This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

MAILED

NOV 03 1981

This application has been examined. [X] Responsive to communication filed on 8-26-81 [X] This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), ___ days from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:
1. [X] Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892
2. [ ] Notice of Informal Patent Drawing, PTO-948
3. [ ] Notice of References Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449
4. [ ] Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION
1. [X] Claims 1-13 are pending in the application.
   Of the above, claims _______________ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. [ ] Claims _______________ have been cancelled.
3. [ ] Claims _______________ are allowed.
4. [X] Claims 1, 2, 6-10 are rejected.
5. [X] Claims 3-5, 11-13 are objected to.
6. [ ] Claims _______________ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. [ ] The formal drawings filed on _______________ are acceptable.
8. [ ] The drawing correction request filed on _______________ has been [ ] approved. [ ] disapproved.
9. [ ] Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has [ ] been received. [ ] not been received. [ ] been filed in parent application, serial no. ____________________________ filed on ____________________________.
10. [ ] Since this application appears to be 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.
11. [ ] Other

PTOL-326 (rev. 7-79)
Claims 1, 2, 6-10 are again rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Petrillo, Jr. (pat. 4168267), Ondetti et al. (patents 4105776, 4154935, 4234489), Krapcho (pat. 4217359) and British patents 2027025, 2028327 all considered together. Applicant's arguments have been considered, but are deemed unpersuasive. It is noted that instantly claimed compound and the art compounds are clearly analogous. In fact, they are all closely related in chemical structures. They all disclose antihypertensive compounds having the following general structure:

![Diagram](image)

slight modification of the end unit of the proline side chain would be obvious to one skilled in the antihypertensive art. The introduction of various substituents into the proline ring would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the antihypertensive art in view of the vast knowledge disclosed in Ondetti et al., Krapcho and the British patents. It is noted that the rejection based on the combination of references is proper since Ondetti et al., Krapcho, applicant and the like are all working in the same technological area.

Note In re Kepper, 152 USPQ 436 and In re Skoll, 187 USPQ 481.

The mistake in objecting claim 6 in the last office action is regretted. Claim 6 should have been rejected.
Claims 3-5 and 11-13 are objected to for depending from a rejected parent claim. These claims are considered to contain allowable subject matter and would be considered allowable if rewritten in independent form.

This action is made FINAL.
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