

# EXHIBIT 2001



# 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

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
90/011,861	08/16/2011	6700602	BLAIR.001A	3736
27299	7590	06/30/2014	EXAMINER	
GAZDZINSKI & ASSOCIATES, PC 16644 WEST BERNARDO DRIVE SUITE 201 SAN DIEGO, CA 92127			RALIS, STEPHEN J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3992	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/30/2014	PAPER

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

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

*Ex parte* SCOTT BLAIR  
Patent Owner, Appellant

---

Appeal 2014-000060  
Reexamination Control 90/011,861  
Patent US 6,700,602 B1<sup>1</sup>  
Technology Center 3900

---

Before CAROLYN D. THOMAS, ELENI MANTIS MERCADER, and  
DANIEL N. FISHMAN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MANTIS MERCADER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

---

<sup>1</sup> Issued Mar. 2, 2004 to Blair (hereinafter the “’602 Patent”).

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Patent Owner (hereinafter “Appellant”) appeals under 35 U.S.C. §§ 134(b) and 306 from the Final Rejection of claim 1.<sup>2</sup> Br. 1.

We reverse.

We have considered in this decision only those arguments Appellant actually raised in the Briefs. Any other arguments which Appellant could have made but chose not to make in the Briefs are deemed to be waived. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii).

### *Appellant’s Invention*

Appellant’s invention relates to a television system, for subway cars including a plurality of TV monitors mounted at the junction of the sidewall and ceiling. *See generally* ’602 Patent, Abstract.

Claim 1 under reexamination is reproduced as follows:

1. A subway car for mass transportation including longitudinal opposed sidewalls, a ceiling adjoining the sidewalls, a video display system comprising a plurality of video display monitors each having a video screen, and a video signal source unit operatively connected to said monitors,

said monitors being spaced along the length of the car on opposed sides thereof, each of said monitor being mounted at

---

<sup>2</sup> In response to Patent Owner’s Request for *Ex Parte* Reexamination filed August 16, 2011, seeking reexamination of independent claim 1, an Order Granting Request for *Ex Parte* Reexamination was issued on September 29, 2011, ordering reexamination of claim 1. During reexamination, Patent Owner presented new claims 8-30. Claims 2-7 are not subject to reexamination, claims 8-18, and 20-30 stand patentable and/or confirmed, and claim 19 is canceled. Final Action 2 (mailed Apr. 25, 2012); Advisory Action 2, 22-23 (mailed Jan. 16, 2013).

the junction of the sidewall and ceiling, with the screen of the monitor substantially flushed with the adjacent wall surface structure of the car, and directed obliquely downwardly toward the car seats, so that each video screen is readily visible to passengers in the subway car.

*The Examiner's Rejections*

1. Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Minesaki (JP 63-125984, pub. May 30, 1988).
2. Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Amano (JP H2-223985, pub. Sept. 6, 1990).
3. Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maekawa (JP H04-160991, pub. June 4, 1992) and Amano.
4. Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minesaki and Moore (US 3,480,727, issued Nov. 25, 1969).
5. Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amano and Moore.
6. Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maekawa, Amano, and Moore.
7. Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shinagawa (JP S61-285490, pub. Dec. 16, 1986), Amano, and Moore.

# 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.