



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

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

Pw

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/336,470	01/03/2003	David A. Monroe	121817.0002.042	8448

7590 08/09/2005
Robert C Curfiss
JACKSON WALKER L.L.P.
112 E. Pecan Street, Suite 2100
San Antonio, TX 78205

EXAMINER

POKRZYWA, JOSEPH R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2622	

2622

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2005

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

E-Watch, Inc
Exhibit 2003
Petitioner - Iron Dome LLC
Patent Owner - E-Watch Inc
IPR2014-00439

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendments were received on 5/20/05 and 5/2/05, and have been entered and made of record. Currently, **claims 1-4, 7-9, 12, 13, 18-20, 22-30, and 35-62** are pending.

Response to Affidavit under 37 CFR 1.131

2. The affidavit filed on 1/6/05 under 37 CFR 1.131 is sufficient to overcome the cited references of Wertsberger (U.S. Patent Number 6,072,600), Parulski *et al.* (U.S. Patent Number 5,666,159), Shibata *et al.* (U.S. Patent Number 5,689,300), and Bradley *et al.* (U.S. Patent Number 5,995,041).

3. However, the affidavit is ineffective to overcome the references of Hassan *et al.* (U.S. Patent Number 5,550,646) and Ross (U.S. Patent Number 5,546,194).

4. These two references, as well as the additional references that are noted in this Office action, are cited under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), which is a statutory bar under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), and thus cannot be overcome by an affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR 1.131.

Drawings

5. The drawings were received on 5/20/05. These drawings are unacceptable by the examiner. The replacement sheets that were submitted are unreadable, as many of the lines and lettering within the drawings are faded and blurred due to numerous copies of the images.

Therefore, the objection to the drawings remains, and will be repeated hereinbelow.

Art Unit: 2622

6. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "81" has been used to designate both the hardwired personal computer in Fig. 4 and the data multiplexer circuit in Fig. 5, and reference character "83" has been used to designate both the communications interface module in Fig. 4 and the sync signal in Fig. 5.

7. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: reference numeral "29", in paragraph 0049, line 18.

8. The drawings are objected to because in Fig. 4, PC modem protocol box "66" should read "68", as read in paragraph 0053, lines 20 and 21.

9. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 5/2/05, with respect to the reference of Hassan *et al.*, which was cited in the Office action dated 9/27/04 as anticipating claim 1, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments dated 5/2/05 regarding the rejection of independent claim 1, wherein applicant argues on pages 16 and 17 that Hassan fails to teach of how using a cellular line is implemented, thus failing to teach of "a self-contained image processing system...for capturing a visual image and transmitting it to a remote receiving station ... a processor ... a communications device...adapted for transmitting the data signal to the remote receiving station and a wireless transmission system between the communications device and the compatible receiving station".

As read in column 2, lines 49-54, Hassan states that "the image capture device can be connected or gain access to a telecommunications network, such as by being connected to an ordinary telephone jack 130 by a telephone line 131, or being connected to a cellular telephone arranged to establish an over the air communications link." With this, Hassan teaches that the image capture device 110, seen in Fig. 1, can be connected to a cellular telephone, instead of the ordinary telephone line and telephone jack seen in Fig. 1. Thus, an "air communications link" of the cellular telephone is being interpreted as "a wireless transmission system between the communication s device and the compatible receiving station", as currently required in claim 1. Further, as read in column 5, lines 7-9, Hassan teaches that "the output of fax modem 240 may be applied as an input to the transmitter section of a cellular telephone". This shows how Hassan implements the cellular network for the system.

Art Unit: 2622

11. Therefore, the rejection of independent **claim 1**, as well as the corresponding dependent claims, as cited in the Office action dated 9/27/04, under 35U.S.C.102(b), as being anticipated by Hassan *et al.*, is maintained and repeated in this Office action.

Claim Objections

12. **Claims 44 and 56** are objected to because of the following informalities:

In *claim 44*, line 3, “the operator” should read “an operator”, as an operator is not previously introduced;

in *claim 56*, line 2, “image capture device” should read “electronic camera”; and

in line 3, “the operator” should read “an operator”.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

13. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

14. **Claims 46, 47, 58, and 59** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Particularly, the newly added limitations requiring “the display is adapted for viewing such incoming alpha numeric messages” and “the display is adapted for viewing such

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.