

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: [Applicant Name]
Application No.: [Application Number]
Filed: [Filing Date]
Title: [Title of Invention]
Examiner: [Examiner Name]
Art Unit: [Art Unit Number]

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

In response to the Office Action dated [Date of Office Action], please consider the following remarks regarding the rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

REMARKS

The Office Action rejected Claims [Claim Numbers] on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims [Claim Numbers] of U.S. Patent No. / Application No. [Reference Number].

[Option 1: Terminal Disclaimer Filed]

Applicant herewith files a Terminal Disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) to obviate this rejection. Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn based on the filing of said disclaimer.

[Option 2: Arguments Against Rejection]

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because the pending claims are patentably distinct from the cited reference. Specifically, the pending claims require [Describe technical difference], which is neither taught nor suggested by the cited reference. Therefore, the claims do not constitute an obvious variation of the previously claimed invention.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the double patenting rejection and the allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
[Name of Attorney/Agent]
[Registration Number]
[Date]