

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor: Peter L. VENETIANER et al.)
Patent No.: 7,868,912) Control No.: Unassigned
Issued: January 11, 2011)
Title: VIDEO SURVEILLANCE)
SYSTEM EMPLOYING)
VIDEO PRIMITIVES)
Filing Date: April 5, 2005)

Mail Stop *Ex Parte* Reexam
Central Reexamination Unit
Office of Patent Legal Administration
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

ATTACHMENT TO REQUEST FOR *EX PARTE* REEXAMINATION (FORM PTO-SB/57; PTO-1465) PROVIDING INFORMATION ON U.S. PATENT NO. 7,868,912

Pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §§ 302-307 and 37 C.F.R. § 1.510, the undersigned, on behalf of an anonymous Requester, requests *ex parte* reexamination of claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent No. 7,868,912 ("the '912 Patent").

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	CLAIMS FOR WHICH REEXAMINATION IS REQUESTED.....	1
II.	COPY OF '912 PATENT PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.510(b)(4).....	1
III.	CERTIFICATION REGARDING 35 U.S.C. § 315(e)(1) AND 35 U.S.C. § 325(e)(1)	1
IV.	PROCEEDINGS RELATED TO THE '912 PATENT	1
V.	'912 PATENT AND ITS PROSECUTION.....	3
VI.	CITATION OF PRIOR PATENTS AND PRINTED PUBLICATIONS.....	12
VII.	STATEMENT POINTING OUT SUBSTANTIAL NEW QUESTIONS OF PATENTABILITY.....	15
A.	Proposed Rejection 1: Claims 1 to 3 and 6 to 22 are anticipated by Gilge under 35 U.S.C. § 102	17
B.	Proposed Rejection 2: Claims 1 to 4 and 6 to 22 are anticipated by Lipton et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102.....	22
C.	Proposed Rejection 3: Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 to 13, 15 to 20, and 22 are anticipated by Courtney under 35 U.S.C. § 102.....	26
D.	Proposed Rejection 4: Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 to 13, 15 to 20, and 22 are anticipated by Olson et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102	31
E.	Proposed Rejection 5: Claims 1 to 3 and 6 to 22 are unpatentable in view of the combination of Gilge and Brill under 35 U.S.C. § 103	34
F.	Proposed Rejection 6: Claims 1 to 3 and 6 to 22 are unpatentable in view of the combination of Lipton et al. and Brill under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	38
G.	Proposed Rejection 7: Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 to 13, 15 to 20, and 22 are unpatentable in view of the combination of Courtney and Brill Under 35 U.S.C. § 103	39
H.	Proposed Rejection 8: Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 to 13, 15 to 20, and 22 are unpatentable in view of the combination of Olson et al. and Brill under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	40
I.	Proposed Rejection 9: Claims 1 to 3 and 6 to 22 are unpatentable in view of the combination of Gilge and Day under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	41
J.	Proposed Rejection 10: Claims 1 to 4 and 6 to 22 are unpatentable in view of the combination of Lipton et al. and Day under 35 U.S.C. § 103	45
K.	Proposed Rejection 11: Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 to 13, 15 to 20, and 22 are unpatentable in view of the combination of Courtney and Day under 35 U.S.C. § 103	46
L.	Proposed Rejection 12: Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 to 13, 15 to 20, and 22 are unpatentable in view of the combination of Olson et al. and Day under 35 U.S.C. § 103	47
M.	Proposed Rejection 13: Claim 5 is unpatentable in view of the combination of Gilge and JP '783 under 35 U.S.C. § 103	48
N.	Proposed Rejection 14: Claim 5 is unpatentable in view of the combination of Lipton et al. and JP '783 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	50

O. Proposed Rejection 15: Claim 5 is unpatentable in view of the combination of Courtney and JP '783 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	51
P. Proposed Rejection 16: Claim 5 is unpatentable in view of the combination of Olson et al. and JP '783 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	52
Q. Proposed Rejection 17: Claim 5 is unpatentable in view of the combination of Gilge, Brill and JP '783 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	53
R. Proposed Rejection 18: Claim 5 is unpatentable in view of the combination of Lipton et al., Brill and JP '783 under 35 U.S.C. § 103	53
S. Proposed Rejection 19: Claim 5 is Unpatentable in view of the combination of Courtney, Brill and JP '783 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103	54
T. Proposed Rejection 20: Claim 5 is unpatentable in view of the combination of Olson et al., Brill and JP '783 under 35 U.S.C. § 103	55
U. Proposed Rejection 21: Claim 5 is unpatentable in view of the combination of Gilge, Day and JP '783 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	56
V. Proposed Rejection 22: Claim 5 is unpatentable in view of the combination of Lipton et al., Day and JP '783 under 35 U.S.C. § 103	57
W. Proposed Rejection 23: Claim 5 is unpatentable in view of the combination of Courtney, Day and JP '783 under 35 U.S.C. § 103	57
X. Proposed Rejection 24: Claim 5 is unpatentable in view of the combination of Olson et al., Day and JP '783 under 35 U.S.C. § 103	58
VIII. EXPLANATION OF PERTINENCY AND MANNER OF APPLYING CITED PRIOR ART TO EVERY CLAIM FOR WHICH REEXAMINATION IS REQUESTED UNDER 37 CFR § 1.510(b)(2)	59
IX. COMMENTS ON PATENT OWNER'S AMENDMENT AND REPLY IN RELATED PROCEEDING	60
A. Comments On Patent Owner's Remarks	60
1. Patent Owner Is Not Entitled To A Priority Date Before Earlier Than The '912 Patent Filing Date	61
2. The Rejections Based On Gilge and Lipton et al. Were Substantively Uncontested In The '912 Reexamination.....	77
3. Patent Owner's Arguments Against The Rejection Of Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 to 13, 15 to 20, And 22 As Anticipated By Courtney Lack Merit.....	77
4. Patent Owner's Arguments Against the Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 to 13, 15 to 20, and 22 As Anticipated by Olson et al. Lack Merit	87
B. Comments On New Claims Presented In The '912 Reexamination.....	95
1. Claim 23.....	96
2. Claims 46-49.....	96
3. Claim 50.....	99
4. Claim 51.....	99

5.	Claim 52.....	99
6.	Claim 53.....	100
7.	Claim 54.....	101
8.	Claim 55.....	102
9.	Claim 56.....	102
10.	Claims 57 to 67.....	102
11.	Claims 68 to 79.....	103
12.	Claims 80 to 90.....	103
13.	Claims 91 to 101.....	104
14.	Claim 24.....	104
15.	Claim 25.....	104
16.	Claim 26.....	104
17.	Claim 29.....	106
18.	Claim 31.....	106
19.	Claim 34.....	106
20.	Claims 37-41.....	107
21.	Claims 42 and 43.....	107
22.	Claims 44 and 45.....	108
23.	Proposed Grounds Of Rejection For New Claims.....	108
X.	CONCLUSION.....	112

LISTING OF ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment A:** Copy of U.S. Patent No. 7,868,912, for which reexamination is requested
- Attachment B:** German Patent Publication No. DE 101 53 484 A1 (“Gilge”)
- Attachment C:** Certified translation of Gilge
- Attachment D:** Lipton et al., “ObjectVideo Forensics: Activity-Based Video Indexing and Retrieval For Physical Security Applications,” Intelligent Distributed Surveillance Systems (IDSS-04), The IEE, Savoy Place, London, U.K., February 23, 2004. (“Lipton et al.”)
- Attachment E:** U.S. Patent No. 5,969,755 (“Courtney”)
- Attachment F:** Olson et al, “Moving Object Detection and Event Recognition Algorithms for Smart Cameras” Proceedings of the 1997 Image Understanding Workshop, New Orleans, May 1997, pp. 159-175. (“Olson et al.”)
- Attachment G:** U.S. Patent No. 6,628,835 (“Brill et al.”)
- Attachment H:** Day et al., “Object Oriented Conceptual Modeling of Video Data,” Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Data Engineering, pp. 401-408. IEEE March, 1995 (“Day”)
- Attachment I:** Japanese Published Patent Application No. 1997-130783 (“JP ‘783”)
- Attachment J:** Certified translation of JP ‘783
- Attachment K:** Claim Chart - Claims 1 to 3 and 6 to 22 are Anticipated by Gilge Under 35 USC § 102
- Attachment L:** Claim Chart - Claims 1 to 4 and 6 to 22 are Anticipated by Lipton et al. Under 35 USC § 102
- Attachment M:** Claim Chart - Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 to 13, 15 to 20, and 22 Are Anticipated by Courtney Under 35 U.S.C. § 102
- Attachment N:** Claim Chart - Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 to 13, 15 to 20, and 22 are Anticipated by Olson et al. Under 35 U.S.C. § 102
- Attachment O:** Claim Chart - Claims 1 to 3 and 6 to 22 are Unpatentable in view of the combination of Gilge and Brill Under 35 USC § 103

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.