



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.
90/012,876	05/23/2013	7932923	4079-116	6419

6449 7590 04/30/2014
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.
607 14th Street, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

BASEHOAR, ADAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3992

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

04/30/2014

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.



DO NOT USE IN PALM PRINTER

(THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS)

DINESH AGARWAL, P.C.

5350 SHAWNEE ROAD

SUITE 330

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22312

EX PARTE REEXAMINATION COMMUNICATION TRANSMITTAL FORM

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NO. 90/012,876.

PATENT NO. 7932923.

ART UNIT 3992.

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above identified *ex parte* reexamination proceeding (37 CFR 1.550(f)).

Where this copy is supplied after the reply by requester, 37 CFR 1.535, or the time for filing a reply has passed, no submission on behalf of the *ex parte* reexamination requester will be acknowledged or considered (37 CFR 1.550(g)).

Notice of Intent to Issue Ex Parte Reexamination Certificate	Control No.	Patent Under Reexamination	
	90/012,876	7932923	
	Examiner	Art Unit	AIA (First Inventor to File) Status
	ADAM L. BASEHOAR	3992	No

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

1. Prosecution on the merits is (or remains) closed in this *ex parte* reexamination proceeding. This proceeding is subject to reopening at the initiative of the Office or upon petition. Cf. 37 CFR 1.313(a). A Certificate will be issued in view of
 - (a) Patent owner's communication(s) filed: 16 April 2014.
 - (b) Patent owner's failure to file an appropriate timely response to the Office action mailed: _____.
 - (c) Patent owner's failure to timely file an Appeal Brief (37 CFR 41.31).
 - (d) The decision on appeal by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences Court dated _____
 - (e) Other: _____.
2. The Reexamination Certificate will indicate the following:
 - (a) Change in the Specification: Yes No
 - (b) Change in the Drawing(s): Yes No
 - (c) Status of the Claim(s):
 - (1) Patent claim(s) confirmed: _____.
 - (2) Patent claim(s) amended (including dependent on amended claim(s)): 1-41
 - (3) Patent claim(s) canceled: _____.
 - (4) Newly presented claim(s) patentable: _____.
 - (5) Newly presented canceled claims: 42-81.
 - (6) Patent claim(s) previously currently disclaimed: _____
 - (7) Patent claim(s) not subject to reexamination: _____.
3. A declaration(s)/affidavit(s) under **37 CFR 1.130(b)** was/were filed on _____.
4. Note the attached statement of reasons for patentability and/or confirmation. Any comments considered necessary by patent owner regarding reasons for patentability and/or confirmation must be submitted promptly to avoid processing delays. Such submission(s) should be labeled: "Comments On Statement of Reasons for Patentability and/or Confirmation."
5. Note attached NOTICE OF REFERENCES CITED (PTO-892).
6. Note attached LIST OF REFERENCES CITED (PTO/SB/08 or PTO/SB/08 substitute).
7. The drawing correction request filed on _____ is: approved disapproved.
8. Acknowledgment is made of the priority claim under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some* c) None of the certified copies have
 - been received.
 - not been received.
 - been filed in Application No. _____.
 - been filed in reexamination Control No. _____.
 - been received by the International Bureau in PCT Application No. _____.

* Certified copies not received: _____.
9. Note attached Examiner's Amendment.
10. Note attached Interview Summary (PTO-474).
11. Other: _____.

All correspondence relating to this reexamination proceeding should be directed to the **Central Reexamination Unit** at the mail, FAX, or hand-carry addresses given at the end of this Office action.

/ADAM L BASEHOAR/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3992

cc: Requester (if third party requester)

Art Unit: 3992

The present application is being examined under the pre-AIA first to invent provisions.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action addresses original claims 1-41 and newly presented claims 42-81 of United States Patent Number 7,932,923 B2 (Lipton et al), for which it has been determined in the Order Granting Ex Parte Reexamination (hereafter the “Order”) mailed 06/17/2013 that a substantial new question of patentability was raised in the Request for Ex Parte reexamination filed on 05/23/2013 (hereafter the “Request”).

2. This Office action is a response to the Patent Owner’s (PO) After Final Amendment and Reply (hereafter the “Reply”) filed 04/16/2014. PO’s Reply, along with its accompanying amendments, has been entered and made of record. By virtue of PO’s Reply: (1) the specification has been amended (see: Reply, p. 2); (2) original independent claims 1, 8, 9, 20, 22, 29, and 30 have been amended (see: Reply, pp. 3-6); and (3) newly presented claims 42-81 have been cancelled (see: Reply, p. 6).

Regarding PO’s amendment to the specification, said amendment is sufficient to properly correct the benefit claim (see: MPEP 211.03: “the reference to the prior application was previously submitted within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 1.78, but not in the location of the application as required by 37 CFR 1.78 (e.g., if the reference was submitted in an oath or declaration or the application transmittal letter), and the information concerning the benefit claim was recognized by the Office as shown by its inclusion on the first filing receipt...still required to submit the reference in compliance with 37 CFR 1.78 by filing an amendment to the first sentence(s) of the specification”) to satisfy the specific reference requirement found lacking and discussed in at least the Final Action (see: Final Action, pp. 5-6).

Art Unit: 3992

In view of PO's amendments to original independent claims 1, 8, 9, 20, 22, 29, and 30, as discussed below in the Statement of Reasons for Patentability and/or Confirmation section, the remaining corresponding rejections (i.e., rejections relating to original claims 1-41) related to the primary Day-I reference (see: Final Action, pp. 24, 25, and 29-31) have been withdrawn.

Therefore, amended original claims 1-41 are found patentable and/or confirmed.

STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR PATENTABILITY AND/OR CONFIRMATION

3. Claims 1-41 are patentable and/or confirmed. The following is an Examiner's statement of reasons for patentability and/or confirmation of claims 1-41 found in this reexamination proceeding. Claims 1-41 are confirmed and/or patentable over the prior art that was explained in the Request and determined to raise a substantial new question of patentability in the Order granting reexamination and over the prior art that was applied and discussed by the Examiner in the present reexamination proceeding because of the following:

Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the new limitation of, "applying the new user rule to only the plurality of detected attributes." (see: Lipton '923, column 14, lines 64-67: "only the video primitives are reviewed"). Said new limitation having previously been indicated as patentable/confirmable with regard to the limitations of independent claim 1 by virtue of the features presented in new independent claim 55 (see: Final Action, pp. 36-37). As similarly presented in the Final Action, the Examiner agrees with the PO (see: Zeger Declaration, Paragraphs 133-134) that the conceptual queries utilized in the video query system of Day-I are not applied to "only" the detected attributes, but require the use of object-oriented abstractions to interface with the VSDG model. As shown in the Lipton '923 patent, an event discriminator

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.