May 6, 2020

Via Email: john.smith4444@gmail.com

John Smith IV

Bob Attorney

Direct: (209) 933-2332

bob@attorneys.com

Acme Corp.

123 Easy St.

Seattle, WA 98018

Re: Title: TOTABLE CONTAINER WITH ENHANCED CAPACITY LID

App. No.: 15/884,435

Filing Date: January 31, 2018

Our Reference: 5885-077

**Instructions Requested By: August 14, 2018**

Dear John Smith IV:

We have received a Non-Final Office Action from the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office in connection with the above-referenced patent application. Attached for your review are copies of the Office Action and the references cited by the Examiner. A response to the Office Action is initially due by September 14, 2018, which can be extended to a maximum of three months, with the payment of extension fees.

**Summary**: In summary, the Examiner has rejected all of the claims over the prior art, \_\_\_. We recommend \_\_\_\_.

**Overview of the Action**:

The Examiner objects to the specification, with specific reference to paragraphs/lines/sections \_\_.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-14 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by US Patent No. 440,656 (“Sefton”).

The Examiner rejects claims 1-8, 13, 15, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by US Patent No. 2,714,911 (“Fontana”).

The Examiner rejects claims 1 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by US Patent No. 2,533,539 (“Vivian”).

An “anticipation” rejection is a legal phrase applied to claims to indicate that each feature of a rejected claim is taught or suggested by a single reference. An anticipation rejection is generally refuted by presenting arguments that show how particular claim elements are not present in the cited reference.

The Examiner rejects claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Fontana and US Patent No. 6,948,632 (“Kellogg”).

The Examiner rejects claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Fontana and Kellogg.

An “obviousness” rejection is a legal phrase applied to claims to indicate that, in view of the one or more references cited, “one skilled in the art at the time of the invention” would have known how to do what is claimed. Such rejections are generally overcome by pointing out how the Examiner’s reasoning is flawed (for example, explaining how the teachings of two references won’t operate together).

**Analysis and Recommendation**: We do not agree with the Examiner’s rejections. A preliminary review of these references shows that they may lack (even in combination) one or more features of each of the pending claims. If so, we can present arguments to the Examiner to that effect. We also recommend at this time adding claims that are specifically directed to protecting your products in the context of the specific environments in which they are used.

**Conclusion**: Please let us know by August 14, 2018 whether we have your permission to proceed with a response as outlined above. Of course, if you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,

Law Firm PLLC  
  
  
  
Bob Attorney

Enclosure:

As noted.