggest any feature or functionality comprising an “RF information transmission network” as that term has been defined by Judge Spencer and the CAFC. Perkins’ discussion of a wireless network is limited to a plurality of mobile communication units in wireless communication with a plurality of header stations. Nothing in Perkins suggests that such a wireless network has a substantial geographic RF coverage area as the phrase “RF information transmission network” has been defined. One of skill in the art would not expect the wireless network disclosed by Perkins to have a substantial or even wide geographic coverage area given the nature of the systems and methods



disclosed by Perkins. Campana, on the other hand, describes a backbone network connecting geographically dispersed RF transmitters, each of which has a substantial geographic RF coverage area. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 35.

The preferred implementation of the LAN of Perkins is suitable, at best, only for an internal office environment where a mobile unit can be placed near to the IR header station in a particular room. While the Perkins system can provide limited room-specific wireless network connectivity for mobile units, it is not practical for more general usage. Perkins does state that “other embodiments may employ an RF wireless medium,” but given its focus on *local* area networks, Perkins does not describe how this RF medium could be utilized with the type of substantial geographic RF coverage described in the RF system used in the Campana patents. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 36.

Moreover, while Perkins involves “coupling” users via localized links to a network, it describes the provision of mobility only within a small LAN implemented by providing a means for managing IP addresses assigned either dynamically or statically for its “mobile units,” although some of those units may well be “permanently situated” (*see* 7:49-50 of the Perkins specification). The teachings of the Perkins patent therefore have utility only in a LAN context using a protocol that encodes a LAN identification into a network address. Perkins does not address the type of wide-area wireless distribution of electronic mail to a configured user’s mobile processor as taught and claimed by the Campana patents. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 37.

- e. Perkins fails to disclose or suggest the requirement for “at least one interface, one of the at least one interface connecting the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors to the RF information transmission network.”

Perkins does not teach or suggest an “electronic mail system” or an “RF information

transmission network,” nor does Perkins teach or suggest an “interface” or “interface switch” that connects the two. Neither the global gateway nor the local gateway disclosed by Perkins serves this function since the former merely connects remote users to LANs, and the latter connects mobile users to LANs. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 38.

Perkins also does not teach or suggest any “interface” or “interface switch,” as those terms are used in the Campana claims. In particular, Perkins does not teach or suggest transmission of electronic mail messages for delivery to mobile processors which can be carried by a person outside of a home or office and which execute electronic mail programming. To the contrary, the mobile units disclosed in Perkins must always be located in close proximity to a header station. Neither the global gateway or the local gateway serve this function since the former merely connects remote users to the local gateway, and the latter is not described as being capable of transmitting electronic mail messages. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 39.

- f. Perkins fails to disclose or suggest the requirement that “the originated information is transmitted in association with an address of the one interface from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface with the electronic mail system responding to the address of the one interface to direct the originated information from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface.”

Perkins does not teach or suggest “originated information,” as the phrase has been defined by Judge Spencer and the CAFC. Rather, because of the type of system Perkins relates to, the only information disclosed in Perkins concerns internet addresses (*e.g.*, LAN addresses) of mobile units and remote users. While Perkins does mention that remote users may be enabled to send messages, such as mail, there is no disclosure that such messages or mail comprise the text of an electronic mail messaging comprising: (a) a destination address identifying the

person(s), place(s) or object(s) to which the message is directed; (b) an indication of the sender; (c) a subject field; and (d) the inputted message text. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 40.

Perkins also does not describe any data transmission containing the “originated information” in association with an address of an “interface” from an “originating processor,” as those terms have been defined by Judge Spencer and the CAFC. In particular, Perkins does not disclose any processor *in an* electronic mail system that initiates the transmission of a message in the system, nor does Perkins disclose transmission of originated information with an address of an interface, wherein the interface is capable of transmitting electronic mail messages to a wireless system for delivery to a mobile processor. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 41.

- g. Perkins fails to disclose or suggest the requirement that “the originated information is transmitted from the one of the at least one interface to the RF information transmission network with an address of the at least one RF receiver to receive the originated information being associated with the originated information before transmission of the originated information to the at least one RF receiver.”

Patent Owner respectfully submits that Perkins does not teach or suggest any feature or component comprising an “RF receiver,” as that term has been defined by Judge Spencer and the CAFC. The mobile units of Perkins cannot comprise RF receivers because they are not described as being capable of receiving RF signals outside a home or office. In fact, the wireless network of Perkins is suitable, at best, only for an internal office environment where a mobile unit can be placed near to the header station in a particular room. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 42.

Perkins also does not describe any feature or functionality that transmits originated information from an interface to an RF information transmission network with an address of an RF receiver, where the originated information is transmitted in association with an address of the interface. The pseudo-IP address of a mobile unit disclosed in Perkins cannot comprise the

address of the RF receiver because that address is not known before transmission by the remote user to the network. In fact, Perkins clearly states that “[a]ll communication from a remote user to a mobile unit 10 employs the pseudo-IP address of the mobile unit 10” (*see* 7:5-7). To obtain the pseudo-IP address necessary to communication with a mobile unit, the remote user must first consult a network nameserver. If a pseudo-IP address has been assigned to the mobile unit, that address is returned to the remote user. Only after the remote user obtains the pseudo-IP address can it begin to direct data packets to the mobile unit. Thus, the pseudo-IP address is not associated with the originated information at the interface before transmission of the originated information to the at least one RF receiver. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 43.

3. Perkins Fails to Disclose or Suggest Numerous Limitations of Claim 5 of the ‘946 Patent

Many of the limitations in Claim 5 are also included in Claim 1. Perkins fails to disclose or suggest a method for transmitting originated information “from one of a plurality of originating processors contained in an electronic mail system;” “destination processors;” “an RF information transmission network;” “at least one interface” that “connect[s] the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors to the RF information transmission network;” transmitting “the originated information in association with an address of the one interface from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface with the electronic mail system responding to the address of the one interface to direct the originated information from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface;” or transmitting “the originated information is transmitted from the one of the at least one interface to the RF information transmission network with an address of the at least one RF receiver to receive the originated information being associated with the originated information before

transmission of the originated information to the at least one RF receiver” as I described above with reference to Claim 1. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 44.

4. Perkins Fails to Disclosure or Suggest Numerous Limitations in Claims 24 and 34 of the ‘946 Patent

Many of the recitations in claims 24 and 34 are also included in Claim 1. Thus, Perkins fails to disclose or suggest any of the missing requirements listed above in connection with Claim 5 of the Rhyne Declaration. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 45.

Moreover, Claims 24 and 34 further recite a plurality of electronic mail systems. Perkins fails to disclose or suggest even one such system and thus, certainly fails to disclosure or suggest a plurality of such systems. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 46.

5. Perkins Fails to Disclosure or Suggest Numerous Limitations of Claims 115 and 119 of the ‘946 Patent

Many of the limitations of Claims 115 and 119 are also included in Claim 1. Thus, Perkins fails to disclose or suggest any of the missing requirements listed above in connection with Claim 5. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 47.

Additionally, Claims 115 and 119 recite that the “RF information transmission system provides transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver in response to information inputted to the system.” Perkins does not describe the transmission of originated information through an RF information transmission network to at least one RF receiver, as those terms have been defined by Judge Spencer and the CAFC. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 48.

For at least these reasons, Perkins fails to anticipate Claims 1, 5, 24, 34, 115 and 119 of the ‘946 Patent under Reexamination.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the aforementioned anticipation

rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 15, 18, 24, 25, 27, 31, 34, 35, 37, 38, 44, 115, 116, 118-120, 122, 123, 129, 132, 138 and 141 be withdrawn.

### **III. THE OBVIOUSNESS REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-185**

As stated in MPEP § 2143, to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Further, as stated in MPEP § 2141, objective evidence or secondary considerations such as unexpected results, commercial success, long-felt need, failure of others, copying by others, licensing, and skepticism of experts are relevant to the issue of obviousness and must be considered in every case in which they are present. When evidence of any of these secondary considerations is submitted, the examiner must evaluate the evidence. The weight to be accorded to the evidence depends on the individual factual circumstances of each case. *Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*, 713 F.2d 1530, 218 USPQ 871 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 231 USPQ 81 (Fed. Cir. 1986), *cert. denied*, 480 U.S. 947 (1987). The ultimate determination on patentability is made on the entire record. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1446, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Although § 103 does not, by its terms, define the "art to which [the] subject matter

[sought to be patented], pertains,” this determination is frequently couched in terms of whether the art is analogous or not, i.e., whether the art is “too remote to be treated as prior art.” *In re Clay*, 966 F.2d 656, 658 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Two criteria have evolved for determining whether prior art is analogous: (1) whether the art is from the same field of endeavor, regardless of the problem addressed, and (2) if the reference is not within the field of the inventor’s endeavor, whether the reference still is reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor is involved.” *Id.*

The Office Action rejects claims 1-185 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over: (1) Verjinski in view of United States Patent No. 4,698,839 to Devaney (hereinafter “Devaney”) or the Patent Owner’s Admission of Prior Art, or (2) Patent Owner’s Admission of Prior Art (AT&T System) in view of United States Patent No. 5,181,200 to Harrison and an IEEE article written by Shoch (hereinafter “Shoch”). Each basis for rejection is discussed below:

**A. Verjinski**

On page 9 of the Office Action, claims 10, 11, 16, 17, 19, 20, 32, 33, 39, 40, 45, 46, 124, 125, 130, 131, 133, 134, 139, 140, 142 and 143 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verjinski in view of Devaney. On Page 10 of the Office, claims 3, 7, 12, 21, 26, 28, 36, 41, 50, 53, 58, 67, 71, 73, 81, 85, 117, 121, 127, 135, 148, 152, 158, 166, 167 and 177 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verjinski in view of Patent Owner’s Admission of Prior Art. This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

Patent Owner respectfully submits that the proposed combination of Verjinski in view of to DeVaney fails to render dependent claims 10, 11, 16, 17, 19, 20, 32, 33, 39, 40, 45, 46, 124,

125, 130, 131, 133, 134, 139, 140, 142 and 143 obvious. DeVaney fails to provide an “interface” or “originating information transmitted in association with an address of the one interface” as defined by Judge Spencer and the CAFC and required by independent claims 1, 5, 24, 34, 115 or 119. Thus, the proposed combination fails to cure Verjinski’s deficiency. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 67.

Patent Owner respectfully submits that the proposed combination of Verjinski in view of the alleged admitted prior art also fails to render dependent claims 3, 7, 12, 21, 26, 28, 36, 41, 50, 53, 58, 67, 71, 73, 81, 85, 117, 121, 127, 135, 148, 152, 157, 158, 166, 167 and 177 obvious. The alleged admitted prior art explicitly fails to provide either an “interface” or “originating information transmitted in association with an address of the one interface” as defined above and required by independent claims 1, 5, 24, 34, 115 or 119. Thus, the proposed combination fails to cure Verjinski’s deficiency. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 68.

As for Claims 12, 21, 28, 41, 127 and 135, the assertion that the “TCP/IP based email system such as that taught by Verjinski would remove, at a first communication node, the IP address of said node upon receipt of the message in order to replace it with the IP address of the next node in the chain” is wholly unsupported. Patent Owner respectfully submits that nothing in Verjinski teaches performing that step, and the alleged admitted prior art does not suggest it, either. Moreover, that removal would not necessarily occur because additional IP addresses in a string may be added without removing anything. Patent Owner respectfully submits that there is absolutely nothing to suggest that the “system removes from the originated information added by the electronic mail system” as required by these dependent claims. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 69.

As for claims 50, 53, 58, 67, 71, 73, 81 and 85, the Office Action’s assertion that the



proposed combination would inherently compare destination addresses lacks any foundation. Patent Owner respectfully submits that there is nothing in Verjinski or the alleged admitted prior art to suggest that the proposed combination would necessarily compare information “to determine if the originated information should be transmitted by the RF information transmission network.” *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 70.

**B. The Alleged Modification of the AT&T System in view of Harrison and Shoch Fails to Invalidate any Claim of the ‘946 Patent under Reexamination**

On page 11 of the Office Action, claims 1-185 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patent Owner’s admission of Prior Art in the ‘946 Patent under reexamination in view of Harrison and Shoch.

Patent Owner respectfully submits that, in view of the claim constructions made by Judge Spencer and the CAFC, the proposed modification of the AT&T System described in the background of the ‘946 Patent in view of Harrison (“Harrison” hereafter) and the IEEE article written by Shoch (“Schoch” hereafter) is improper and fails to provide all of the elements of the ‘946 Patent claims. I start my technical analysis with Claim 1 of the ‘946 Patent. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 49.

**1. The Harrison Reference is Not Prior Art**

The Harrison reference was filed October 29, 1990 -- the same day as the Perkins reference discussed above -- and thus has a reduction to practice date of October 29, 1990.

As set forth above in connection with Perkins, the Campana Declaration submitted herewith sets forth numerous facts and details showing conception and reduction to practice of the claimed systems and methods of the ‘946 Patent under reexamination prior the October 29, 1990 filing date of Harrison.

Moreover, to the extent the Campana Declaration is not found to demonstrate reduction to practice of the systems and methods of the '946 Patent prior to October 29, 1990, Patent Owner respectfully submits that the Campana Declaration demonstrates diligence on the part of the inventors from just prior to October 29, 1990, the filing date of the Harrison reference, to May 20, 1991, the filing date of the application that issued into '946 Patent under reexamination. For example, paragraph 45 of the Campana Declaration describes the substantial efforts undertaken by the inventors and their patent attorney, Mr. Donald Stout, towards obtaining patent protection on the systems and methods claimed by the '946 Patent under reexamination.

Accordingly, Patent Owner respectfully submits that the Harrison reference is not a proper prior art reference for application against the claims of the '946 Patent under reexamination.

2. Harrison is in a Different Field of Endeavor

Patent Owner respectfully submits that even if Harrison were to qualify as prior art against the pending claims -- which it does not -- Perkins would still not anticipate the pending claims because it is in a different field of endeavor than the '946 Patent under reexamination. In particular, Harrison relates to communications between LAN's -- not electronic mail system components. Accordingly, it is not related to the same field of endeavor as the Campana patents. *See Rhyne Declaration*, ¶ 50.

3. The AT&T System, Harrison and Shoch are not properly combined

Patent Owner respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify the AT&T system described in the Campana patent with Harrison and Shoch. Nothing suggests that use of Harrison or Shoch would cure any of the deficiencies identified in the Campana relative to the AT&T system. The AT&T system already had a

wireless capability, but it did not have an interface between an electronic mail system and an RF transmission network that was addressable as such. Adding Harrison or Shoch would not cure that deficiency. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 51.

4. The Proposed Combination Fails to Disclose All of the Limitations of the Claims of the '946 Patent

Patent Owner respectfully submits that the Host CPU described in the background of the Campana patents is not an “interface” as required by Claims 1, 5, 24, 34, 115 and 119 of the '946 Patent. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 52.

The “Host CPU” as asserted by the PTO to be the claimed “interface” does not connect an electronic mail system to an RF information transmission network. Rather, the Host CPU is part of the electronic mail system that enables communications between processors A, B, ... N. There is no element in the AT&T system, as described in the Campana patent, that operates between the Host CPU and the RF information transmission network. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 53.

Moreover, Harrison does not disclose an “interface” as that term has been defined by Judge Spencer and the CAFC. Harrison does not disclose any type of messages being addressed to the “interface” and then having the messages addressed to the recipient. To the contrary, in Harrison messages are addressed to the mobile unit from the start. *See, e.g.*, 9:10-11. Thus, Harrison fails to cure that deficiency of the AT&T system. Any combination of Harrison with the AT&T system would thus fail to provide an interface “connecting the electronic mail system ... to the RF information transmission network” as required by Claim 1. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 54.

Further, the originating information in Harrison is never transmitted “in association with an address of the one interface from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface.” The messages in both the AT&T system and Harrison are transmitted in association with an address of the recipient unit. *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 55.

Because these elements are also present in claims 5, 24, 34, 115, and 119, the proposed modification of AT&T with Harrison fails to invalidate any of those independent claims or any of the dependent claims therefrom (which covers all 185 claims of the ‘946 Patent). *See* Rhyne Declaration, ¶ 56.

### **C. Secondary Indicia of Non-Obviousness**

Patent Owner respectfully submits that numerous evidence of non-obviousness exists in the form of objective evidence or secondary indicia of non-obviousness. In particular, Patent Owner proffers the Declaration of William C. White Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132, submitted herewith, which sets forth secondary indicia of non-obviousness in the form of industry recognition, commercial success/licensing, copying, and inability to design around.

#### **1. Industry Recognition**

The systems and methods claimed in the ‘946 patent under reexamination relate to the integration of electronic mail systems with RF wireless communications networks. *See, e.g.*, ‘946 Patent, Col. 17, l. 41 to Col. 19, l. 29. In simplified terms, a message originating in an electronic mail system may be transmitted not only by wireline but also via radio frequency (RF), in which case, it is received by and stored on a user’s mobile RF receiver. The transmission to the RF receiver was advantageous because it eliminated the requirement that a destination processor be turned on and carried with the user and connected to a telephone jack in

order for the user to receive email messages. Col. 17, ll. 51-55. Almost immediately, the industry recognized the significance of the inventions. *See* White Declaration, ¶ 16.

Indeed, when the inventors demonstrated the claimed inventions to AT&T in September 1990, AT&T requested that the technology be adapted for demonstration at the upcoming Comdex Show in November 1990. *See* White Declaration at ¶ 17.

After witnessing the demonstration of the invention, AT&T also requested that the technology be implemented with its new Safari laptop computer. *See* White Declaration at ¶ 18.

Mr. Campana's testimony at trial, and various contemporaneous documents, regarding industry reaction to his invention at the 1990 Comdex Trade Show establish that there was a significant need in the industry for the patented technology accompanied by a strongly positive reaction to the patented inventions. Indeed, one of RIM's own witnesses confirmed this overwhelmingly positive reaction by industry customers. *See* White Declaration at ¶ 19.

## 2. Commercial Success/Licensing

As is evident from the success of RIM's infringing Blackberry™ devices, Patent Owner respectfully submits that NTP's, patented inventions have achieved a high degree of commercial success and industry acclaim. Indeed, industry analysts report that the market for this technology is still immature and growing. *See* White Declaration at ¶ 20.

Many of the features touted by RIM as factors for its commercial success were anticipated by the inventors in their patent application filed in May 1991, before the establishment of RIM. Indeed, at trial, there was evidence that the \$405M of RIM's infringing sales were due to the inventions described in the NTP patents. *See* White Declaration at ¶ 21.

In fact, Judge Spencer -- the presiding judge in the litigation between Patent Owner and

RIM -- commented on the compelling strength of Patent Owner's evidence of commercial success: "Furthermore, [Patent Owner] offered irrefutable evidence of nonobviousness in the form of tremendous commercial success of the infringing Blackberry products, which indicated the satisfaction of "long-felt" need. *See* White Declaration at ¶ 5.

Further, it is important to note that NTP has been able to license its patents including the '946 Patent to other entities, apart from RIM, who are now commercializing the NTP patented technology. For example, in June, 2004, NTP licensed its patent portfolio, including the '946 Patent to Nokia Inc., a major manufacturer of mobile telephones and related hardware and software products, notwithstanding the pending litigation against RIM and these pending PTO reexamination proceedings. *See* White Declaration at ¶ 23.

Additionally, on January 1, 2005, NTP granted a license to Good Technology Inc. under its patents, including the '946 Patent, notwithstanding the pending RIM litigation and reexamination proceedings. *See* White Declaration at ¶ 24.

Moreover, as has been widely reported in the press, NTP and RIM have been engaged in licensing negotiations since the issuance of the Federal Circuit opinion. The license under consideration would provide RIM the right to continue to make, use and sell its Blackberry™ system under the NTP patents. *See* White Declaration at ¶ 25.

This extensive licensing of the patents, even after the initiation of the reexamination proceedings, provides significant evidence of the commercial success of the claimed inventions and their nonobviousness. *See* White Declaration at ¶ 26.

### 3. Copying

With regard to copying, Patent Owner respectfully submits that NTP presented

unchallenged evidence during its trial against RIM that AT&T provided the patented technology to its strategically important customer Skytel, thus allowing Skytel to copy the technology developed by the '946 Patent's inventors. *See* White Declaration at ¶ 22.

4. Inability to Design Around

Patent Owner respectfully submits that RIM's admissions regarding their inability to design around NTP's patents are further evidence that the patented material is nonobvious. *See, e.g., Advanced Display Sys. v. Kent State Univ.*, 212 F.3d 1272, 1285 (Fed. Cir. 2000) ("In the present case, [the witness's] deposition furnishes persuasive evidence that the West patent is nonobvious by describing [the infringer's] repeated failures to design the claimed invention. In his deposition, [the witness] testified that [the infringer] was entirely unsuccessful in developing the cholestric visible material through independent research. [The witness] also explained that [the infringer] 'tried for a long time' to build an electrical driver, but its efforts 'were all not successful.' [The witness] further detailed how [the infringer's] attempts to develop a polymer-free LCD met with failure and that [the infringer] 'did not know how to design' the device until it copied the claimed invention. In addition, [the witness] testified that, even after gaining access to the claimed invention [the infringer] was unable to design around the West patent because such a task was time consuming and 'very hard.'"). *See* White Declaration at ¶ 5.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the aforementioned obviousness rejection of claims 1-185 be withdrawn.

**IV. DOUBLE PATENTING**

The Double Patenting section in the Office Action sets forth an administrative request and a rejection of claims 1, 5, 24, 34, 115, and 119. The Office Action asserts that conflicts exist

between claims of the following related co-pending reexamination proceedings.

Control No.	Patent No.	Filing Date	Issue Date	Expiration Date
90/006,675 90/006,533	5,436,960	May 20, 1991	July, 25, 1995	July 25, 2012
90/006,676	5,438,611	May 23, 1994	Aug. 1, 1995	Aug. 1, 2012
90/006,677	5,479,472	May 20, 1991	Dec. 26, 1995	Dec. 26, 2012
90/006,678 90/006,491	5,625,670	May 18, 1995	Apr. 29, 1997	July 25, 2012
90/006,679 90/006,492	5,631,946	May 16, 1995	May 20, 1997	July 25, 2012
90/006,680 90/006,493	5,819,172	Apr. 23, 1997	Oct. 6, 1998	May 20, 2011
90/006,681 90/006,494	6,067,451	Sep. 28, 1998	May 23, 2000	May 20, 2011
95/000,020 90/006,495	6,317,592	Dec. 6, 1999	Nov. 13, 2001	May 20, 2011

The listed expiration dates for Patent Owner's related patents take into account the applicable terminal disclaimers previously filed. A terminal disclaimer was filed November 7, 1996 during the prosecution of the application from which this patent issued. This terminal disclaimer sets forth:

Petitioner hereby disclaims all that portion of the term of any patent to be issued on the above-identified application subsequent to the expiration date of the full statutory term, defined in 35 U.S.C. §§154-156, of U.S. Patent Nos. 5,436,960, 5,438,611 and 5,479,472 and allowed United States Patent Application Serial No. 08/443,430 [issued as U.S. Patent No. 5,625,670] which are commonly owned.

“ An obviousness-type double patenting rejection prevents applicants from extending their patent term beyond statutory limits where an application claims merely an obvious variant of the claims in a *prior patent*.” *In re Emert*, 124 F.1458, 1460, 44 U.S.P.Q.2d 1149, 1152 (Fed.



Cir. 1997) (*citing In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 1052, 29 U.S.P.Q.2d 2010, 2015 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 441, 164 U.S.P.Q. 619, 622 (C.C.P.A. 1970)) (emphasis added). The terminal disclaimer of this patent is effective to prevent the term of this patent from extending the term of the claims in any of the *prior* patents at issue. As the term of this patent does not extend beyond the term of any prior patent at issue, no double patenting rejection is appropriate.

As seen from the above table, the Patent Owner is in the unusual position of having its later issued patents expire before its earlier issued patents. This is because the filing dates of Patent Owner's chain of continuation patents spans June 8, 1995, the effective date of the Uruguay Round Agreement Act (Pub. L. No. 103-465 (1994) ("URAA")). Under the URAA, the Patent Owner's patents issued from applications filed prior to June 8, 1995 have a term that expires 17 years from grant, subject to any terminal disclaimers (35 U.S.C. § 154(c)(1)), while the patents issued from applications filed after June 8, 1995, have a term that expires 20 years from the date on which the earliest application was filed (35 U.S.C. § 154(a)(2)). There is no suggestion that Congress intended the URAA to shorten the term available to any patent issuing from an application pending on June 8, 1995. To the contrary, the URAA provides the greater of the term available under the old law and the term available under the new law to patents issued from applications pending on June 8, 1995. 35 U.S.C. § 154(c)(1).

**A. Administrative Request**

The following request is made in the Office Action.

It order to resolve the conflict between proceedings, the Patent Owner is requested to either:

- (1) file terminal disclaimers in each of the REEXAM

- proceedings; or
- (2) resolve all conflicts between claims in the above identified REEXAM proceedings . . . ; or
- (3) provide persuasive arguments to overcome obvious double patenting rejections.

See Office Action, p. 16. Patent Owner declines to accept this request at this time. First, the Patent Owner notes that the terminal disclaimer in effect for this patent is sufficient to overcome any double patenting rejections based on the prior patents at issue. Second, there is no authority that requires a Patent Owner to identify potential claim conflicts among related applications based on the Examiner's unsubstantiated assertion that conflicts exist.

#### **B. Double Patenting Rejections**

Claims 1, 5, 24, 34, 115, and 119 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of each of U.S. Patent Nos. 5,819,172; 6,067,451; and 6,317,592. The Office Action fails to set forth a proper *prima facie* case of double patenting. First, the '172, '451 and '592 patents are not prior patents to the '946 patent. Second, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established over claim 1 of each of the '172, '451, and '592 patents.

The Office is entitled to consider double patenting during reexamination. *In re Lonardo*, 119 F.3d 960, 966, 43 U.S.P.Q.2d 1262, 1266 (Fed. Cir. 1997). However, there is no authority for the Office to reject an earlier issued patent over a later issued patent during a reexamination proceeding. "Obvious-type double patenting . . . is judicially created and prohibits an inventor from obtaining a *second* patent for claims that are not patentably distinct from claims of the *first* patent. *Id.* (citing *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 892, 225 U.S.P.Q. 645, 648 (Fed. Cir. 1985)) (emphasis added). As the '946 patent, at issue in this reexamination proceeding, was issued prior

to the issuance of the '172, '451 and '592 patents, the '946 patent cannot be said to extend the patent term of the claims of the later issued '172, '451 and '592 patents. The judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting does not provide the basis for a rejection of claims in an earlier issued patent over claims from a later issued patent. Accordingly, the double rejection patenting rejections set forth in the Office Action are improper and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action does not set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claims 1, 5, 24, 34, 115, and 119 over claim 1 of each of the '172, '451 and '592 patents. In determining whether obviousness-type double patenting exists, the relevant inquiry is whether the claim or claims pending in the current examination define an invention that is merely an obvious variation of an invention claimed in an issued patent. M.P.E.P. § 804 (8<sup>th</sup> Ed., Rev. 2, 2004). A rejection based on obviousness-type double patenting must demonstrate that the claimed subject matter is not patentably distinct from the subject matter claimed in the issued patent. *See In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 U.S.P.Q. 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985). The M.P.E.P. instructs examiners to employ the *Graham* factors, *see Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 U.S.P.Q. 459 (1966), used to establish a case of obviousness when making an obviousness-type double patenting analysis.

M.P.E.P. § 804. Further, the M.P.E.P. instructs examiners that:

Any obviousness-type double patenting rejection should make clear:

- (A) The differences between the inventions defined by the conflicting claims - a claim in the patent compared to a claim in the application; and
- (B) The reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention defined in the claim in issue is an obvious variation of the invention defined in a claim in the patent.

M.P.E.P. § 804; *see also In re Kaplan*, 789 F.2d 1574, 229 U.S.P.Q. 1574 (Fed. Cir. 1986) (to support an obviousness-type double patenting rejection “there must be some clear evidence to establish why the variation would have been obvious”).

The Office Action does not discuss any *Graham* factors, the differences between the inventions defined by the alleged conflicting claims, or the reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the inventions defined in the instant claims are merely obvious variations of the inventions defined in the claims of the '172, '451 and '592 patents. Accordingly, the Office Action does not set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness-type double patenting.

The Examiner asserts that claim 1 of the '496 patent and claim 1 of each of the '172, '451 and '592 patents each “teach the transmission of an originated message from originating processors in an email system to an RF receiver using an RF network and an interface, as well as an address to route the message.” Office Action, pp. 16-17. This statement of the broad subject matter addressed by Patent Owner’s patents is insufficient to establish a double patenting rejection. The Office Action highlights similarities of the claims without properly setting forth the differences between the inventions defined by the claims of the '946 patent and the inventions defined by the claims of the '172, '451 and '592 patents. For example, the Office Action does not identify where “an address of the at least one RF receiver to receive the originated information being associated with the originated information before transmission of the originated information to the at least one RF receiver” set forth in claim 1 is defined in claim 1 of the '172, '451 and '592 patents. The Office Action is silent regarding the language of claims 5, 24, 34, 115 and 119 and, thus, fails to set forth the differences between the invention

set forth by these claims and claim 1 of the '172, '451 and '592 patents. As the Office Action does not properly compare the claims of this patent to the claims of the '172, '451 and '592 patents to identify the differences, the Office Action cannot show that the rejected claims define an invention that is an obvious variation of the inventions defined in the claims of Patent Owner other patents.

For the above reasons, the Patent Owner respectfully submits that the double patenting rejections are improper. The Patent Owner requests that the double patent rejections of claims 1, 5, 24, 34, 115 and 119 over claim 1 of each of the '172, '451 and '592 patents be withdrawn.

**V. NEW DEPENDENT CLAIMS**

The present response adds new dependent claims 186-287, wherein new dependent claims 186-216 and 237-267 depend directly or indirectly from system claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12-17, 24-33, 47, 49-51, 55, 56, 58-63, 70-78, 91, 100-103, 115-118, 126-131, 144, 146-149, 157-162, 174-178, and 184, and new dependent claims 217-236 and 268-287 depend directly or indirectly from method claims 5-8, 11, 18-23, 34-46, 48, 52-54, 57, 64-69, 79-90, 92-99, 104, 112-114, 119-125, 132-143, 145, 150-156, 163-173, 179-183, and 185. Thus, each of the new dependent claims 186-287 recites the features of claims 1-185 shown above not to be taught or suggested by any of the references of record, particularly Cole, Verjinski, Perkins, Davaney, the Patent Owner's admissions of prior art, Harrison, and Shoch, whether taken individually or in combination with each other as set forth in the Office Action. Therefore, the same arguments presented above that claims 1-185 are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by any of the references of record apply as well to new dependent claims 186-287.

In addition new dependent claims 186-287 each recites further features of the invention as disclosed in the specification that are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record, particularly Cole, Verjinski, Perkins, Davaney, the Patent Owner's admissions of prior art, Harrison, and Shoch, whether taken individually or in combination with each other.

The support for the further features of the inventions as recited in the new dependent claims is indicated in the attached Appendix B. It should be noted that the disclosure (specification, drawings, abstract, appendix, etc) of the present patent is the same as the disclosure of each of the other Campana Patents. Therefore, support for the new dependent claims is indicated with respect to the disclosure of Campana Patent No. 5,479,472.

Therefore, Patent Owner respectfully submits that the references of record, whether taken individually or in combination with each other, fail to teach or suggest the features recited in the new dependent claims.

Accordingly, with respect to new dependent claims 186, 187, 217, 218, 237, 238, 269 and 270(63, 64, 93 and 94), Patent Owner respectfully submits the references of record, whether taken individually or in combination with each other, fail to teach or suggest that the system further includes a communication system, including the electronic mail system, which transmits electronic mail inputted to the electronic mail systems and further other information from a processor included in the communication system, that the processor included in the communication system sends the further other information to one of the destination processors using the RF information transmission network, and that the transmission of further other information can occur through the interface.

With respect to new dependent claims 188, 189, 219, 220, 239, 240, 271 and 272(65, 66, 95 and 96), Patent Owner respectfully submits the references of record, whether taken individually or in combination with each other, fail to teach or suggest that after reception of electronic mail including the originated information from the electronic mail system, information is deleted from the electronic mail and is not transmitted by the RF information transmission network, that the deleted information is a header in the electronic mail, and that the information is deleted by the interface.

With respect to new dependent claims 190, 221, 241, and 273(67 and 97), Patent Owner respectfully submits the references of record, whether taken individually or in combination with each other, fail to teach or suggest that the at least one RF receiver is coupled to a memory which stores the originated information received by the RF receiver, and that the at least one destination processor processes the originated information, after the originated information has been output from the memory, by executing an application program.

With respect to new dependent claims 191-193, 222-224, 242-244 and 274-276(68-70 and 98-100), Patent Owner respectfully submits the references of record, whether taken individually or in combination with each other, fail to teach or suggest that after reception of the originated information, a security check is performed to determine if the originated information should be transmitted by the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver, that the security check is performed by comparing an identification of the one RF receiver device with identifications of permissible RF receivers in the RF information transmission network that are permitted to receive RF transmissions and supplying the originated information to the RF information transmission network for transmission to the one RF receiver

if the identification of the one RF receiver device matches one of the identifications of the permissible RF receivers, and that the security check is performed by the interface.

With respect to new dependent claims 194-197, 225-228, 245-248 and 277-280(71-74 and 101-104), Patent Owner respectfully submits the references of record, whether taken individually or in combination with each other, fail to teach or suggest that each electronic mail system includes a processor which receives originated information from an originating processor, and causes the originated information to be transmitted to the destination processor via the interface and the RF information transmission network, that the processor adds the address of the interface, and that the processor is a gateway switch.

With respect to new dependent claims 198-201, 229-232, 249-252 and 281-284(75-78 and 105-108), Patent Owner respectfully submits the references of record, whether taken individually or in combination with each other, fail to teach or suggest that an address of the at least one destination processor is added to the originated information by the processor, that the address is an identification of the at least one RF receiver which is to receive the originated information, that the identification is an identifier number of the RF receiver, and that the processor is a gateway switch.

With respect to new dependent claims 202-204, 233-235, 253-255 and 285-287(79-81 and 109-111), Patent Owner respectfully submits the references of record, whether taken individually or in combination with each other, fail to teach or suggest that the interface receives the originated information from the at least one originating processor, processes the originated information, and supplies processed originated information to said RF information transmission network for transmission to the at least one RF receiver, that processes performed by the



interface includes varying content of the originated information, and that varying the content includes one of adding and deleting information.

With respect to new dependent claim 205 and 256(82), Patent Owner respectfully submits the references of record, whether taken individually or in combination with each other, fail to teach or suggest that a computer program stored on a storage medium is provided, that the computer program when executed causes the interface to perform the steps of receiving the originated information from the at least one originating processor, and supplying the originated information and an identification of the at least one RF receiver to the RF information transmission network which thereafter broadcasts the originated information to the at least one RF receiver.

With respect to new dependent claims 206, 207, 257 and 258(83 and 84), Patent Owner respectfully submits the references of record, whether taken individually or in combination with each other, fail to teach or suggest that a computer program stored on a storage medium is provided, that the computer program when executed causes the interface to perform the steps of deleting, after reception of the electronic mail by the interface, information from the electronic mail, and not transmitting deleted information by the RF information transmission network, and that the deleted information is a header of the electronic mail.

With respect to new dependent claims 208-211 and 259-262(85-88), Patent Owner respectfully submits the references of record, whether taken individually or in combination with each other, fail to teach or suggest that a computer program stored on a storage medium is provided and that the computer program when executed causes the processor to perform the steps of receiving the originated information from the at least one originating processor, and causing

the originated information to be transmitted to the destination processor via the interface and the RF information transmission network which thereafter broadcasts the originated information to the at least one RF receiver, that the processor adds the address of the interface, and that the processor is a gateway switch.

With respect to new dependent claims 212-215 and 263-266(89-92), Patent Owner respectfully submits the references of record, whether taken individually or in combination with each other, fail to teach or suggest that a computer program stored on a storage medium is provided, that the computer program when executed causes the processor to perform the step of adding an address of the at least one destination processor to the originated information, wherein the address is an identification of the at least one RF receiver which is to receive the originated information, that the identification is an identifier number of the RF receiver, and that the processor is a gateway switch.

With respect to new dependent claims 216, 236, 267 and 287, Patent Owner respectfully submits the references of record, whether taken individually or in combination with each other, fail to teach or suggest that the interface is coupled to at least one other electronic mail system, and that the interface receives originated information from an originating processor in the electronic mail system, and transmits the originated information to a RF receiver coupled to a destination processor in one of the at least one other electronic mail system via the RF information transmission network.

## **VI. CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present reexamination proceeding is in condition for a Notice of Intent to Issue a Reexamination Certificate, and an

early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number, in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0206, and please credit any excess fees to the same deposit account.

Dated: June 21, 2005  
Sturm & Fix, LLP  
Midland Building  
206 Sixth Avenue, 1213  
Des Moines, IA 50309-4076  
(515) 288-9589 (telephone)  
(515) 288-4860 (facsimile)

By: William H. Wright  
William H. Wright  
Registration No. 26,424

Of Counsel:

Brian M. Buroker  
Registration No. 39,125  
Christopher C. Campbell  
Registration No. 37,291  
Hunton & Williams, LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109  
Telephone: (202) 955-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 778-2201

Carl I. Brundidge  
Registration No. 29,621  
Mattingly, Stanger, Malur & Brundidge, P.C.  
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 370  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Telephone: (703) 684-1120  
Facsimile: (703) 684-1157

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 21st of June, 2005, I caused a copy of the foregoing  
RESPONSE to be served as follows:

***By First Class Mail:***

Customer Number 28,694

Novak Druce DeLuca & Quigg

1300 Eye Street, N.W.

Suite 400 East Tower

Washington DC US 20005



---

Brian M. Buroker

A

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
<p>1. A system for transmitting originated information from one of a plurality of originating processors contained in an electronic mail system to at least one RF receiver with the originated information originating from one of the plurality of originating processors and being transmitted by an RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver and for transmitting other originated information originating from one of the originating processors with the electronic mail system without using the RF information transmission network to at least one of a plurality of destination processors comprising:</p>	<p>“The ESA email integration was reduced to practice before the successful public demonstration on October 29, 1990. The email integration with the Network used the Network including all of its intended functionality. The processors from which email was sent and at which email was received used email software. The entry methods of Fig. 11 of the Campana patents were all operational prior to October 26, 1990. Two gateway switches with mailboxes and interface switches were operational with one being located at ESA in Chicago and another one being located at Telefind headquarters within the 3B2. The two gateway switches with mailboxes and interface switches performed the functions described in the Campana patents. Email headers were stripped. The interface switches at ESA and Telefind were respectively connected to a hub switch at those locations to forward the electronic mail messages with an added Messenger ID included in packets using the modified X.25 protocol of Fig. 6 of the prior art of the Campana patents. The Network forwarded the email messages, including Messenger ID, to the location of the pager as determined by the destination field in the local switch which is associated with the Messenger ID. The email messages were transmitted to the Safari computer with the revision 0</p>	<p>Q: “When [AT&amp;T] visited you on August 15<sup>th</sup> [1990], what did you show [them] regarding what you were doing?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “We gave [them] a great deal of background information and demonstrated the network, and also demonstrated to [them] some of the capabilities, including this e-mail interface that we had.” <i>See</i> White Declaration, Appendix E: Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 147, line 22 - Page 148, line 2.</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “I believe it was during that first meeting on August 15<sup>th</sup> [1990], that we had actually given [them] a pager and a mating printer that this pager plugged into that offloaded messages. We gave him some interface specifications, and a breadboard of this interface between the PC and the message pager.” <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 148, lines 11-16.</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “Through September [1990]... we were developing the e-mail gateway side of the project as well as refining many of the components. In</p>	<p>Q: Okay. Do you recall a meeting in New Jersey on October 26<sup>th</sup>, 1990 of which the Telefind pager was used to download messages into an AT&amp;T portable computer?</p> <p>Mr. Campana: I believe that was the date that it was demonstrated to AT&amp;T in New Jersey. <i>See</i> White Declaration, Appendix C: Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 176, lines 10-16.</p> <p>Mr. Campana: What took place at that demonstration was the commercial forum that [AT&amp;T] had requested, in preparation for the COMDEX show. That module right there. <i>See</i>, Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 176, line 25 - Page 177, line 4.</p>

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
	<p>software routine (either “C” or “Better Basic”). The email messages were available and processed by application programs in the Safari, Poquet or other portable computers.” <i>See</i> Campana Decl., Page 12, ¶31.</p> <p><i>See also</i> Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶ s 15 and 16; Page 8, ¶ 17, and Page 9, ¶ 23.</p>	<p>order to put e-mail, to glue these two networks together, it took many changes to many different pieces of equipment throughout the network. And code was being written to allow us to extract messages from the pager and display them on a laptop computer in an e-mail fashion. And that continued through October [1990]. I believe we had our production, our first production release of the operating software on or around October 6<sup>th</sup> of 1990. And on October 26<sup>th</sup> [1990] we demonstrated this to AT&amp;T in New Jersey on their -- as we learned by then, their Safari laptop product. At the onset of the project, we weren’t aware of what this project or application was.” <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 148, line 22- Page 149, line 11.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">*****</p> <p>Q: “And what had happened . . . at that meeting in New Jersey?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “The demonstration was successful.” <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 171, lines 11-25.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">*****</p> <p>Q: “Okay. So it is your position that in the visit to AT&amp;T in New Jersey on</p>	

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
		<p>October 26<sup>th</sup> [1990], e-mail was sent; is that right?"</p> <p>Mr. Campana: "Yes." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 5, 2002 (Day II), Page 265, line 17-20.</p>	
<p>at least one interface, one of the at least one interface connecting the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors to the RF information transmission network; and wherein</p> <p>the originated information is transmitted in association with an address of the one interface from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface with the electronic mail system responding to the address of the one interface to direct the originated information from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface; and</p>	<p>"Initially, email was manually processed to remove the email header because of its extreme length which, in many instances, was larger than the 512 character per message memory capacity of the Messenger. The email, which I manually inserted into the RF Network, contained the ID of the Messenger, which was an eight digit ID code as described on pages 3, 18 and 19 of the Telefind E-Mail Integration Document (Ex. #1). The Network responded to the ID code to transmit the email to the local switch/local service provider in Chicago which then wirelessly transmitted the email to a Messenger." <i>See</i> Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶ 15</p> <p>"During August and September 1990, the hub switch at ESA and the 3B2 computer at Telefind's corporate headquarters were used by ESA to implement the functions of a gateway switch with mailboxes 14 and an interface switch 304 as described in the Campana patents. These reductions to practice included the writing of suitable software to perform the functions of a mailbox</p>	<p>Q: "So the [translation software from the AT&amp;T e-mail system to the paging system of Telefind] was already done by the time of the COMDEX show; is that right?"</p> <p>Mr. Campana: "The software that was placed in the laptop, yes, it was finished, and in fact I think it was in an October 6<sup>th</sup> document, the listing." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 5, 2002 (Day II), Page 264, line 8- Page 265, line 3.</p>	<p>Q: All right. But you hadn't designed, yet designed an interface between the AT&amp;T system and the Telefind system that would connect AT&amp;T e-mail to the Telefind network, had you?</p> <p>Mr. Campana: I believe we did. I believe that the interface was to the 3B was operation at the demonstration we had in New Jersey. And was working in fact in early October [1990]. <i>See</i> Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 210, line 25 - Page 211, line 7.</p>



## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
	<p>as well as performing packetizing, a security check and header stripping. This development eliminated the manual cutting and pasting of email messages from ESA's computer into the Network. This software allowed the gateway switch and interface switch, as implemented in the Network hub switch at ESA, to retrieve email messages from the 3B2 computer. The ability to automatically retrieve and process email messages permitted the reduction to practice of the various addressing schemes described in the Campana patents (see, e.g., Figure 11) as well as the Telefind E-Mail Integration document (see, e.g., pages 3, 18, 19). These efforts to connect the hub network switch directly to an electronic mail system are partially reflected in the patent specification at, for example, column 32, lines 29-34 of the '592 patent:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Optionally, a plurality of electronic mail systems 1-N each as illustrated in FIG. 8 are connected to a data input port of the RF information transmission system which is preferably hub switch 116 of the prior art paging network described above with reference to FIGS. 2-6."</p> <p><i>See Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶ 16.</i></p>		

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
	<i>See also</i> Campana Decl., Page 8, ¶ 17, Page 9, ¶ 23 and Page 12, ¶ 31.		
the originated information is transmitted from the one of the at least one interface to the RF information transmission network with an address of the at least one RF receiver to receive the originated information being associated with the originated information before transmission of the originated information to the at least one RF receiver.	<p>“My conception included the pushing of electronic mail to a processor capable of executing electronic mail programming and other applications. To reduce this conception to practice, we used the Messenger which we attached to a personal computer (“PC”) located at ESA. We used the peripheral port of the Messenger, as described in Fig. 7 of the Campana Patents, to transmit the email messages to a PC.” <i>See</i> Campana Decl., Page 8, ¶17.</p> <p>“During these initial reductions to practice, ESA utilized a variety of desktop and portable computers as the ultimate destination processor which received email through the Messenger RF device. One such computer was a handheld computer called the Poqet. ESA built a working connection to a Poqet computer – a phone of which is shown in Exhibit 9. The hardware connection between the pager and Poqet was simpler than a conventional RS-232 serial port because the Poqet operated on the same batter voltages as the Messenger, required simple wiring connections and was similar to the version of the ‘Messenger RS-232 PORT’ drawing dated October 23, 1990 in the Telefind E-Mail Integration Document. We implemented</p>	<p>Mr. Campana: “[I]n July [1990], we had conceived that we could take the Internet and e-mail services and start this integration process with wireless media. And there are a number of pressing reasons for that. The messaging industry, the radio messaging industry had a number of problems. One is trying to get an alphanumeric message to one of these pages. You couldn’t go to an ordinary telephone and type in a text message on a telephone key pad and in this other island of communications called the Internet were thousands of PC’s, actually millions at that time, that had alphanumeric entry. So we conceived that idea and started to implement in July of 1990. Subsequently, we had a breadboard implementation.” <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 145, line 18- Page 146, line 7.</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “And ... that gave us a very early prototype then of this Circuit we needed to connect between the pager serial port and a PC computer. <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4,</p>	<p>Q.: “What were the design hurdles that you had to overcome in order to send a CompuServe message to a pager?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “Well, just to give us the highest level summary, it was extracting message from an e-mail system, interfacing it to the Telefind switches, transporting it through the Telefind network for transmission to the Messenger pager, and then transferring it from the Messenger to the e-mail program in what at that time wasn’t called -- it was called -- might call it a laptop but it was a 15 pound laptop computer.” <i>See</i> Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 65, lines 3-14.</p> <p>Q.: “Did someone have to write software in order to make this transfer happen?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “There would have had to have been an extraction program to permit the transfer between the [Messenger] pager.” <i>See</i> Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 66, lines 23- Page 67, line 4.</p>

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
	<p>extraction software having substantially the functionality of or used the revision 0 software of pages 6-12 and/or 12-14 of the Telefind E-Mail Integration Document. The Poqet computer used a basic email programming permitting the manipulation of the extracted messages.” <i>See</i> Campana Decl., Page 9, ¶23.</p> <p><i>See also</i> Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶ s 15 and 16 and Page 12, ¶ 31.</p>	<p>2002 (Day I), Page 146, lines 18-21.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">*****</p> <p>Q: “At that time, as of August 20<sup>th</sup> [1990], were you working just to develop prototypes with the AT&amp;T computer or were you working to develop prototypes for other brand computers?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “We were working with other brands. In fact, we were working with other brands prior to even the AT&amp;T meeting. We had PC’s on our facility that we used for office use, as well as we integrated into our network switches, and they were PCs’ or PC-based, I should say, and so we had it operational on, I believe, a Compaq office computer as well as several generic computers that we had at the facility.” <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 158, line 21- Page 159, line 7.</p>	<p>Q.: “That extraction program was on the Compaq computer, isn’t that right?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “I believe it resided in the Compaq computer.” <i>See</i> Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 67, lines 17-20.</p>
<p>5. A method for transmitting originated information from one of a plurality of originating processors contained in an electronic mail system to at least one RF receiver with the originated information originating from one of the plurality of originating processors and being</p>	<p>“The ESA email integration was reduced to practice before the successful public demonstration on October 29, 1990. The email integration with the Network used the Network including all of its intended functionality. The processors from which email was sent and at which email was</p>	<p>Q: “When [AT&amp;T] visited you on August 15<sup>th</sup> [1990], what did you show [them] regarding what you were doing?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “We gave [them] a great deal of background information and</p>	<p>Q: Okay. Do you recall a meeting in New Jersey on October 26<sup>th</sup>, 1990 of which the Telefind pager was used to download messages into an AT&amp;T portable computer?</p> <p>Mr. Campana: I believe that was the</p>

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
<p>transmitted by an RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver and for transmitting other originated information originating from one of the originating processors with the electronic mail system without using the RF information transmission network to at least one of a plurality of destination processors comprising:</p>	<p>received used email software. The entry methods of Fig. 11 of the Campana patents were all operational prior to October 26, 1990. Two gateway switches with mailboxes and interface switches were operational with one being located at ESA in Chicago and another one being located at Telefind headquarters within the 3B2. The two gateway switches with mailboxes and interface switches performed the functions described in the Campana patents. Email headers were stripped. The interface switches at ESA and Telefind were respectively connected to a hub switch at those locations to forward the electronic mail messages with an added Messenger ID included in packets using the modified X.25 protocol of Fig. 6 of the prior art of the Campana patents. The Network forwarded the email messages, including Messenger ID, to the location of the pager as determined by the destination field in the local switch which is associated with the Messenger ID. The email messages were transmitted to the Safari computer with the revision 0 software routine (either "C" or "Better Basic"). The email messages were available and processed by application programs in the Safari, Poquet or other portable computers." <i>See Campana Decl., Page 12, ¶31.</i></p> <p><i>See also Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶s 15 and 16; Page 8, ¶ 17, and Page 9, ¶ 23.</i></p>	<p>demonstrated the network, and also demonstrated to [them] some of the capabilities, including this e-mail interface that we had." <i>See Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 147, line 22 - Page 148, line 2.</i></p> <p>Mr. Campana: "I believe it was during that first meeting on August 15<sup>th</sup> [1990], that we had actually given [them] a pager and a mating printer that this pager plugged into that offloaded messages. We gave him some interface specifications, and a breadboard of this interface between the PC and the message pager." <i>See Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 148, lines 11-16.</i></p> <p>Mr. Campana: "Through September [1990]... we were developing the e-mail gateway side of the project as well as refining many of the components. In order to put e-mail, to glue these two networks together, it took many changes to many different pieces of equipment throughout the network. And code was being written to allow us to extract messages from the pager and display them on a laptop computer in an e-mail fashion. And that continued through October [1990]. I believe we had our production, our first production</p>	<p>date that it was demonstrated to AT&amp;T in New Jersey. <i>See Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 176, lines 10-16.</i></p> <p>Mr. Campana: What took place at that demonstration was the commercial forum that [AT&amp;T] had requested, in preparation for the COMDEX show. That module right there. <i>See, Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 176, line 25 - Page 177, line 4.</i></p>

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
		<p>release of the operating software on or around October 6<sup>th</sup> of 1990. And on October 26<sup>th</sup> [1990] we demonstrated this to AT&amp;T in New Jersey on their -- as we learned by then, their Safari laptop product. At the onset of the project, we weren't aware of what this project or application was." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 148, line 22- Page 149, line 11.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">*****</p> <p>Q: "And what had happened . . . at that meeting in New Jersey?"</p> <p>Mr. Campana: "The demonstration was successful." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 171, lines 11-25.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">*****</p> <p>Q: "Okay. So it is your position that in the visit to AT&amp;T in New Jersey on October 26<sup>th</sup> [1990], e-mail was sent; is that right?"</p> <p>Mr. Campana: "Yes." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 5, 2002 (Day II), Page 265, line 17-20.</p>	
connecting the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating	"Initially, email was manually processed to remove the email header because of its	Q: "So the [translation software from the AT&T e-mail system to the paging	Q: All right. But you hadn't designed, yet designed an interface between the

## **APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)**

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
<p>processors to the RF information transmission network with one of at least one interface;</p> <p>transmitting the originated information in association with an address of the one interface from one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface with the electronic mail system responding to the address of the one interface to direct the originated information from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface; and</p>	<p>extreme length which, in many instances, was larger than the 512 character per message memory capacity of the Messenger. The email, which I manually inserted into the RF Network, contained the ID of the Messenger, which was an eight digit ID code as described on pages 3, 18 and 19 of the Telefind E-Mail Integration Document (Ex. #1). The Network responded to the ID code to transmit the email to the local switch/local service provider in Chicago which then wirelessly transmitted the email to a Messenger.” <i>See</i> Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶ 15</p> <p>“During August and September 1990, the hub switch at ESA and the 3B2 computer at Telefind’s corporate headquarters were used by ESA to implement the functions of a gateway switch with mailboxes 14 and an interface switch 304 as described in the Campana patents. These reductions to practice included the writing of suitable software to perform the functions of a mailbox as well as performing packetizing, a security check and header stripping. This development eliminated the manual cutting and pasting of email messages from ESA’s computer into the Network. This software allowed the gateway switch and interface switch, as implemented in the Network hub switch at ESA, to retrieve email messages from the 3B2 computer. The ability to automatically retrieve and process email messages permitted the reduction to</p>	<p>system of Telefind] was already done by the time of the COMDEX show; is that right?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “The software that was placed in the laptop, yes, it was finished, and in fact I think it was in an October 6<sup>th</sup> document, the listing.” <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 5, 2002 (Day II), Page 264, line 8- Page 265, line 3.</p>	<p>AT&amp;T system and the Telefind system that would connect AT&amp;T e-mail to the Telefind network, had you?</p> <p>Mr. Campana: I believe we did. I believe that the interface was to the 3B was operation at the demonstration we had in New Jersey. And was working in fact in early October [1990]. <i>See</i> Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 210, line 25 - Page 211, line 7.</p>

## **APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)**

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
	<p>practice of the various addressing schemes described in the Campana patents (see, e.g., Figure 11) as well as the Telefind E-Mail Integration document (see, e.g., pages 3, 18, 19). These efforts to connect the hub network switch directly to an electronic mail system are partially reflected in the patent specification at, for example, column 32, lines 29-34 of the '592 patent:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Optionally, a plurality of electronic mail systems 1-N each as illustrated in FIG. 8 are connected to a data input port of the RF information transmission system which is preferably hub switch 116 of the prior art paging network described above with reference to FIGS. 2-6."</p> <p><i>See Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶ 16.</i></p> <p><i>See also Campana Decl., Page 8, ¶ 17, Page 9, ¶ 23 and Page 12, ¶ 31.</i></p>		
<p>transmitting the originated information from the one of the at least one interface to the RF information transmission network with an address of the at least one RF receiver to receive the originated information being associated with the</p>	<p>"My conception included the pushing of electronic mail to a processor capable of executing electronic mail programming and other applications. To reduce this conception to practice, we used the Messenger which we attached to a personal computer ("PC")</p>	<p>Mr. Campana: "[I]n July [1990], we had conceived that we could take the Internet and e-mail services and start this integration process with wireless media. And there are a number of pressing reasons for that. The</p>	<p>Q.: "What were the design hurdles that you had to overcome in order to send a CompuServe message to a pager?"</p> <p>Mr. Campana: "Well, just to give us the highest level summary, it was</p>

## **APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)**

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
<p>originated information before transmission of the originated information to the at least one RF receiver.</p>	<p>located at ESA. We used the peripheral port of the Messenger, as described in Fig. 7 of the Campana Patents, to transmit the email messages to a PC.” <i>See</i> Campana Decl., Page 8, ¶17.</p> <p>“During these initial reductions to practice, ESA utilized a variety of desktop and portable computers as the ultimate destination processor which received email through the Messenger RF device. One such computer was a handheld computer called the Poqet. ESA built a working connection to a Poqet computer – a phone of which is shown in Exhibit 9. The hardware connection between the pager and Poqet was simpler than a conventional RS-232 serial port because the Poqet operated on the same batter voltages as the Messenger, required simple wiring connections and was similar to the version of the ‘Messenger RS-232 PORT’ drawing dated October 23, 1990 in the Telefind E-Mail Intergration Document. We implemented extraction software having substantially the functionality of or used the revision 0 software of pages 6-12 and/or 12-14 of the Telefind E-Mail Integration Document. The Poqet computer used a basic email programming permitting the manipulation of the extracted messages.” <i>See</i> Campana Decl., Page 9, ¶23.</p> <p><i>See also</i> Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶s 15 and 16</p>	<p>messaging industry, the radio messaging industry had a number of problems. One is trying to get an alphanumeric message to one of these pages. You couldn’t go to an ordinary telephone and type in a text message on a telephone key pad and in this other island of communications called the Internet were thousands of PC’s, actually millions at that time, that had alphanumeric entry. So we conceived that idea and started to implement in July of 1990. Subsequently, we had a breadboard implementation.” <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 145, line 18- Page 146, line 7.</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “And ... that gave us a very early prototype then of this Circuit we needed to connect between the pager serial port and a PC computer. <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 146, lines 18-21.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">*****</p> <p>Q: “At that time, as of August 20<sup>th</sup> [1990], were you working just to develop prototypes with the AT&amp;T computer or were you working to develop prototypes for other brand computers?”</p>	<p>extracting message from an e-mail system, interfacing it to the Telefind switches, transporting it through the Telefind network for transmission to the Messenger pager, and then transferring it from the Messenger to the e-mail program in what at that time wasn’t called -- it was called -- might call it a laptop but it was a 15 pound laptop computer.” <i>See</i> Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 65, lines 3-14.</p> <p>Q.: “Did someone have to write software in order to make this transfer happen?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “There would have had to have been an extraction program to permit the transfer between the [Messenger] pager.” <i>See</i> Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 66, lines 23- Page 67, line 4.</p> <p>Q.: “That extraction program was on the Compaq computer, isn’t that right?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “I believe it resided in the Compaq computer.” <i>See</i> Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 67, lines 17-20.</p>



## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
	and Page 12, ¶ 31.	Mr. Campana: "We were working with other brands. In fact, we were working with other brands prior to even the AT&T meeting. We had PC's on our facility that we used for office use, as well as we integrated into our network switches, and they were PCs' or PC-based, I should say, and so we had it operational on, I believe, a Compaq office computer as well as several generic computers that we had at the facility." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 158, line 21- Page 159, line 7.	
24. A system for transmitting originated information from one of a plurality of originating processors, contained in any one of a plurality of electronic mail systems, to at least one RF receiver with the originated information originating from one of the plurality of originating processors and being transmitted by an RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver and for transmitting other originated information originating from one of the originating processors with one of the plurality of electronic mail systems without using the RF information transmission network to at least one of a plurality of destination processors comprising:	"The ESA email integration was reduced to practice before the successful public demonstration on October 29, 1990. The email integration with the Network used the Network including all of its intended functionality. The processors from which email was sent and at which email was received used email software. The entry methods of Fig. 11 of the Campana patents were all operational prior to October 26, 1990. Two gateway switches with mailboxes and interface switches were operational with one being located at ESA in Chicago and another one being located at Telefind headquarters within the 3B2. The two gateway switches with mailboxes and interface switches performed the functions described in the	Q: "When [AT&T] visited you on August 15 <sup>th</sup> [1990], what did you show [them] regarding what you were doing?"  Mr. Campana: "We gave [them] a great deal of background information and demonstrated the network, and also demonstrated to [them] some of the capabilities, including this e-mail interface that we had." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 147, line 22 - Page 148, line 2.  Mr. Campana: "I believe it was during that first meeting on August 15 <sup>th</sup> [1990], that we had actually given [them] a	Q: Okay. Do you recall a meeting in New Jersey on October 26 <sup>th</sup> , 1990 of which the Telefind pager was used to download messages into an AT&T portable computer?  Mr. Campana: I believe that was the date that it was demonstrated to AT&T in New Jersey. <i>See</i> Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 176, lines 10-16.  Mr. Campana: What took place at that demonstration was the commercial forum that [AT&T] had requested, in preparation for the COMDEX show. That module right there. <i>See</i> , Campana

## **APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)**

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
	<p>Campana patents. Email headers were stripped. The interface switches at ESA and Telefind were respectively connected to a hub switch at those locations to forward the electronic mail messages with an added Messenger ID included in packets using the modified X.25 protocol of Fig. 6 of the prior art of the Campana patents. The Network forwarded the email messages, including Messenger ID, to the location of the pager as determined by the destination field in the local switch which is associated with the Messenger ID. The email messages were transmitted to the Safari computer with the revision 0 software routine (either "C" or "Better Basic"). The email messages were available and processed by application programs in the Safari, Poquet or other portable computers." <i>See</i> Campana Decl., Page 12, ¶31.</p> <p><i>See also</i> Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶s 15 and 16; Page 8, ¶ 17, and Page 9, ¶ 23.</p>	<p>pager and a mating printer that this pager plugged into that offloaded messages. We gave him some interface specifications, and a breadboard of this interface between the PC and the message pager." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 148, lines 11-16.</p> <p>Mr. Campana: "Through September [1990]... we were developing the e-mail gateway side of the project as well as refining many of the components. In order to put e-mail, to glue these two networks together, it took many changes to many different pieces of equipment throughout the network. And code was being written to allow us to extract messages from the pager and display them on a laptop computer in an e-mail fashion. And that continued through October [1990]. I believe we had our production, our first production release of the operating software on or around October 6<sup>th</sup> of 1990. And on October 26<sup>th</sup> [1990] we demonstrated this to AT&amp;T in New Jersey on their -- as we learned by then, their Safari laptop product. At the onset of the project, we weren't aware of what this project or application was." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 148, line 22- Page</p>	<p>Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 176, line 25 - Page 177, line 4.</p>

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
		<p>149, line 11.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">*****</p> <p>Q: "And what had happened . . . at that meeting in New Jersey?"</p> <p>Mr. Campana: "The demonstration was successful." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 171, lines 11-25.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">*****</p> <p>Q: "Okay. So it is your position that in the visit to AT&amp;T in New Jersey on October 26<sup>th</sup> [1990], e-mail was sent; is that right?"</p> <p>Mr. Campana: "Yes." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 5, 2002 (Day II), Page 265, line 17-20.</p>	
<p>at least one interface, one of the at least one interface connecting at least one of the plurality of electronic mail systems containing the plurality of originating processors to the RF information transmission network; and wherein</p> <p>the originated information is transmitted in association with an address of the one interface from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface with one of the plurality of electronic mail</p>	<p>"Initially, email was manually processed to remove the email header because of its extreme length which, in many instances, was larger than the 512 character per message memory capacity of the Messenger. The email, which I manually inserted into the RF Network, contained the ID of the Messenger, which was an eight digit ID code as described on pages 3, 18 and 19 of the Telefind E-Mail Integration Document (Ex. #1). The Network responded to the ID code to transmit the email to the local switch/local service provider in</p>	<p>Q: "So the [translation software from the AT&amp;T e-mail system to the paging system of Telefind] was already done by the time of the COMDEX show; is that right?"</p> <p>Mr. Campana: "The software that was placed in the laptop, yes, it was finished, and in fact I think it was in an October 6<sup>th</sup> document, the listing." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 5, 2002 (Day II), Page 264, line 8- Page</p>	<p>Q: All right. But you hadn't designed, yet designed an interface between the AT&amp;T system and the Telefind system that would connect AT&amp;T e-mail to the Telefind network, had you?</p> <p>Mr. Campana: I believe we did. I believe that the interface was to the 3B was operation at the demonstration we had in New Jersey. And was working in fact in early October [1990]. <i>See</i> Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12,</p>

## **APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)**

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
<p>systems responding to the address of the one interface to direct the originated information from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface; and</p>	<p>Chicago which then wirelessly transmitted the email to a Messenger.” <i>See</i> Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶ 15</p> <p>“During August and September 1990, the hub switch at ESA and the 3B2 computer at Telefind’s corporate headquarters were used by ESA to implement the functions of a gateway switch with mailboxes 14 and an interface switch 304 as described in the Campana patents. These reductions to practice included the writing of suitable software to perform the functions of a mailbox as well as performing packetizing, a security check and header stripping. This development eliminated the manual cutting and pasting of email messages from ESA’s computer into the Network. This software allowed the gateway switch and interface switch, as implemented in the Network hub switch at ESA, to retrieve email messages from the 3B2 computer. The ability to automatically retrieve and process email messages permitted the reduction to practice of the various addressing schemes described in the Campana patents (see, e.g., Figure 11) as well as the Telefind E-Mail Integration document (see, e.g., pages 3, 18, 19). These efforts to connect the hub network switch directly to an electronic mail system are partially reflected in the patent specification at, for example, column 32, lines 29-34 of the ‘592 patent:</p>	<p>265, line 3.</p>	<p>2002 (Day II), Page 210, line 25 - Page 211, line 7.</p>

## **APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)**

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
	<p>Optionally, a plurality of electronic mail systems 1-N each as illustrated in FIG. 8 are connected to a data input port of the RF information transmission system which is preferably hub switch 116 of the prior art paging network described above with reference to FIGS. 2-6.”</p> <p><i>See Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶ 16.</i></p> <p><i>See also Campana Decl., Page 8, ¶ 17, Page 9, ¶ 23 and Page 12, ¶ 31.</i></p>		
<p>the originated information is transmitted from the one of the at least one interface to the RF information transmission network with an address of the at least one RF receiver to receive the originated information being associated with the originated information before transmission of the originated information to the at least one RF receiver.</p>	<p>“My conception included the pushing of electronic mail to a processor capable of executing electronic mail programming and other applications. To reduce this conception to practice, we used the Messenger which we attached to a personal computer (“PC”) located at ESA. We used the peripheral port of the Messenger, as described in Fig. 7 of the Campana Patents, to transmit the email messages to a PC.” <i>See Campana Decl., Page 8, ¶17.</i></p> <p>“During these initial reductions to practice, ESA utilized a variety of desktop and portable computers as the ultimate destination processor which received email through the</p>		

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
	<p>Messenger RF device. One such computer was a handheld computer called the Poqet. ESA built a working connection to a Poqet computer – a phone of which is shown in Exhibit 9. The hardware connection between the pager and Poqet was simpler than a conventional RS-232 serial port because the Poqet operated on the same batter voltages as the Messenger, required simple wiring connections and was similar to the version of the 'Messenger RS-232 PORT' drawing dated October 23, 1990 in the Telefind E-Mail Intergration Document. We implemented extraction software having substantially the functionality of or used the revision 0 software of pages 6-12 and/or 12-14 of the Telefind E-Mail Integration Document. The Poqet computer used a basic email programming permitting the manipulation of the extracted messages." <i>See</i> Campana Decl., Page 9, ¶23.</p> <p><i>See also</i> Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶s 15 and 16 and Page 12, ¶ 31.</p>		
<p>34. A method for transmitting originated information from one of a plurality of originating processors, contained in any one of a plurality of electronic mail systems, to at least one RF receiver with the originated information originating from one of the plurality of originating</p>	<p>"The ESA email integration was reduced to practice before the successful public demonstration on October 29, 1990. The email integration with the Network used the Network including all of its intended functionality. The processors from which email was sent and at which email was</p>	<p>Q: "When [AT&amp;T] visited you on August 15<sup>th</sup> [1990], what did you show [them] regarding what you were doing?"</p> <p>Mr. Campana: "We gave [them] a great deal of background information and</p>	<p>Q: Okay. Do you recall a meeting in New Jersey on October 26<sup>th</sup>, 1990 of which the Telefind pager was used to download messages into an AT&amp;T portable computer?</p> <p>Mr. Campana: I believe that was the</p>

## **APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)**

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
<p>processors and being transmitted by an RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver and for transmitting other originated information originating from one of the originating processors with one of the plurality of electronic mail systems without using the RF information transmission network to at least one of a plurality of destination processors comprising:</p>	<p>received used email software. The entry methods of Fig. 11 of the Campana patents were all operational prior to October 26, 1990. Two gateway switches with mailboxes and interface switches were operational with one being located at ESA in Chicago and another one being located at Telefind headquarters within the 3B2. The two gateway switches with mailboxes and interface switches performed the functions described in the Campana patents. Email headers were stripped. The interface switches at ESA and Telefind were respectively connected to a hub switch at those locations to forward the electronic mail messages with an added Messenger ID included in packets using the modified X.25 protocol of Fig. 6 of the prior art of the Campana patents. The Network forwarded the email messages, including Messenger ID, to the location of the pager as determined by the destination field in the local switch which is associated with the Messenger ID. The email messages were transmitted to the Safari computer with the revision 0 software routine (either "C" or "Better Basic"). The email messages were available and processed by application programs in the Safari, Poquet or other portable computers." <i>See Campana Decl., Page 12, ¶31.</i></p> <p><i>See also Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶ s 15 and 16; Page 8, ¶ 17, and Page 9, ¶ 23.</i></p>	<p>demonstrated the network, and also demonstrated to [them] some of the capabilities, including this e-mail interface that we had." <i>See Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 147, line 22 - Page 148, line 2.</i></p> <p>Mr. Campana: "I believe it was during that first meeting on August 15<sup>th</sup> [1990], that we had actually given [them] a pager and a mating printer that this pager plugged into that offloaded messages. We gave him some interface specifications, and a breadboard of this interface between the PC and the message pager." <i>See Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 148, lines 11-16.</i></p> <p>Mr. Campana: "Through September [1990]... we were developing the e-mail gateway side of the project as well as refining many of the components. In order to put e-mail, to glue these two networks together, it took many changes to many different pieces of equipment throughout the network. And code was being written to allow us to extract messages from the pager and display them on a laptop computer in an e-mail fashion. And that continued through October [1990]. I believe we had our production, our first production</p>	<p>date that it was demonstrated to AT&amp;T in New Jersey. <i>See Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 176, lines 10-16.</i></p> <p>Mr. Campana: What took place at that demonstration was the commercial forum that [AT&amp;T] had requested, in preparation for the COMDEX show. That module right there. <i>See, Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 176, line 25 - Page 177, line 4.</i></p>

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
		<p>release of the operating software on or around October 6<sup>th</sup> of 1990. And on October 26<sup>th</sup> [1990] we demonstrated this to AT&amp;T in New Jersey on their -- as we learned by then, their Safari laptop product. At the onset of the project, we weren't aware of what this project or application was." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 148, line 22- Page 149, line 11.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">*****</p> <p>Q: "And what had happened . . . at that meeting in New Jersey?"</p> <p>Mr. Campana: "The demonstration was successful." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 171, lines 11-25.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">*****</p> <p>Q: "Okay. So it is your position that in the visit to AT&amp;T in New Jersey on October 26<sup>th</sup> [1990], e-mail was sent; is that right?"</p> <p>Mr. Campana: "Yes." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 5, 2002 (Day II), Page 265, line 17-20.</p>	
connecting at least one of the plurality of electronic mail systems containing the	"Initially, email was manually processed to remove the email header because of its	Q: "So the [translation software from the AT&T e-mail system to the paging	Q: All right. But you hadn't designed, yet designed an interface between the



## **APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)**

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
<p>plurality of originating processors to the RF information transmission network with at least one interface;</p> <p>transmitting the originated information in association with an address of the one interface from one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface with one of the plurality of electronic mail system responding to the address of the one interface to direct the originated information from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface; and</p>	<p>extreme length which, in many instances, was larger than the 512 character per message memory capacity of the Messenger. The email, which I manually inserted into the RF Network, contained the ID of the Messenger, which was an eight digit ID code as described on pages 3, 18 and 19 of the Telefind E-Mail Integration Document (Ex. #1). The Network responded to the ID code to transmit the email to the local switch/local service provider in Chicago which then wirelessly transmitted the email to a Messenger.” <i>See</i> Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶ 15</p> <p>“During August and September 1990, the hub switch at ESA and the 3B2 computer at Telefind’s corporate headquarters were used by ESA to implement the functions of a gateway switch with mailboxes 14 and an interface switch 304 as described in the Campana patents. These reductions to practice included the writing of suitable software to perform the functions of a mailbox as well as performing packetizing, a security check and header stripping. This development eliminated the manual cutting and pasting of email messages from ESA’s computer into the Network. This software allowed the gateway switch and interface switch, as implemented in the Network hub switch at ESA, to retrieve email messages from the 3B2 computer. The ability to automatically retrieve and process email messages permitted the reduction to</p>	<p>system of Telefind] was already done by the time of the COMDEX show; is that right?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “The software that was placed in the laptop, yes, it was finished, and in fact I think it was in an October 6<sup>th</sup> document, the listing.” <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 5, 2002 (Day II), Page 264, line 8- Page 265, line 3.</p>	<p>AT&amp;T system and the Telefind system that would connect AT&amp;T e-mail to the Telefind network, had you?</p> <p>Mr. Campana: I believe we did. I believe that the interface was to the 3B was operation at the demonstration we had in New Jersey. And was working in fact in early October [1990]. <i>See</i> Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 210, line 25 - Page 211, line 7.</p>

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
	<p>practice of the various addressing schemes described in the Campana patents (see, e.g., Figure 11) as well as the Telefind E-Mail Integration document (see, e.g., pages 3, 18, 19). These efforts to connect the hub network switch directly to an electronic mail system are partially reflected in the patent specification at, for example, column 32, lines 29-34 of the '592 patent:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Optionally, a plurality of electronic mail systems 1-N each as illustrated in FIG. 8 are connected to a data input port of the RF information transmission system which is preferably hub switch 116 of the prior art paging network described above with reference to FIGS. 2-6.”</p> <p><i>See Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶ 16.</i></p> <p><i>See also Campana Decl., Page 8, ¶ 17, Page 9, ¶ 23 and Page 12, ¶ 31.</i></p>		
<p>transmitting the originated information from one of the at least one interface to the RF information transmission network with an address of the at least one RF receiver to receive the originated information being associated with the originated information</p>	<p>“My conception included the pushing of electronic mail to a processor capable of executing electronic mail programming and other applications. To reduce this conception to practice, we used the Messenger which we attached to a personal computer (“PC”)</p>	<p>Mr. Campana: “[I]n July [1990], we had conceived that we could take the Internet and e-mail services and start this integration process with wireless media. And there are a number of pressing reasons for that. The</p>	<p>Q.: “What were the design hurdles that you had to overcome in order to send a CompuServe message to a pager?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “Well, just to give us the highest level summary, it was</p>

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
before transmission of the originated information to the at least one RF receiver.	<p>located at ESA. We used the peripheral port of the Messenger, as described in Fig. 7 of the Campana Patents, to transmit the email messages to a PC.” <i>See</i> Campana Decl., Page 8, ¶17.</p> <p>“During these initial reductions to practice, ESA utilized a variety of desktop and portable computers as the ultimate destination processor which received email through the Messenger RF device. One such computer was a handheld computer called the Poqet. ESA built a working connection to a Poqet computer – a phone of which is shown in Exhibit 9. The hardware connection between the pager and Poqet was simpler than a conventional RS-232 serial port because the Poqet operated on the same batter voltages as the Messenger, required simple wiring connections and was similar to the version of the ‘Messenger RS-232 PORT’ drawing dated October 23, 1990 in the Telefind E-Mail Intergration Document. We implemented extraction software having substantially the functionality of or used the revision 0 software of pages 6-12 and/or 12-14 of the Telefind E-Mail Integration Document. The Poqet computer used a basic email programming permitting the manipulation of the extracted messages.” <i>See</i> Campana Decl., Page 9, ¶23.</p> <p><i>See also</i> Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶s 15 and 16</p>	<p>messaging industry, the radio messaging industry had a number of problems. One is trying to get an alphanumeric message to one of these pages. You couldn’t go to an ordinary telephone and type in a text message on a telephone key pad and in this other island of communications called the Internet were thousands of PC’s, actually millions at that time, that had alphanumeric entry. So we conceived that idea and started to implement in July of 1990. Subsequently, we had a breadboard implementation.” <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 145, line 18- Page 146, line 7.</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “And ... that gave us a very early prototype then of this Circuit we needed to connect between the pager serial port and a PC computer. <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 146, lines 18-21.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">*****</p> <p>Q: “At that time, as of August 20<sup>th</sup> [1990], were you working just to develop prototypes with the AT&amp;T computer or were you working to develop prototypes for other brand computers?”</p>	<p>extracting message from an e-mail system, interfacing it to the Telefind switches, transporting it through the Telefind network for transmission to the Messenger pager, and then transferring it from the Messenger to the e-mail program in what at that time wasn’t called -- it was called -- might call it a laptop but it was a 15 pound laptop computer.” <i>See</i> Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 65, lines 3-14.</p> <p>Q.: “Did someone have to write software in order to make this transfer happen?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “There would have had to have been an extraction program to permit the transfer between the [Messenger] pager.” <i>See</i> Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 66, lines 23- Page 67, line 4.</p> <p>Q.: “That extraction program was on the Compaq computer, isn’t that right?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “I believe it resided in the Compaq computer.” <i>See</i> Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 67, lines 17-20.</p>

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
	and Page 12, ¶ 31.	Mr. Campana: "We were working with other brands. In fact, we were working with other brands prior to even the AT&T meeting. We had PC's on our facility that we used for office use, as well as we integrated into our network switches, and they were PCs' or PC-based, I should say, and so we had it operational on, I believe, a Compaq office computer as well as several generic computers that we had at the facility." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 158, line 21- Page 159, line 7.	
115. A system for transmitting originated information from one of a plurality of originating processors contained in an electronic mail system to at least one RF receiver with the originated information originating from one of the plurality of originating processors and being transmitted by a RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver and for transmitting other originated information originating from one of the plurality of originating processors with the electronic mail system without using the RF information transmission network to at least one of a plurality of destination processors comprising:	"The ESA email integration was reduced to practice before the successful public demonstration on October 29, 1990. The email integration with the Network used the Network including all of its intended functionality. The processors from which email was sent and at which email was received used email software. The entry methods of Fig. 11 of the Campana patents were all operational prior to October 26, 1990. Two gateway switches with mailboxes and interface switches were operational with one being located at ESA in Chicago and another one being located at Telefind headquarters within the 3B2. The two gateway switches with mailboxes and interface switches performed the functions described in the	<p>Q: "When [AT&amp;T] visited you on August 15<sup>th</sup> [1990], what did you show [them] regarding what you were doing?"</p> <p>Mr. Campana: "We gave [them] a great deal of background information and demonstrated the network, and also demonstrated to [them] some of the capabilities, including this e-mail interface that we had." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 147, line 22 - Page 148, line 2.</p> <p>Mr. Campana: "I believe it was during that first meeting on August 15<sup>th</sup> [1990], that we had actually given [them] a</p>	<p>Q: Okay. Do you recall a meeting in New Jersey on October 26<sup>th</sup>, 1990 of which the Telefind pager was used to download messages into an AT&amp;T portable computer?</p> <p>Mr. Campana: I believe that was the date that it was demonstrated to AT&amp;T in New Jersey. <i>See</i> Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 176, lines 10-16.</p> <p>Mr. Campana: What took place at that demonstration was the commercial forum that [AT&amp;T] had requested, in preparation for the COMDEX show. That module right there. <i>See</i>, Campana</p>

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
	<p>Campana patents. Email headers were stripped. The interface switches at ESA and Telefind were respectively connected to a hub switch at those locations to forward the electronic mail messages with an added Messenger ID included in packets using the modified X.25 protocol of Fig. 6 of the prior art of the Campana patents. The Network forwarded the email messages, including Messenger ID, to the location of the pager as determined by the destination field in the local switch which is associated with the Messenger ID. The email messages were transmitted to the Safari computer with the revision 0 software routine (either "C" or "Better Basic"). The email messages were available and processed by application programs in the Safari, Poquet or other portable computers." <i>See</i> Campana Decl., Page 12, ¶31.</p> <p><i>See also</i> Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶s 15 and 16; Page 8, ¶ 17, and Page 9, ¶ 23.</p>	<p>pager and a mating printer that this pager plugged into that offloaded messages. We gave him some interface specifications, and a breadboard of this interface between the PC and the message pager." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 148, lines 11-16.</p> <p>Mr. Campana: "Through September [1990]... we were developing the e-mail gateway side of the project as well as refining many of the components. In order to put e-mail, to glue these two networks together, it took many changes to many different pieces of equipment throughout the network. And code was being written to allow us to extract messages from the pager and display them on a laptop computer in an e-mail fashion. And that continued through October [1990]. I believe we had our production, our first production release of the operating software on or around October 6<sup>th</sup> of 1990. And on October 26<sup>th</sup> [1990] we demonstrated this to AT&amp;T in New Jersey on their -- as we learned by then, their Safari laptop product. At the onset of the project, we weren't aware of what this project or application was." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 148, line 22- Page</p>	<p>Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 176, line 25 - Page 177, line 4.</p>

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
		<p>149, line 11.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">*****</p> <p>Q: “And what had happened . . . at that meeting in New Jersey?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “The demonstration was successful.” <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 171, lines 11-25.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">*****</p> <p>Q: “Okay. So it is your position that in the visit to AT&amp;T in New Jersey on October 26<sup>th</sup> [1990], e-mail was sent; is that right?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “Yes.” <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 5, 2002 (Day II), Page 265, line 17-20.</p>	
<p>at least one interface, one of the at least one interface connecting the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors to the RF information transmission network; and wherein</p> <p>the originated information is transmitted in association with an address of the one interface from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface with the electronic mail system responding</p>	<p>“Initially, email was manually processed to remove the email header because of its extreme length which, in many instances, was larger than the 512 character per message memory capacity of the Messenger. The email, which I manually inserted into the RF Network, contained the ID of the Messenger, which was an eight digit ID code as described on pages 3, 18 and 19 of the Telefind E-Mail Integration Document (Ex. #1). The Network responded to the ID code to transmit the email to the local switch/local service provider in</p>	<p>Q: “So the [translation software from the AT&amp;T e-mail system to the paging system of Telefind] was already done by the time of the COMDEX show; is that right?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “The software that was placed in the laptop, yes, it was finished, and in fact I think it was in an October 6<sup>th</sup> document, the listing.” <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 5, 2002 (Day II), Page 264, line 8- Page</p>	<p>Q: All right. But you hadn’t designed, yet designed an interface between the AT&amp;T system and the Telefind system that would connect AT&amp;T e-mail to the Telefind network, had you?</p> <p>Mr. Campana: I believe we did. I believe that the interface was to the 3B was operation at the demonstration we had in New Jersey. And was working in fact in early October [1990]. <i>See</i> Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12,</p>

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
<p>to the address of the one interface to direct the originated information from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface; and</p>	<p>Chicago which then wirelessly transmitted the email to a Messenger.” <i>See</i> Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶ 15</p> <p>“During August and September 1990, the hub switch at ESA and the 3B2 computer at Telefind’s corporate headquarters were used by ESA to implement the functions of a gateway switch with mailboxes 14 and an interface switch 304 as described in the Campana patents. These reductions to practice included the writing of suitable software to perform the functions of a mailbox as well as performing packetizing, a security check and header stripping. This development eliminated the manual cutting and pasting of email messages from ESA’s computer into the Network. This software allowed the gateway switch and interface switch, as implemented in the Network hub switch at ESA, to retrieve email messages from the 3B2 computer. The ability to automatically retrieve and process email messages permitted the reduction to practice of the various addressing schemes described in the Campana patents (see, e.g., Figure 11) as well as the Telefind E-Mail Integration document (see, e.g., pages 3, 18, 19). These efforts to connect the hub network switch directly to an electronic mail system are partially reflected in the patent specification at, for example, column 32, lines 29-34 of the ‘592 patent:</p>	<p>265, line 3.</p>	<p>2002 (Day II), Page 210, line 25 - Page 211, line 7.</p>

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
	<p>Optionally, a plurality of electronic mail systems 1-N each as illustrated in FIG. 8 are connected to a data input port of the RF information transmission system which is preferably hub switch 116 of the prior art paging network described above with reference to FIGS. 2-6.”</p> <p><i>See Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶ 16.</i></p> <p><i>See also Campana Decl., Page 8, ¶ 17, Page 9, ¶ 23 and Page 12, ¶ 31.</i></p>		
<p>the RF information transmission system provides transmission of the originated information from the one interface through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver in response to information inputted to the system.</p>	<p>“My conception included the pushing of electronic mail to a processor capable of executing electronic mail programming and other applications. To reduce this conception to practice, we used the Messenger which we attached to a personal computer (“PC”) located at ESA. We used the peripheral port of the Messenger, as described in Fig. 7 of the Campana Patents, to transmit the email messages to a PC.” <i>See Campana Decl., Page 8, ¶17.</i></p> <p>“During these initial reductions to practice, ESA utilized a variety of desktop and portable computers as the ultimate destination processor which received email through the</p>	<p>Mr. Campana: “[I]n July [1990], we had conceived that we could take the Internet and e-mail services and start this integration process with wireless media. And there are a number of pressing reasons for that. The messaging industry, the radio messaging industry had a number of problems. One is trying to get an alphanumeric message to one of these pages. You couldn’t go to an ordinary telephone and type in a text message on a telephone key pad and in this other island of communications called the Internet were thousands of PC’s, actually millions at that time, that had</p>	<p>Q.: “What were the design hurdles that you had to overcome in order to send a CompuServe message to a pager?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “Well, just to give us the highest level summary, it was extracting message from an e-mail system, interfacing it to the Telefind switches, transporting it through the Telefind network for transmission to the Messenger pager, and then transferring it from the Messenger to the e-mail program in what at that time wasn’t called -- it was called -- might call it a laptop but it was a 15 pound laptop computer.” <i>See Campana Depo.</i></p>



## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
	<p>Messenger RF device. One such computer was a handheld computer called the Poqet. ESA built a working connection to a Poqet computer – a phone of which is shown in Exhibit 9. The hardware connection between the pager and Poqet was simpler than a conventional RS-232 serial port because the Poqet operated on the same batter voltages as the Messenger, required simple wiring connections and was similar to the version of the 'Messenger RS-232 PORT' drawing dated October 23, 1990 in the Telefind E-Mail Intergration Document. We implemented extraction software having substantially the functionality of or used the revision 0 software of pages 6-12 and/or 12-14 of the Telefind E-Mail Integration Document. The Poqet computer used a basic email programming permitting the manipulation of the extracted messages." <i>See</i> Campana Decl., Page 9, ¶23.</p> <p><i>See also</i> Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶s 15 and 16 and Page 12, ¶ 31.</p>	<p>alphanumeric entry. So we conceived that idea and started to implement in July of 1990. Subsequently, we had a breadboard implementation." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 145, line 18- Page 146, line 7.</p> <p>Mr. Campana: "And ... that gave us a very early prototype then of this Circuit we needed to connect between the pager serial port and a PC computer. <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 146, lines 18-21.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">*****</p> <p>Q: "At that time, as of August 20<sup>th</sup> [1990], were you working just to develop prototypes with the AT&amp;T computer or were you working to develop prototypes for other brand computers?"</p> <p>Mr. Campana: "We were working with other brands. In fact, we were working with other brands prior to even the AT&amp;T meeting. We had PC's on our facility that we used for office use, as well as we integrated into our network switches, and they were PCs' or PC-based, I should say, and so we had it operational on, I believe, a Compaq office computer as well as several</p>	<p>Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 65, lines 3-14.</p> <p>Q.: "Did someone have to write software in order to make this transfer happen?"</p> <p>Mr. Campana: "There would have had to have been an extraction program to permit the transfer between the [Messenger] pager." <i>See</i> Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 66, lines 23- Page 67, line 4.</p> <p>Q.: "That extraction program was on the Compaq computer, isn't that right?"</p> <p>Mr. Campana: "I believe it resided in the Compaq computer." <i>See</i> Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 67, lines 17-20.</p>

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
		generic computers that we had at the facility.” <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 158, line 21- Page 159, line 7.	
119. A method for transmitting originated information from one of a plurality of originating processors contained in an electronic mail system to at least one RF receiver with the originated information originating from one of the plurality of originating processors and being transmitted by a RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver and for transmitting other originated information originating from one of the plurality of originating processors with the electronic mail system without using the RF information transmission network to at least one of a plurality of destination processors comprising:	<p>“The ESA email integration was reduced to practice before the successful public demonstration on October 29, 1990. The email integration with the Network used the Network including all of its intended functionality. The processors from which email was sent and at which email was received used email software. The entry methods of Fig. 11 of the Campana patents were all operational prior to October 26, 1990. Two gateway switches with mailboxes and interface switches were operational with one being located at ESA in Chicago and another one being located at Telefind headquarters within the 3B2. The two gateway switches with mailboxes and interface switches performed the functions described in the Campana patents. Email headers were stripped. The interface switches at ESA and Telefind were respectively connected to a hub switch at those locations to forward the electronic mail messages with an added Messenger ID included in packets using the modified X.25 protocol of Fig. 6 of the prior art of the Campana patents. The Network forwarded the email messages, including Messenger ID, to the location of the pager as</p>	<p>Q: “When [AT&amp;T] visited you on August 15<sup>th</sup> [1990], what did you show [them] regarding what you were doing?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “We gave [them] a great deal of background information and demonstrated the network, and also demonstrated to [them] some of the capabilities, including this e-mail interface that we had.” <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 147, line 22 - Page 148, line 2.</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “I believe it was during that first meeting on August 15<sup>th</sup> [1990], that we had actually given [them] a pager and a mating printer that this pager plugged into that offloaded messages. We gave him some interface specifications, and a breadboard of this interface between the PC and the message pager.” <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 148, lines 11-16.</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “Through September</p>	<p>Q: Okay. Do you recall a meeting in New Jersey on October 26<sup>th</sup>, 1990 of which the Telefind pager was used to download messages into an AT&amp;T portable computer?</p> <p>Mr. Campana: I believe that was the date that it was demonstrated to AT&amp;T in New Jersey. <i>See</i> Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 176, lines 10-16.</p> <p>Mr. Campana: What took place at that demonstration was the commercial forum that [AT&amp;T] had requested, in preparation for the COMDEX show. That module right there. <i>See</i>, Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 176, line 25 - Page 177, line 4.</p>

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
	<p>determined by the destination field in the local switch which is associated with the Messenger ID. The email messages were transmitted to the Safari computer with the revision 0 software routine (either "C" or "Better Basic"). The email messages were available and processed by application programs in the Safari, Poquet or other portable computers." <i>See</i> Campana Decl., Page 12, ¶31.</p> <p><i>See also</i> Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶s 15 and 16; Page 8, ¶ 17, and Page 9, ¶ 23.</p>	<p>[1990]... we were developing the e-mail gateway side of the project as well as refining many of the components. In order to put e-mail, to glue these two networks together, it took many changes to many different pieces of equipment throughout the network. And code was being written to allow us to extract messages from the pager and display them on a laptop computer in an e-mail fashion. And that continued through October [1990]. I believe we had our production, our first production release of the operating software on or around October 6<sup>th</sup> of 1990. And on October 26<sup>th</sup> [1990] we demonstrated this to AT&amp;T in New Jersey on their -- as we learned by then, their Safari laptop product. At the onset of the project, we weren't aware of what this project or application was." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 148, line 22- Page 149, line 11.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">*****</p> <p>Q: "And what had happened . . . at that meeting in New Jersey?"</p> <p>Mr. Campana: "The demonstration was successful." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 171, lines 11-25.</p>	

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
		<p>Q: "Okay. So it is your position that in the visit to AT&amp;T in New Jersey on October 26<sup>th</sup> [1990], e-mail was sent; is that right?"</p> <p>Mr. Campana: "Yes." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 5, 2002 (Day II), Page 265, line 17-20.</p>	
<p>connecting the electronic mail system containing the plurality of originating processors to the RF information transmission network with one of at least one interface;</p> <p>transmitting the originated information in association with an address of the one interface from one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface with the electronic mail system responding to the address of the one interface to direct the originated information from the one of the plurality of originating processors to the one interface; and</p>	<p>"Initially, email was manually processed to remove the email header because of its extreme length which, in many instances, was larger than the 512 character per message memory capacity of the Messenger. The email, which I manually inserted into the RF Network, contained the ID of the Messenger, which was an eight digit ID code as described on pages 3, 18 and 19 of the Telefind E-Mail Integration Document (Ex. #1). The Network responded to the ID code to transmit the email to the local switch/local service provider in Chicago which then wirelessly transmitted the email to a Messenger." <i>See</i> Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶ 15</p> <p>"During August and September 1990, the hub switch at ESA and the 3B2 computer at Telefind's corporate headquarters were used by ESA to implement the functions of a gateway switch with mailboxes 14 and an interface switch 304 as described in the Campana patents. These reductions to</p>	<p>Q: "So the [translation software from the AT&amp;T e-mail system to the paging system of Telefind] was already done by the time of the COMDEX show; is that right?"</p> <p>Mr. Campana: "The software that was placed in the laptop, yes, it was finished, and in fact I think it was in an October 6<sup>th</sup> document, the listing." <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 5, 2002 (Day II), Page 264, line 8- Page 265, line 3.</p>	<p>Q: All right. But you hadn't designed, yet designed an interface between the AT&amp;T system and the Telefind system that would connect AT&amp;T e-mail to the Telefind network, had you?</p> <p>Mr. Campana: I believe we did. I believe that the interface was to the 3B was operation at the demonstration we had in New Jersey. And was working in fact in early October [1990]. <i>See</i> Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 210, line 25 - Page 211, line 7.</p>

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
	<p>practice included the writing of suitable software to perform the functions of a mailbox as well as performing packetizing, a security check and header stripping. This development eliminated the manual cutting and pasting of email messages from ESA's computer into the Network. This software allowed the gateway switch and interface switch, as implemented in the Network hub switch at ESA, to retrieve email messages from the 3B2 computer. The ability to automatically retrieve and process email messages permitted the reduction to practice of the various addressing schemes described in the Campana patents (see, e.g., Figure 11) as well as the Telefind E-Mail Integration document (see, e.g., pages 3, 18, 19). These efforts to connect the hub network switch directly to an electronic mail system are partially reflected in the patent specification at, for example, column 32, lines 29-34 of the '592 patent:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Optionally, a plurality of electronic mail systems 1-N each as illustrated in FIG. 8 are connected to a data input port of the RF information transmission system which is preferably hub switch 116 of the prior art paging network described above with reference to FIGS. 2-6."</p>		

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
	<p><i>See</i> Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶ 16.</p> <p><i>See also</i> Campana Decl., Page 8, ¶ 17, Page 9, ¶ 23 and Page 12, ¶ 31.</p>		
transmitting the originated information through the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver in response to inputted information.	<p>“My conception included the pushing of electronic mail to a processor capable of executing electronic mail programming and other applications. To reduce this conception to practice, we used the Messenger which we attached to a personal computer (“PC”) located at ESA. We used the peripheral port of the Messenger, as described in Fig. 7 of the Campana Patents, to transmit the email messages to a PC.” <i>See</i> Campana Decl., Page 8, ¶17.</p> <p>“During these initial reductions to practice, ESA utilized a variety of desktop and portable computers as the ultimate destination processor which received email through the Messenger RF device. One such computer was a handheld computer called the Poqet. ESA built a working connection to a Poqet computer – a phone of which is shown in Exhibit 9. The hardware connection between the pager and Poqet was simpler than a conventional RS-232 serial port because the Poqet operated on the same batter voltages as the Messenger, required simple wiring connections and was similar to the version of the ‘Messenger RS-232 PORT’ drawing dated</p>	<p>Mr. Campana: “[I]n July [1990], we had conceived that we could take the Internet and e-mail services and start this integration process with wireless media. And there are a number of pressing reasons for that. The messaging industry, the radio messaging industry had a number of problems. One is trying to get an alphanumeric message to one of these pages. You couldn’t go to an ordinary telephone and type in a text message on a telephone key pad and in this other island of communications called the Internet were thousands of PC’s, actually millions at that time, that had alphanumeric entry. So we conceived that idea and started to implement in July of 1990. Subsequently, we had a breadboard implementation.” <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 145, line 18- Page 146, line 7.</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “And ... that gave us a very early prototype then of this Circuit we needed to connect between the pager</p>	<p>Q.: “What were the design hurdles that you had to overcome in order to send a CompuServe message to a pager?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “Well, just to give us the highest level summary, it was extracting message from an e-mail system, interfacing it to the Telefind switches, transporting it through the Telefind network for transmission to the Messenger pager, and then transferring it from the Messenger to the e-mail program in what at that time wasn’t called -- it was called -- might call it a laptop but it was a 15 pound laptop computer.” <i>See</i> Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 65, lines 3-14.</p> <p>Q.: “Did someone have to write software in order to make this transfer happen?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “There would have had to have been an extraction program to permit the transfer between the [Messenger] pager.” <i>See</i> Campana</p>

## APPENDIX A -- REDUCTION TO PRACTICE ('946 PATENT)

CLAIM	CAMPANA DECLARATION	CAMPANA TRIAL TESTIMONY	CAMPANA DEPOSITION TESTIMONY
	<p>October 23, 1990 in the Telefind E-Mail Intergration Document. We implemented extraction software having substantially the functionality of or used the revision 0 software of pages 6-12 and/or 12-14 of the Telefind E-Mail Integration Document. The Poqet computer used a basic email programming permitting the manipulation of the extracted messages.” <i>See</i> Campana Decl., Page 9, ¶23.</p> <p><i>See also</i> Campana Decl., Page 7, ¶ s 15 and 16 and Page 12, ¶ 31.</p>	<p>serial port and a PC computer. <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 146, lines 18-21.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">*****</p> <p>Q: “At that time, as of August 20<sup>th</sup> [1990], were you working just to develop prototypes with the AT&amp;T computer or were you working to develop prototypes for other brand computers?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “We were working with other brands. In fact, we were working with other brands prior to even the AT&amp;T meeting. We had PC’s on our facility that we used for office use, as well as we integrated into our network switches, and they were PCs’ or PC-based, I should say, and so we had it operational on, I believe, a Compaq office computer as well as several generic computers that we had at the facility.” <i>See</i> Campana Trial Testimony, Nov. 4, 2002 (Day I), Page 158, line 21- Page 159, line 7.</p>	<p>Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 66, lines 23- Page 67, line 4.</p> <p>Q.: “That extraction program was on the Compaq computer, isn’t that right?”</p> <p>Mr. Campana: “I believe it resided in the Compaq computer.” <i>See</i> Campana Depo. Testimony, Aug. 12, 2002 (Day II), Page 67, lines 17-20.</p>

B



## **APPENDIX B – DEPENDENT CLAIM SUPPORT ('946 PATENT)**

CLAIM	EXEMPLARY SUPPORT
<p>186. A system in accordance with one of claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12-17, 49-51, 55, 56, 58-63, 100-103, 115-118, 126-131, 144, 146-149, 157-162, 174-178, and 184, further comprising: a communication system, including said electronic mail systems, which transmits electronic mail inputted to said electronic mail system and further other information from a processor included in said communication system, wherein: said processor included in said communication system sends said further other information to one of said destination processors using the RF information transmission network.</p> <p>185. A system in accordance with claim 186, wherein said further information is transmitted to the one destination processor via the interface switch.</p> <p>System and Method Claims 217, 218, 237, 238, 269 recite similar features.</p>	<p>“The hub switch 116 receives the packet from the receiving interface switch 304 and disassembles the packet into information from the plurality of originating processors either within a single electronic mail system such as system 1 or from a plurality of electronic mail systems, such as systems 1-N, or from outside of any electronic mail system from at least one additional processor 312 which is connected directly to interface switch 304 to originate information to be transmitted to a destination processor A-N in an electronic mail system as described below.” <i>See</i> ‘472 Col. 22, lines 33-42, col. 23, line 48-col. 24, line 12.</p>
<p>188. A system in accordance with one of claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12-17, 49-51, 55, 56, 58-63, 100-103, 115-118, 126-131, 144, 146-149, 157-162, 174-178, and 184, wherein: after reception of electronic mail including said originated information from one of the electronic mail systems, information is deleted from the electronic mail prior to transmission by the RF information transmission network; and the deleted information is a header in the electronic mail.</p> <p>189. A system in accordance with claim 188, wherein the information is deleted by the interface switch.</p> <p>System and Method Claims 219, 220, 239, 240, 271 and 272 recite similar features.</p>	<p>“The interface switch 304 also removes information added by the electronic mail system 1-N to the information from the originating processor A-N from the stored information received from one of the gateway switches 14 and adds information used by the RF information transmission network 302 during transmission of the information originated at the originating processor to a RF receiver 119 in the RF information transmission network 302 which receives the information and transfers it to the destination processor A-N.” <i>See</i> ‘472 Col. 21, line 64-col. 22, line 6, and Appendix cols. 49 and 50.</p>

## **APPENDIX B – DEPENDENT CLAIM SUPPORT ('946 PATENT)**

CLAIM	EXEMPLARY SUPPORT
<p>190. A system in accordance with one of claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12-17, 49-51, 55, 56, 58-63, 100-103, 115-118, 126-131, 144, 146-149, 157-162, 174-178, and 184, wherein: the at least one RF receiver is coupled to a memory which stores the originated information received by the RF receiver, and the at least one destination processor processes the originated information, after the originated information has been output from the memory, by executing an application program.</p> <p>System and Method Claims 221, 241, and 273 recite similar features.</p>	<p>“A computer program for controlling the transfer of information from the receiver 119 to a SAFARI.TM. laptop computer of AT&amp;T Corporation is contained within the attached Appendix at pages 1-9. This program automatically provides transfer of the stored electronic mail stored within the memory of the RF receiver 119 into the destination processor A-N where it is accessible to application programs within the destination processor.” <i>See</i> ‘472 Col. 20, lines 47-55, and Appendix cols. 27-44.</p>
<p>191. A system in accordance with one of claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12-17, 49-51, 55, 56, 58-63, 100-103, 115-118, 126-131, 144, 146-149, 157-162, 174-178, and 184, wherein: after reception of the originated information, a security check is performed to determine if the originated information should be transmitted by the RF information transmission network to the at least one RF receiver.</p> <p>192. A system in accordance with claim 191, wherein: said security check is performed by comparing an identification of the one RF receiver device with identifications of permissible RF receivers in the RF information transmission network that are permitted to receive RF transmissions and supplying the originated information to the RF information transmission network for transmission to the one RF receiver if the identification of the one RF receiver device matches one of the identifications of the permissible RF receivers.</p> <p>193. A system in accordance with claim 192, wherein said comparing is performed by the interface switch.</p>	<p>“In the first place, the interface switches 304 function as a security check to determine that information transmissions originating from a gateway switch with mailbox 14 represent transmissions which should be coupled to a hub switch 116 of the RF information transmission network 302. The security check is performed by the interface switch 304 comparing the identification number of the RF receiver 119 which has been added by either an originating processor A-N or a gateway switch with mailboxes 14 with permissible identification numbers or the interface switch performing the addition of the identification number. The interface switch 304 also removes information added by the electronic mail system 1-N to the information from the originating processor A-N from the stored information received from one of the gateway switches 14 and adds information used by the RF information transmission network 302 during transmission of the information originated at the originating processor to a RF receiver 119 in the RF information transmission network 302 which receives the information and transfers it to the</p>

## **APPENDIX B – DEPENDENT CLAIM SUPPORT ('946 PATENT)**

CLAIM	EXEMPLARY SUPPORT
System and Method Claims 222-224, 242-244 and 274-276 recite similar features.	destination processor A-N.” <i>See</i> ‘472 Col. 21, line 53-col. 22, line 6.
<p>194. A system in accordance with one of claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12-17, 49-51, 55, 56, 58-63, 100-103, 115-118, 126-131, 144, 146-149, 157-162, 174-178, and 184, wherein: each electronic mail system includes a processor which receives originated information from an originating processor, and causes the originated information to be transmitted to the destination processor via the interface switch and the RF information transmission network.</p> <p>195. A system in accordance with claim 194, wherein said processor adds an address of the interface switch.</p> <p>196. A system in accordance with claim 194, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.</p> <p>197. A system in accordance with claim 195, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.</p> <p>System and Method Claims 225-228, 245-248 and 277-280 recite similar features.</p>	<p>“The distributed intelligence of the system implementing the present invention, which may be located in any one of the originating processors A-N, gateway switch 14 or interface switch 304 or distributed therebetween as described below with reference to FIG. 11, may be used to add the necessary address of the interface switch connecting the electronic mail system 1-N to the RF information transmission network 302 and the identification of the RF receiver 119 in the RF information transmission network from the inputting of only an identification of the destination processor A-N. The addition of the identification number of the RF receiver 119 and the address of the interface switch may be implemented by the originating processor A-N of one of the computing systems #1-#N, a gateway switch 14 or an interface switch 304 as described below with reference to FIG. 9.” <i>See</i> ‘472 Col. 21, lines 14-30.</p> <p>“The information is transmitted to a receiving interface switch 304 from one or more gateway switches 14 by one or more electronic mail systems 1-N in response to an address of the receiving interface switch which has been added to the information originated by the originating processor by either the originating processor or gateway switch. The information is transmitted from the receiving interface switch 304 to the RF information transmission network with an address of the destination processor, such as a name of a user of the destination processor A-N, to receive the information which has been added by either the originating processor A-N, a gateway switch 14 or the receiving interface switch 304.” <i>See</i> ‘472 Col. 22, line 60-col. 23, line 4.</p>

## **APPENDIX B – DEPENDENT CLAIM SUPPORT ('946 PATENT)**

CLAIM	EXEMPLARY SUPPORT
<p>198. A system in accordance with claim 194, wherein: an address of the at least one destination processor is added to the originated information by the processor, said address being an identification of the at least one RF receiver which is to receive the originated information.</p> <p>199. A system in accordance with claim 198, wherein said identification is an identifier number of the RF receiver.</p> <p>200. A system in accordance with claim 198, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.</p> <p>201. A system in accordance with claim 199, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.</p> <p>System and Method Claims 229-232, 249-252 and 281-284 recite similar features.</p>	<p>“The identification number may be added to the information from the originating processor or, alternatively, may be added by the originating processor by matching an identification of the destination processor (the name of the user of the processor) with a stored identification of a destination processor (the authorized user of the destination processor) and adding an identification number stored with the matched identification of the destination processor to the information as the identification number of the RF receiver 119. Alternatively, the aforementioned matching process may be performed by either the gateway switch 14 or the interface switch 304.” <i>See</i> ‘472 Col. 23, lines 36-47.</p> <p>“In the fourth method, the originating processor adds the destination processor preferably in the form of the user's name only; the gateway switch 14 adds an address of the interface switch 304 and the identification number of the receiver 119; and the interface switch takes no action other than verification that the identification number of the receiver 119 added by the gateway switch 14 is valid. In the fifth method, the operator of the originating processor adds the destination processor, points to an icon displayed on a CRT associated with the originating processor and the originating processor adds the address of the interface switch 304; the gateway switch 14 adds the identification number of the receiver 119 and the interface switch 304 takes no action other than verification.” <i>See</i> ‘472 Col. 24, line 64-col.25, line 10, and Fig. 11, entry methods 4 and 5.</p>
<p>202. A system in accordance with one of claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12-17, 49-51, 55, 56, 58-63, 100-103, 115-118, 126-131, 144, 146-149, 157-162, 174-178, and 184, wherein: said interface switch receives the originated information from the at least one originating processor, processes the</p>	<p>“The interface switches 304 function to store information which has been stored by at least one gateway switch 114 that is received from a plurality of originating processors, assemble the information from a plurality of originating</p>

## **APPENDIX B – DEPENDENT CLAIM SUPPORT ('946 PATENT)**

CLAIM	EXEMPLARY SUPPORT
<p>originated information, and supplies processed originated information to said RF information transmission network for transmission to the at least one RF receiver.</p> <p>203. A system in accordance with claim 202, wherein said processes performed by said interface switch includes varying content of the originated information.</p> <p>204. A system in accordance with claim 203, wherein said varying of content includes one of adding and deleting information.</p> <p>System and Method Claims 233-235, 253-255 and 285-287 recite similar features.</p>	<p>processors into a packet preferably having the format of that described above with reference to the prior art in FIG. 6 and transmit the packet to the hub switch 116 within the RF information transmission network 302.” <i>See</i> ‘472 Col. 22, lines 15-23.</p>
<p>205. A computer program stored on a storage medium when executed by the interface switch as set forth in one of claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12-17, 49-51, 55, 56, 58-63, 100-103, 115-118, 126-131, 144, 146-149, 157-162, 174-178, and 184, causes the interface switch to perform the steps of: receiving the originated information from the at least one originating processor; and supplying the originated information and an identification of the at least one RF receiver to the RF information transmission network which thereafter broadcasts the originated information to the at least one RF receiver.</p> <p>.Computer Program Claim 256 recites similar features</p>	<p>“The information is transmitted to a receiving interface switch 304 from one or more gateway switches 14 by one or more electronic mail systems 1-N in response to an address of the receiving interface switch which has been added to the information originated by the originating processor by either the originating processor or gateway switch. The information is transmitted from the receiving interface switch 304 to the RF information transmission network with an address of the destination processor, such as a name of a user of the destination processor A-N, to receive the information which has been added by either the originating processor A-N, a gateway switch 14 or the receiving interface switch 304.” <i>See</i> ‘472 Col. 22, line 60-col. 23, line 4.</p> <p>“An Appendix containing a listing of control programs for controlling the transmission of information between an RF receiver and a destination processor and controlling the operation of an interface switch in accordance with the invention is attached. The programs are written in the C</p>

## **APPENDIX B – DEPENDENT CLAIM SUPPORT ('946 PATENT)**

CLAIM	EXEMPLARY SUPPORT
	programming language. The program for controlling the transmission of information from the RF receiver to the destination processor appears at pages 1-9 and the program for controlling the operation of the interface switch appears at pages 10-14." <i>See</i> '472 Col. 26, lines 28-37, and Appendix cols. 45-50.
<p>206. A computer program in accordance with claim 205, wherein said computer program when executed by the interface switch further causes the interface switch to perform the steps of:  deleting, after reception of the electronic mail by the interface switch, information from the electronic mail; and  not transmitting deleted information by the RF information transmission network.</p> <p>207. A computer program in accordance with claim 206, wherein the deleted information is a header of the electronic mail.</p> <p>Computer Program Claims 257 and 258 recite similar features</p>	<p>"The interface switch 304 also removes information added by the electronic mail system 1-N to the information from the originating processor A-N from the stored information received from one of the gateway switches 14 and adds information used by the RF information transmission network 302 during transmission of the information originated at the originating processor to a RF receiver 119 in the RF information transmission network 302 which receives the information and transfers it to the destination processor A-N." <i>See</i> '472 Col. 21, line 64-col. 22, line 6, and Appendix cols. 49 and 50, and Appendix cols. 45-50.</p>
<p>208. A computer program stored on a storage medium when executed by the processor as set forth in claim 194, causes the processor to perform the steps of:  receiving the originated information from the at least one originating processor; and  causing the originated information to be transmitted to the destination processor via the interface switch and the RF information transmission network which thereafter broadcasts the originated information to the at least one RF receiver.</p>	<p>"The information is transmitted to a receiving interface switch 304 from one or more gateway switches 14 by one or more electronic mail systems 1-N in response to an address of the receiving interface switch which has been added to the information originated by the originating processor by either the originating processor or gateway switch. The information is transmitted from the receiving interface switch 304 to the RF information transmission network with an address of the destination processor, such as a name of a user of the destination processor A-N, to receive the information which has been added by either the originating processor A-N, a</p>

## **APPENDIX B – DEPENDENT CLAIM SUPPORT ('946 PATENT)**

CLAIM	EXEMPLARY SUPPORT
<p>209. A computer program in accordance with claim 208, wherein said processor adds an address of the interface switch.</p> <p>210. A computer program in accordance with claim 208, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.</p> <p>211. A computer program in accordance with claim 209, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.</p> <p>Computer Program Claims 259-262 recite similar features.</p>	<p>gateway switch 14 or the receiving interface switch 304.” <i>See</i> ‘472 Col. 22, line 60-col. 23, line 4, and Appendix cols. 49 and 50, and Appendix cols. 45-50.</p>
<p>212. A computer program in accordance with claim 208, wherein said computer program when executed by the processor further causes the processor to perform the step of: adding an address of the at least one destination processor to the originated information, said address being an identification of the at least one RF receiver which is to receive the originated information.</p> <p>213. A computer program in accordance with claim 212, wherein said identification is an identifier number of the RF receiver.</p> <p>214. A computer program in accordance with claim 212, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.</p> <p>215. A computer program in accordance with claim 213, wherein said processor is a gateway switch.</p> <p>Computer Program Claims 263-266 recite similar features.</p>	<p>“The identification number may be added to the information from the originating processor or, alternatively, may be added by the originating processor by matching an identification of the destination processor (the name of the user of the processor) with a stored identification of a destination processor (the authorized user of the destination processor) and adding an identification number stored with the matched identification of the destination processor to the information as the identification number of the RF receiver 119. Alternatively, the aforementioned matching process may be performed by either the gateway switch 14 or the interface switch 304.” <i>See</i> ‘472 Col. 23, lines 36-47, and Appendix cols. 49 and 50, and Appendix cols. 45-50.</p> <p>“In the fourth method, the originating processor adds the destination processor preferably in the form of the user's name only; the gateway switch 14 adds an address of the interface switch 304 and the identification number of the receiver 119; and the interface switch takes no action other than verification that the identification number of the receiver 119 added by the gateway switch 14 is valid. In the fifth method, the operator of the originating processor adds</p>

## **APPENDIX B – DEPENDENT CLAIM SUPPORT ('946 PATENT)**

CLAIM	EXEMPLARY SUPPORT
	<p>the destination processor, points to an icon displayed on a CRT associated with the originating processor and the originating processor adds the address of the interface switch 304; the gateway switch 14 adds the identification number of the receiver 119 and the interface switch 304 takes no action other than verification.” <i>See</i> ‘472 Col. 24, line 64-col.25, line 10, and Fig. 11, entry methods 4 and 5, and Appendix cols. 49 and 50, and Appendix cols. 45-50.</p>
<p>216. A system in accordance with one of claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12-17, 49-51, 55, 56, 58-63, 100-103, 115-118, 126-131, 144, 146-149, 157-162, 174-178, and 184, wherein said interface, being coupled to at least one other electronic mail system, receives originated information from an originating processor in said electronic mail system, and transmits said originated information to a RF receiver coupled to a destination processor in one of the at least one other electronic mail system via said RF information transmission network.</p> <p>System and Method Claims 236, 267 and 287 recite similar features.</p>	<p>“A plurality of interface switches 304 connect information transmitted from at least one electronic mail system as illustrated in FIG. 8. Optionally, a plurality of electronic mail systems 1-N each as illustrated in FIG. 8 are connected to a data input port of the RF information transmission system which is preferably hub switch 116 of the prior art paging network described above with reference to FIGS. 2-6. The dotted line communication paths 306 illustrate optional information transmissions in which information from a plurality of different electronic mail systems is concentrated at a single interface switch 304. The dotted line communication paths 307 illustrate connections to additional gateway switches with mailboxes 14 within electronic mail systems 1-N.” <i>See</i> ‘472 Col. 21, lines 39-52.</p>