

---

## **Remarks**

These remarks are submitted in response to the Final Office Action of December 19, 2013, and is being filed along with a Request for Continued Examination. At the time of the Office Action, claims 1-32 were pending. Amendments have been made to claims 1, 14 and 27, and claims 13 and 25 have been cancelled without waiver or prejudice in the present Office Action. No new matter has been added.

### **I. Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 12-13, 25, 26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### **II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 102**

Claims 1 - 3, 8, 14 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Zinanti et al. (US 6,943,734).

On pages 2-3, the Office submits that Zinanti describes in FIG. 2 the features of a plurality of coupling elements for electrically coupling to neighboring antenna elements of the plurality of antenna elements such that the plurality of antenna elements and the plurality of coupling elements are arranged about a periphery of the multimode antenna structure and form a single radiating structure, wherein electrical currents on one antenna element of the plurality of antenna elements flow to the neighboring antenna elements and substantially bypass the plurality of antenna ports coupled to the neighboring antenna elements such that an antenna mode excited by one of the plurality of antenna ports is substantially electrically isolated from a mode excited by another one of the plurality of antenna ports at a given desired signal frequency range without coupling a decoupling network to the plurality of antenna ports, and the multimode antenna structure generates diverse antenna patterns as recited in claim 1. We respectfully traverse this interpretation of Zinanti.

The Office presents no evidence that the antenna structure described in FIG. 2 in Zinanti results in current following in antenna elements 202 and 204, but not through antenna elements 206 and 208.

---

For purposes of further advancing prosecution, notwithstanding these discrepancies in the record, the features of claim 13 have been incorporated into claims 1 and 27, and the features of claim 25 have been incorporated into claim 14, which the Office has deemed allowable.

Accordingly, claims 1-3, 8, 14 and 27 are in condition for allowance.

### **III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 103**

Claims 1 - 3, 8, 14 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Bell (5, 189,434) in view of Zinanti et al. (US 6,943,734).

Claims 4- 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell (5, 189,434) in view of Zinanti et al. (US 6,943,734) and further in view of Goubau (US 3,967,276).

Claims 14-20 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Goubau (US 3,967,276).

Claims 21 - 24 and 30- 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Goubau (US 3,967,276) in view of Ho (2006/0050009).

Claims 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Goubau (US 3,967,276) in view of Bell (US 5, 189,434).

Based on the amendments to claims 1, 14, and 27, which now include features the Office has deemed allowable, the aforementioned rejections are moot. Accordingly, claims 1-12, 14-24, and 26-32 are in condition for allowance.

