



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

20160203117

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR, | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 12/679,826 | 03/24/2010 | Ganga Raju Gokaraju | LIX 3027 | 9829 |

30868 7590 04/26/2012
 KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.
 1725 DUKE STREET
 SUITE 240
 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

CLARK, AMY LYNN

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
| 1655 | |

| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-------------------|---------------|
| 04/26/2012 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mail@krameramado.com

Office Action Summary

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Application No. 12/679,826 | Applicant(s) GOKARAJU ET AL. | |
| Examiner Amy L. Clark | Art Unit 1655 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 February 2012.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.
- 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) Claim(s) 23-36,39-49,52-55 and 57-63 is/are pending in the application.
5a) Of the above claim(s) 41-44 and 52-55 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 7) Claim(s) 23-36,39,40,45-49 and 57-63 is/are rejected.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 9) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01/12/2012; 02/15/2012.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

Art Unit: 1655

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgment is made of the receipt and entry of the amendment filed on 02/15/2012 with the amendment of claims 23, 24, 26, 27, 31-33, 35, 40, 41, 46, 48, 58 and 59, cancellation of claims 37, 50, 51 and 56 and newly added claims 61-63.

Election/Restrictions

The election/restriction is maintained for the reasons of record.

Any rejection found in the previous Office Action and not repeated herein has been withdrawn based upon Applicant's amendments to the claims.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 23-36, 39-40, 45-49 and 57-63 are currently under examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 01/12/2012 and 02/15/2012 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 23-27, 30-36, 40, 41, 46, 48, 49, 57, 59, 60 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over H²drogepathya (V) (newly applied as necessitated by amendment).

H²drogepathya teaches a therapeutic formulation (dietary formulation) for treating heart disease (which reads on treating a condition associated with adipogenesis) consisting of Dolichos biflorus, Piper betle, rain water, buttermilk (which reads on a milk containing beverage and biologically acceptable excipient), Allium sativum (which reads on a bio-protectant) and Zingiber officinale (which reads on an

Art Unit: 1655

anti-inflammatory agent). Please note that combining water with *Dolichos biflorus* and Piper betle in a composition would provide a water extract of *Dolichos biflorus* and Piper betle.

Although H"drogepathya does not teach that the composition is an anti-adipogenic composition, the claimed functional properties are intrinsic to the preparation taught by H"drogepathya because the ingredients taught by H"drogepathya are one and the same as disclosed in the instantly claimed invention of Applicant. Thus, the composition taught by H"drogepathya is intrinsically an anti-adipogenic composition.

H"drogepathya does not expressly teach the method steps of claim 59 and 60. However, it should be noted claims 59 and 60 constitute Product-by-Process type claims. In Product-by-Process type claims, the process of producing the product is given no patentable weight since it does not impart novelty to a product when the product is taught by the prior art. See *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC 1985); *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 289, 292-293 (CAFC 1983) and *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972). Consequently, even if a particular process used to prepare a product is novel and unobvious over the prior art, the product *per se*, even when limited to the particular process, is unpatentable over the same product taught in by the prior art. See *In re King*, 107 F.2d 618, 620, 43 USPQ 400, 402 (CCPA 1939); *In re Merz*, 97 F.2d 599, 601, 38 USPQ 143-145 (CCPA 1938); *In re Bergy*, 563 F.2d 1031, 1035, 195 USPQ 344, 348 (CCPA 1977) *vacated* 438 US 902 (1978); and *United States v. Ciba-Geigy Corp.*, 508 F. Supp. 1157, 1171, 211 USPQ 529, 543 (DNJ 1979). Finally, since the Patent Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing Applicant's composition with the compositions of the prior art reference, the burden is upon Applicant to show a distinction between the material, structural and functional characteristics of the claimed composition and the composition of the prior art. See *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977).

It would have been obvious to modify the composition taught by H"drogepathya by modifying the amounts of each of the ingredients because at the time the invention was made, it was known that *Dolichos biflorus*, Piper betle, rain water, buttermilk, *Allium sativum* and *Zingiber officinale* are all useful ingredients for treating heart disease as clearly taught by H"drogepathya.

Art Unit: 1655

Thus, an artisan of ordinary skill would reasonably expect that combining *Dolichos biflorus*, Piper betle, rain water, buttermilk and *Allium sativum* and *Zingiber officinale* and modifying the amounts would provide an even more effective composition for treating a disease condition associated with adipogenesis. This reasonable expectation of success would motivate the artisan to modify the amounts of *Dolichos biflorus*, Piper betle, rain water, buttermilk and *Allium sativum* and *Zingiber officinale* to provide an even more effective composition for treating a disease condition associated with adipogenesis based upon the above teaching.

Moreover, it would have been merely a matter of judicious selection to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the referenced composition because it would have been well in the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art practicing the invention to pick and choose effective amounts of *Dolichos biflorus*, Piper betle, rain water, buttermilk and *Allium sativum* and *Zingiber officinale* to provide an even more effective composition for treating a disease condition associated with adipogenesis and to modify the form of administration of the composition for more tolerable administration to a subject based upon the above teaching. Thus, the claimed invention is no more than the routine optimization of a result effect variable.

Based upon the beneficial teachings of the cited references, the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art, and absent evidence to the contrary, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success to result in the claimed invention.

Accordingly, the claimed invention was prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Claims 23-36, 39-41, 45-49, 57 and 59-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over H"drogepathya (V), in view of "WorldHealth.net Tribulus Terrestris" (W), Oudhia (X), and Sharma (U1) (newly applied as necessitated by amendment).

The teachings of H"drogepathya are set forth above and applied as before.

Art Unit: 1655

"WorldHealth.net Tribulus Terrestris" teaches that Tribulus terrestris fruit (which reads on an extract of Tribulus terrestris) is useful for treating heart disease.

Oudhia teaches that Boerhaavia diffusa extract is useful for treating heart disease and atherosclerosis.

Sharma teaches that Commiphora mukul extract helps reduce LDL and raise HDL levels while lowering blood triglycerides which are known to contribute to atherosclerosis and heart attack.

CURCUMA LONGA

It would have been obvious to modify the composition taught by H²drogepathya by combining Dolichos biflorus, Piper betle, rain water, buttermilk, Allium sativum and Zingiber officinale with Tribulus terrestris extract, Boerhaavia diffusa extract and Commiphora mukul extract because at the time the invention was made, it was known that Dolichos biflorus, Piper betle, rain water, buttermilk, Allium sativum, Zingiber officinale, Tribulus terrestris extract, Boerhaavia diffusa extract and Commiphora mukul extract are all useful ingredients for treating heart disease as clearly taught by the above references.

It is well known that it is prima facie obvious to combine two or more ingredients each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose in order to form a third composition which is useful for the same purpose. The idea for combining them flows logically from their having been used individually in the prior art. Based on the disclosure by these references that Dolichos biflorus, Piper betle, rain water, buttermilk, Allium sativum, Zingiber officinale, Tribulus terrestris extract, Boerhaavia diffusa extract and Commiphora mukul extract are useful for treating heart disease, the artisan would have been motivated to combine the claimed ingredients into a single composition. No patentable invention resides in combining old ingredients of known properties where the results obtained thereby are no more than the additive effect of the ingredients. See MPEP section 2144.06, In re Kerkhoven, 626 F.2d 846, 850, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980), Ex parte Quadranti, 25 USPQ2d 1071 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1992).

Thus, an artisan of ordinary skill would reasonably expect that combining Dolichos biflorus, Piper betle, rain water, buttermilk, Allium sativum, Zingiber officinale, Tribulus terrestris extract, Boerhaavia diffusa extract and Commiphora mukul extract would provide an even more effective composition for

Art Unit: 1655

treating heart disease. This reasonable expectation of success would motivate the artisan to combine Dolichos biflorus, Piper betle, rain water, buttermilk, Allium sativum, Zingiber officinale, Tribulus terrestris extract, Boerhaavia diffusa extract and Commiphora mukul extract to provide an even more effective composition for treating heart disease based upon the teachings of the above references..

Moreover, it would have been merely a matter of judicious selection to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the referenced composition because it would have been well in the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art practicing the invention to pick and choose effective amounts of Dolichos biflorus, Piper betle, rain water, buttermilk, Allium sativum, Zingiber officinale, Tribulus terrestris extract, Boerhaavia diffusa extract and Commiphora mukul extract to provide an even more effective composition for treating a disease condition associated with adipogenesis and to modify the form of administration of the composition for more tolerable administration to a subject based upon the above teaching. Thus, the claimed invention is no more than the routine optimization of a result effect variable.

Based upon the beneficial teachings of the cited references, the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art, and absent evidence to the contrary, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success to result in the claimed invention.

Accordingly, the claimed invention was prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Claims 23-36, 39-41, 45-49, 57 and 59-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over H"drogepathya (V), in view of "WorldHealth.net Tribulus Terrestris" (W), Oudhia (X), Sharma (U1) and Mohanty et al. (V1) (newly applied as necessitated by amendment).

The teachings of H"drogepathya are set forth above and applied as before.

"WorldHealth.net Tribulus Terrestris" teaches that Tribulus terrestris fruit (which reads on an extract of Tribulus terrestris) is useful for treating heart disease.

Oudhia teaches that Boerhaavia diffusa extract is useful for treating heart disease and atherosclerosis.

Art Unit: 1655

Sharma teaches that Commiphora mukul extract helps reduce LDL and raise HDL levels while lowering blood triglycerides which are known to contribute to atherosclerosis and heart attack.

Mohanty teaches an aqueous extract of Curcuma longa is useful for treating heart diseases.

It would have been obvious to modify the composition taught by H^odrogepathya by combining Dolichos biflorus, Piper betle, rain water, buttermilk, Allium sativum and Zingiber officinale with Tribulus terrestris extract, Boerhaavia diffusa extract and Commiphora mukul extract because at the time the invention was made, it was known that Dolichos biflorus, Piper betle, rain water, buttermilk, Allium sativum, Zingiber officinale, Tribulus terrestris extract, Boerhaavia diffusa extract, Commiphora mukul extract and Curcuma longa extract are all useful ingredients for treating heart disease as clearly taught by the above references.

It is well known that it is prima facie obvious to combine two or more ingredients each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose in order to form a third composition which is useful for the same purpose. The idea for combining them flows logically from their having been used individually in the prior art. Based on the disclosure by these references that Dolichos biflorus, Piper betle, rain water, buttermilk, Allium sativum, Zingiber officinale, Tribulus terrestris extract, Boerhaavia diffusa extract, Commiphora mukul extract and Curcuma longa extract are useful for treating heart disease, the artisan would have been motivated to combine the claimed ingredients into a single composition. No patentable invention resides in combining old ingredients of known properties where the results obtained thereby are no more than the additive effect of the ingredients. See MPEP section 2144.06, In re Kerkhoven, 626 F.2d 846, 850, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980), Ex parte Quadranti, 25 USPQ2d 1071 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1992).

Thus, an artisan of ordinary skill would reasonably expect that combining Dolichos biflorus, Piper betle, rain water, buttermilk, Allium sativum, Zingiber officinale, Tribulus terrestris extract, Boerhaavia diffusa extract, Commiphora mukul extract and Curcuma longa extract would provide an even more effective composition for treating heart disease. This reasonable expectation of success would motivate the artisan to combine Dolichos biflorus, Piper betle, rain water, buttermilk, Allium sativum, Zingiber officinale, Tribulus terrestris extract, Boerhaavia diffusa extract, Commiphora mukul extract and Curcuma

Art Unit: 1655

longa extract to provide an even more effective composition for treating heart disease based upon the teachings of the above references..

Moreover, it would have been merely a matter of judicious selection to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the referenced composition because it would have been well in the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art practicing the invention to pick and choose effective amounts of Dolichos biflorus, Piper betle, rain water, buttermilk, Allium sativum, Zingiber officinale, Tribulus terrestris extract, Boerhaavia diffusa extract, Commiphora mukul extract and Curcuma longa extract to provide an even more effective composition for treating a disease condition associated with adipogenesis and to modify the form of administration of the composition for more tolerable administration to a subject based upon the above teaching. Thus, the claimed invention is no more than the routine optimization of a result effect variable.

Based upon the beneficial teachings of the cited references, the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art, and absent evidence to the contrary, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success to result in the claimed invention.

Accordingly, the claimed invention was prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Claims 23-26, 40, 41, 46, 49, 57, 59, and 61-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arambewela et al. (W1), in view of Dawa E-Kulthi Barae Ziyabitus (X1) (newly applied as necessitated by amendment).

Arambewela teaches that aqueous and ethanol extracts of leaves of Piper betel have anti-diabetic activity (which reads on treating a disease condition associated with adipogenesis) and can be administered orally.

Dawa E-Kulthi Barae Ziyabitus teaches a decoction of the whole plant of Dolichos biflorus (which reads on an aqueous extract of Dolichos biflorus leaves, since the extract would contain an extract of leaves) for treating diabetes.

Art Unit: 1655

It would have been obvious to modify the composition taught by Arambewela by combining an aqueous or ethanol extract of Piper betel leaves with an aqueous extract of Dolichos biflorus leaves because at the time the invention was made, it was known that an aqueous or ethanol extract of Piper betel leaves and an aqueous extract of Dolichos biflorus leaves are useful ingredients for treating diabetes as clearly taught by the above references.

It is well known that it is prima facie obvious to combine two or more ingredients each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose in order to form a third composition which is useful for the same purpose. The idea for combining them flows logically from their having been used individually in the prior art. Based on the disclosure by these references that an aqueous or ethanol extract of Piper betel leaves and an aqueous extract of Dolichos biflorus leaves are useful for treating diabetes, the artisan would have been motivated to combine the claimed ingredients into a single composition. No patentable invention resides in combining old ingredients of known properties where the results obtained thereby are no more than the additive effect of the ingredients. See MPEP section 2144.06, *In re Kerkhoven*, 626 F.2d 846, 850, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980), *Ex parte Quadranti*, 25 USPQ2d 1071 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1992).

Thus, an artisan of ordinary skill would reasonably expect that combining an aqueous or ethanol extract of Piper betel leaves and an aqueous extract of Dolichos biflorus leaves would provide an even more effective composition for treating diabetes. This reasonable expectation of success would motivate the artisan to combine an aqueous or ethanol extract of Piper betel leaves and an aqueous extract of Dolichos biflorus leaves to provide an even more effective composition for treating diabetes based upon the teachings of the above references.

Moreover, it would have been merely a matter of judicious selection to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the referenced composition because it would have been well in the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art practicing the invention to pick and choose effective amounts of an aqueous or ethanol extract of Piper betel leaves and an aqueous extract of Dolichos biflorus leaves to provide an even more effective composition for treating a disease condition associated with adipogenesis and to modify the form of administration of the composition for more tolerable

Art Unit: 1655

administration to a subject based upon the above teaching. Thus, the claimed invention is no more than the routine optimization of a result effect-variable.

Based upon the beneficial teachings of the cited references, the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art, and absent evidence to the contrary, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success to result in the claimed invention.

Accordingly, the claimed invention was prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Claims 23-26, 40, 41, 46, 49 and 57-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arambewela et al. (W1), in view of and Neelakantan (B*, US 5,916,567) (newly applied as necessitated by amendment).

Arambewela teaches that aqueous and ethanol extracts of leaves of Piper betel have anti-diabetic activity (which reads on treating a disease condition associated with adipogenesis) and can be administered orally.

Neelakantan teaches an herbal anti-diabetic therapeutic product (which reads on treating a disease condition associated with adipogenesis) comprising Dolichos biflorus extract and that the extract can be taken with any liquid or solid.

It would have been obvious to modify the aqueous or ethanol extract of Piper betel leaves taught by Arambewela by combining the extract of Piper betel leaves with Dolichos biflorus extract to provide an aqueous or ethanol extract of Dolichos biflorus (since the combination of an aqueous or ethanol extract of Piper betel leaves with Dolichos biflorus would provide an aqueous or ethanol extract of Dolichos biflorus) because at the time the invention was made, it was known that aqueous and ethanol extracts of Piper betel leaves and Dolichos biflorus extract, which could be combined with a liquid composition, were useful as anti-diabetic medicines as clearly taught by Arambewela and Neelakantan.

It is well known that it is prima facie obvious to combine two or more ingredients each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose in order to form a third composition which is useful for the same purpose. The idea for combining them flows logically from their having been used

Art Unit: 1655

individually in the prior art. Based on the disclosure by these references that aqueous and ethanol extracts of Piper betel leaves and Dolichos biflorus extract are useful for treating diabetes, the artisan would have been motivated to combine the claimed ingredients into a single composition. No patentable invention resides in combining old ingredients of known properties where the results obtained thereby are no more than the additive effect of the ingredients. See MPEP section 2144.06, In re Kerkhoven, 626 F.2d 846, 850, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980), Ex parte Quadranti, 25 USPQ2d 1071 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1992).

Thus, an artisan of ordinary skill would reasonably expect that combining an aqueous or ethanol extract of Piper betel leaves and Dolichos biflorus extract would provide an even more effective composition for treating diabetes. This reasonable expectation of success would motivate the artisan to combine an aqueous or ethanol extract of Piper betel leaves and Dolichos biflorus extract to provide an even more effective composition for treating diabetes based upon the teachings of the above references.

Moreover, it would have been merely a matter of judicious selection to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the referenced composition because it would have been well in the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art practicing the invention to pick and choose effective amounts of an aqueous or ethanol extract of Piper betel leaves and Dolichos biflorus extract for treating a disease condition associated with adipogenesis and to modify the form of administration of the composition for more tolerable administration to a subject based upon the above teaching. Thus, the claimed invention is no more than the routine optimization of a result effect variable.

Based upon the beneficial teachings of the cited references, the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art, and absent evidence to the contrary, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success to result in the claimed invention.

Accordingly, the claimed invention was prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 1655

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot because the arguments do not apply to any of the references being used in the current rejection.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

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

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amy L. Clark whose telephone number is (571)272-1310. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7 am to 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on (571)272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1655

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Amy L Clark/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|-------------|
| Notice of References Cited | Application/Control No. 12/679,826 | Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination GOKARAJU ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Amy L. Clark | Art Unit 1655 | Page 1 of 2 |

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

| * | Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code | Date MM-YYYY | Name | Classification |
|---|--|-----------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| | A US- | | | |
| * | B US-5,916,567 | 06-1999 | Neelakantan, Kameswaran | 424/757 |
| | C US- | | | |
| | D US- | | | |
| | E US- | | | |
| | F US- | | | |
| | G US- | | | |
| | H US- | | | |
| | I US- | | | |
| | J US- | | | |
| | K US- | | | |
| | L US- | | | |
| | M US- | | | |

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

| * | Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code | Date MM-YYYY | Country | Name | Classification |
|---|--|-----------------|---------|------|----------------|
| | N | | | | |
| | O | | | | |
| | P | | | | |
| | Q | | | | |
| | R | | | | |
| | S | | | | |
| | T | | | | |

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

| * | Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages) |
|---|--|
| | U |
| | V "H"drogepathya". From: િયabhi૩4aka - Gujarati Edited (Hindustani No Vaidyarજja) Translation by Harikrishna Bhagwan Lal Vyas; Sastu Sahitya Vardhaka Karyalaya, Bhadra, Ahmedabad, Edn. 12th, 1957" page 154. |
| | W "WorldHealth.net: Tribulus Terrestris". Posting date: 2005-12-30 [Retrieved from the Internet on: 2012-04-20]. Retrieved from the Internet: <URL: http://www.worldhealth.net/news/tribulus_terrestris_puncture_vine_fruit/ >. |
| | X Oudhia, P. "Punanrnava or Santhi (Boerhaavia diffusa Linn.)". Internet archive date: 2004-07-06 [Retrieved from the Internet on: 2012-04-20]. Retrieved from the Internet: < http://web.archive.org/web/20040706030702/http://www.hort.purdue.edu/newcrop/CropFactSheets/punanrnava.html >. |

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.

Notice of References Cited

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|-------------|
| Application/Control No. 12/679,826 | Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination GOKARAJU ET AL. | |
| Examiner Amy L. Clark | Art Unit 1655 | Page 2 of 2 |

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

| * | Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code | Date MM-YYYY | Name | Classification |
|---|--|-----------------|------|----------------|
| | A US- | | | |
| | B US- | | | |
| | C US- | | | |
| | D US- | | | |
| | E US- | | | |
| | F US- | | | |
| | G US- | | | |
| | H US- | | | |
| | I US- | | | |
| | J US- | | | |
| | K US- | | | |
| | L US- | | | |
| | M US- | | | |


FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

| * | Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code | Date MM-YYYY | Country | Name | Classification |
|---|--|-----------------|---------|------|----------------|
| | N | | | | |
| | O | | | | |
| | P | | | | |
| | Q | | | | |
| | R | | | | |
| | S | | | | |
| | T | | | | |

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

| * | Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages) |
|---|---|
| U | (U1) Sharma, D. Web Date: 2007-06-15. [Retrieved from the Internet on: 2012-04-20]. Retrieved from the Internet: <URL: http://abchomeopathy.com/forum2.php/113481/ >. |
| V | (V1) Mohanty et al. "Effect of Curcuma longa and Ocimum sanctum on myocardial apoptosis in experimentally induced myocardial ischemic-reperfusion injury". BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine, Vol 6, No 3 (2006) pages 1-12. |
| W | (W1) Arambewela, LSR et al. "Antidiabetic activities of aqueous and ethanolic extracts of Piper betle leaves in rats". Journal of Ethnopharmacology. Vol 102, Issue 2 (2005) 239-245. |
| X | (X1) "Dawa E - Kulthi Barae Ziyabitus" from Khazaain-al-Advia, Vol III (20th century AD), Nadeem Yunus Printer / Sheikh Mohd Basheer & Sons, Lahore, 1926 AD. Page 375. |

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
 Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Search Notes  | Application/Control No. 12679826 | Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination GOKARAJU ET AL. |
| | Examiner AMY L CLARK | Art Unit 1655 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|
| SEARCHED | | | |
| Class | Subclass | Date | Examiner |
| NONE | NONE | | |

| | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------|
| SEARCH NOTES | | |
| Search Notes | Date | Examiner |
| EAST-See Search Notes | 4/20/2012 | ALC |
| All Inventors Names Searched in PALM | 4/20/2012 | ALC |
| IDS Search Performed | 4/20/2012 | ALC |
| Google and TKDL website Search for all of the ingredients plus their synonyms | 4/20/2012 | ALC |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|
| INTERFERENCE SEARCH | | | |
| Class | Subclass | Date | Examiner |
| NONE | NONE | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|