

Ex. GOOG 1014

08/877,488 06/17/97 MATTES

H P97.1227

EXAMINER

LM61/0605

HILL STEADMAN & SIMPSON
85TH FLOOR SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO IL 60606

ART UNIT

ENG. G

PAPER NUMBER

2743
DATE MAILED:

06/05/98

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

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

08/17/98

Matter

Examiner
George EngGroup Art Unit
2743☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 17, 1997☐ This action is **FINAL**.☐ Since this application is 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.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-16, and 18-24 is/are rejected.☒ Claim(s) 3 and 17 is/are objected to.☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.**Application Papers**☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been☒ received.☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).**Attachment(s)**☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 4☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: on claim 1, line 4, ';' should be --,--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 5-12, 16 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski et al. (US PAT. 5,666,159 hereinafter Parulski) in view of Kawamura et al. (US PAT. 5,576,759 hereinafter Kawamura).

Regarding claim 1, Parulski teaches a communication system as shown in figure 11 comprising:

- a) a telephone unit 48 as shown in figure 9 including a telephone portion, i.e., a keypad 58, for making telephone call, a camera module 68 for recording image, a memory unit 64, a control processing unit 62;

Art Unit: 2743

- b) a computer, i.e., a server, including a receiver C for receiving data from the telephone unit 48;
- c) a transmission system connection.

Parulski differs from the claimed invention in not having a classification unit to classify image data. However, Kawamura teaches an image processing for classifying image data into specific group such that the image data may be easily view when displayed. See col. 2 lines 13-64. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Parulski having a classification unit in the computer because of easily view as the image data classified.

Regarding claim 16, Parulski teaches a combined telephone/camera 48 as shown in figure 9 having

- a) a camera module 68 for recording image;
- b) a memory unit 64 for storing image data;
- c) a cellular transceiver for transmitting data;
- d) a computer for receiving image data (see figure 11).

Note while Parulski does not specifically teaches to store the image in the computer, it is obvious to have the computer storing the image data in order to display. Parulski differs from the claimed invention in not having a classification unit to classify received image data. However, Kawamura teaches an image processing for classifying image data into specific group such that the image data may be easily view when displayed. See col. 2 lines 13-64. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

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.