

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 14/611,595	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DITZLER, BENJAMIN	
	<b>Examiner</b> JAVIER A. PAGAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 3788	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) JAVIER A. PAGAN. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.
- (2) Stephen Schott. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 06 January 2016.

Type:  Telephonic  Video Conference  
 Personal [copy given to:  applicant  applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes  No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Issues Discussed 101 112 102 103 Others  
(For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 19.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Substance of Interview**

(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

Examiner left a message for Mr. Schott explaining what issues remained in order to place the application in condition for allowance. First, the after final amendment stated that new drawings were submitted fixing the informalities objected to in the final office action mailed 4 December 2015. However it appears the drawings were not received by the office. Examiner stated new drawings would be required. Specifically, figure 4 should remove the terms "LID" and "BASE" from the drawings. Furthermore, examiner stated that an examiners amednment would be done to fix the 112 issues for claim 19. Claim 19 depends from 1 and includes 112 2<sup>nd</sup> (lack of antecedent basis) for "the visible cavity" and further includes language already disclosed by the independent claim it depends from. For the purposes of placing the application in condition for allowance, the examiner amended claim 19 to read as follows: "The receptacle of claim 1, wherein each of the cells holds an example of a different one of the materials." With the accepted changes noted above, the application would be in condition for allowance.

**Applicant recordation instructions:** It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.

**Examiner recordation instructions:** Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recordation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

Attachment

/J. A. P./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3788

/STEVEN A REYNOLDS/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3788